

Consultant Performance Evaluation Form

Cobb County Department of Transportation 1890 County Services Parkway, Marietta, Georgia 30008-4014 (770) 528-1600 • Fax: (770) 528-1601

Date: Cobb County Project No: GDOT Project No: Project Name:		Cobb County PM: Consultant Firm: Consultant PM:							
Plan Review Phase(s)	Concept	PFPR	Right of Way □	FFPI	₹		Cons	tr. Re	view
Project Mana	gement				1	2	3	4	□ 5
 Effective in use of resources and made timely decisions Proactively coordinate activities that may impact the project scope, schedule, and budget Manages and coordinates subconsultants effectively Comments: 		 Project Manager takes initiatives and provides creative solutions Out of scope tasks are communicated to Cobb County DOT early and scope is supplemented before work is performed 							
Communicati	ion and Coopera	ition			1	2	3	4	□ 5
 Communicate iss Response to requestion concise, and in a ti 	uests are clear,	flexible, and ● All comm	onsistently well prepare d open to suggestions. unication and meetings writing (meeting minut	are					
Comments:									
Schedule					1	 2	3	4	5
schedule issues in	ones and submittal nty DOT of possible	=	esources in response to f the project delivery sch	edule					
Comments:									
Technical Per					1	 2	3	□ 4	□ 5
with research and assumptions	problems in a timely	articulate the Comment adequately and reportsIncorporation	design alternatives and neir advantages/disadva ts and key decisions are incorporated into the place. Ited local, state, & feder and standards (as approp	ans					

4/6/18

Quality						
Zamaj		1	2	3	4	5
Deliverables are complete for the project stage, organized, with few errors	 Deliverables demonstrates effective implementation of QA/QC plan Plans presentation is clear and of professional quality 					
Comments:						

	Overall Rating Average:
Consultant Comments (attach additional sheets as	necessary):
Please provide comments regarding the Performan	ce Evaluation Process in general:
Consultant Project Manager	
Cobb County Project Manager	Pre-Construction Engineer

Ratings Guidelines:

Rating #1 (Unsatisfactory) - Work required extensive revisions; included numerous & significant errors; consultant was unable or unwilling to perform consistently; required an inordinate amount of supervision, and/or failed to meet professional standards or project objectives.

Rating #2 (Fair) – Performance was marginal; work required more review and included more errors than would normally be anticipated; level of service or expertise below average.

Rating #3 (Satisfactory) – Performance and work were satisfactory; services provided were at least of industry standard; no significant errors or problems; professional service objectives met.

Rating #4 (Good) - Consultant work is better than that of the average consultant.

Rating #5 (Excellent) – Performance was clearly above standard; expectations exceeded; objectives were met with a higher level of professional expertise.