

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

Design Professional: \_\_\_\_\_

University Project Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

University Construction Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

Rate the performance of the contractor on each of the items listed below. A 0 rating should be given for performance that is acceptable and meets the minimum contractual requirements. Remember, you are evaluating the only the contractor's performance and their positive or negative contributions to the project, not the project as a whole. Provide narrative on specific examples when appropriate. Space is provided for these comments at the end of the questionnaire.

**Management and Supervision**

**1. Team participation**

Score = 0

Contractor was a valued member of the team and provided positive contributions

Contractor interacted with other team members professionally and participation met expectations

Contractor was a negative influence on the activities of the project team and contributed to an adversarial tone

2

1

0

-1

-2

**2. Communication Skills and Methods**

Score = 0

Communication lines were established early and was always effectively utilized to positively impact the project

Communication was adequate to meet project needs

Communication was often not effective and had a negative impact on the project

2

1

0

-1

-2

**3. Innovation/Alternatives**

Score = 0

Helpful and constructive alternate methods or value engineering measures were proposed

Work was provided as required to meet the requirements of the contract documents

Substitutions and other suggestions provided were untimely and/or detrimental to project scope, quality, or schedule

2

1

0

-1

-2

**4. Problem and Issue Resolution**

Score = 0

Problems were identified early and before they became delay or cost issues and were addressed immediately

Problems and issues were resolved in a professional manner as required to meet contractual requirements

Problems were often not effectively resolved forcing undesirable compromises

2

1

0

-1

-2

**5. Quality Control Procedures**

Score = 0

Effective quality control procedures were established and required minimal involvement by the Architect and Owner

Quality control procedures were adequate to assure compliance with contractual requirements

Contractor depended on Architect and Owner to enforce quality requirements

2

1

0

-1

-2

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**6. Technical Knowledge** Score = 0

Personnel assigned to the project were well versed and experienced for the Work on the project and had a positive impact	Personnel assigned to the project had necessary experience to complete the Work on the project	Lack of experience for the personnel assigned to the project had a negative impact on the Work on the project
2	1	0
		-1
		-2

**7. Site Organization And Housekeeping** Score = 0

The site was safe, well organized and maintained. Impact on the campus was less than expected and no complaints were received	Site organization and housekeeping met minimum contract requirements	Numerous issues or complaints were received and/or the impact on the campus was excessive
2	1	0
		-1
		-2

**8. Quality of Workmanship** Score = 0

Quality of workmanship exceeded contractual requirements in many areas	Quality of workmanship met minimum contractual requirements	Quality of workmanship did not meet contractual requirements in many areas
2	1	0
		-1
		-2

**9. Damage/Disruption To Existing Or Adjacent Facilities** Score = 0

Damage/Disruption to existing or adjacent facilities was less than expected	Damage/Disruption to existing or adjacent facilities was as expected	Damage/Disruption to existing or adjacent facilities was excessive
2	1	0
		-1
		-2

**Subcontractor Selection and Management**

**10. Quality of Subcontractors** Score = 0

All subcontractors utilized on the project provided superior workmanship and provided positive contributions to the project team	Subcontractors utilized on the project met expectations	Work by some or all subcontractors was poor quality and they were often a negative influence on the activities of the project team
2	1	0
		-1
		-2

**11. Subcontractor Coordination** Score = 0

Subcontractors were coordinated effectively and functioned as a highly effective team	Subcontractor coordination met minimum contractual requirements	Contractor depended on others to coordinate subcontractors
2	1	0
		-1
		-2

**12. Subcontractor Issues** Score = 0

Effective management of the contractor team prevented issues from arising.	No valid claims were filed. Issues were quickly and fairly resolved without Owner involvement.	Numerous claims and/or issues. Owner involvement was required for resolution.
2	1	0
		-1
		-2

**Schedule**

**13. Realistic Schedule Prepared** Score = 0

A well thought out and highly effective schedule was submitted that accurately reflected contractor work flow and sequence	Schedule submitted met minimum contractual requirements	Schedule submitted did not reflect contractor work flow and sequence
2	1	0
		-1
		-2

**14. Effort and Commitment to Schedule** Score = 0

A sense of urgency was established and adjustments were promptly and effectively made to work sequence and work force to maintain or improve the schedule	Necessary adjustments were made to work sequence and work force to maintain schedule commitments	The project lacked a sense of urgency and little or no effort was made to maintain schedule commitments
2	1	0
		-1
		-2



