MDT Consultant Performance Evaluation Criteria & Standards

Updated 11/25/2025

Area of Evaluation	Letter Grade Descriptions and Point Values	
Schedule and Deadlines ***Focus areas: Schedule, timeliness.*** Questions to ask: Did the Consultant meet agreed upon schedule(s)? Were critical path deliverables met? Were non-critical path deliverables met?	**A** (30 pts.)	Exceeded schedule expectations and met numerous critical path deliverables before agreed upon deadlines, with no late deliverables. If an intentionally aggressive/accelerated schedule was used, it was achieved.
	A- (27 pts.)	Met or exceeded schedule expectations and delivered one or more critical path deliverable(s) early, with no late deliverables. If an intentionally aggressive/accelerated schedule was used, it was achieved.
	B (24 pts.)	Generally met agreed upon schedule. No late critical path deliverables. If an intentionally aggressive/accelerated schedule was used, it was mostly achieved.
	C (20 pts.)	Generally met agreed upon schedule with one or more late critical path deliverables and one or more non-critical path deliverables. If late on a critical path deliverable, the Consultant adjusted and met the agreed upon schedule for the next critical path deliverable.
	D (10 pts.)	Did not meet agreed upon schedule with numerous late critical path deliverable(s).
	F (0 pts.)	Repeatedly failed to meet agreed upon critical path deliverables. Late deliverables were caused by the Consultant and resulted in project delivery delay.
	N/A (not included)	Not applicable to this evaluation.
Schedule and Deadlines Your score:	Choose a letter grade	

MDT Consultant Performance Evaluation Criteria & Standards

Updated 11/25/2025

Area of Evaluation	Letter Grade Descriptions and Point Values	
Quality of Work ***Focus areas: Quality of product, quality assurance and control.*** Questions to ask: Were appropriate guidelines, standards, design policies, and/or other available information used to produce an accurate and technically correct product(s)? Were review comments incorporated and/or addressed in subsequent submittals? Was design constructible and reasonable? Was work checked for accuracy and content prior to submission to the Department?	**A** (30 pts.)	Exceeded expectations for quality and accuracy. Clearly effective QA/QC process in place. Minimal corrections needed at plan reviews or review of deliverable(s). Comments were consistently addressed in subsequent submittals. Product was constructible and easy to read/interpret.
	A- (27 pts.)	Generally exceeded expectations for quality and accuracy. Effective QA/QC process in place. Some minor corrections (math errors, missing notes, font sizes, etc.) needed at plan reviews or review of deliverable(s). Comments were consistently addressed in subsequent submittals. Product was constructible and easy to read/interpret.
	B (24 pts.)	Met expectations for quality and accuracy. Good QA/QC process in place. Several minor corrections needed at plan reviews or review of deliverable(s). Comments were generally addressed in subsequent submittals. Product was constructible and generally easy to read/interpret.
	C (20 pts.)	Generally met expectations for quality and accuracy. Decent QA/QC process in place. Numerous minor corrections, and/or a few significant revisions needed at plan reviews or review of deliverable(s). Comments were generally addressed in subsequent submittals. Product was constructible and generally easy to read/interpret.
	D (10 pts.)	Generally did not meet expectations for quality and accuracy. Several major deficiencies and numerous minor deficiencies needed at plan reviews or review of deliverable(s). Comments were generally not addressed in subsequent submittals. Constructability of product was questionable and product was difficult to read/interpret.
	F (0 pts.)	Repeatedly failed to meet quality standards with numerous major deficiencies. The majority of comments were not addressed in subsequent submittals. Work product was difficult to read/interpret.
	N/A (not included)	Not applicable to this evaluation.
Quality of Work Your score:	Choose a letter grade	

MDT Consultant Performance Evaluation Criteria & Standards

Updated 11/25/2025

Area of Evaluation	Letter Grade Descriptions and Point Values	
Cooperation ***Focus areas: Communication, team work, responsiveness.*** Questions to ask: How was the Consultant's overall responsiveness and timeliness? Did Consultant work cooperatively with Project Manager, other MDT staff, other consultants, and project stakeholders? Was information communicated clearly, concisely, and at appropriate intervals? How did the Consultant manage and inform MDT of decisions or changes that had the potential to affect the scope, schedule, and budget? Did they participate and contribute to the decision making process?	**A** (30 pts.)	Exceptional cooperation. Responses to inquiries were very prompt/expeditious. Proactive in communicating information, regularly providing updates on the status of the project. Issues were resolved quickly. Obvious team player interested in the overall success of the project. Proactively managed and informed MDT of decisions and changes that had the potential to affect the scope, schedule, and budget.
	A- (27 pts.)	Very good cooperation. Responses to inquiries were prompt and did not require repeated requests. Proactive in communicating information. Issues were resolved quickly. Obvious team player interested in the overall success of the project. Proactively managed and informed MDT of decisions and changes that had the potential to affect the scope, schedule, and budget.
	B (24 pts.)	Good cooperation. Responses to inquiries were prompt, rarely requiring repeated requests. Proactive in communicating information. Issues were resolved quickly at the direction of MDT. Good team player interested in the overall success of the project. Effectively addressed decisions and changes that had the potential to affect the scope, schedule, and budget.
	C (20 pts.)	Satisfactory communication. Responses were reasonably prompt, sometimes requiring repeated requests. Issues took time to resolve and routinely required MDT input/decision. Decent team player, but on occasion looked out for interests of other parties instead of MDT's. Notified MDT of decisions and changes that had the potential to affect the scope, schedule, and budget.
	D (10 pts.)	Poor communication. Responses were delayed, and often times required repeated requests. Issues took time to resolve and routinely required MDT input/decision. Questionable team player, regularly looked out for interests of other parties instead of MDT's. Generally, but inconsistently, notified MDT of decisions and changes that had the potential to affect the scope, schedule, and budget.
	F (0 pts.)	Unsatisfactory communication. Often argumentative and/or unresponsive. Responses were seriously lacking, routinely requiring repeated requests. Issues were not resolved without significant MDT input/decision. Poor team player, regularly looked out for interests of other parties instead of MDT's. Failed to effectively manage or inform MDT of decisions or changes that had the potential to affect the scope, schedule, and budget.
	N/A (not included)	Not applicable to this evaluation.
Cooperation Your score:	Choose a letter grade	

MDT Consultant Performance Evaluation Criteria & Standards

Updated 11/25/2025

Area of Evaluation	Letter Grade Descriptions and Point Values	
Management ***Focus Areas: Overall project /task management, ownership, efficiency.*** Questions to ask: Were personnel, the budget, and subconsultants managed and used efficiently to provide the best possible value to the taxpayer? Was careful planning and forethought used when expending resources? Did Consultant demonstrate ownership of the work product? Were design decisions, memos, logs, etc. maintained? Were key personnel maintained throughout the project/task, or were personnel routinely reassigned? Were invoices and progress reports accurate and timely?	**A** (30 pts.)	Exceptional management of the project/task. Maximized efficient use of the budget, resulting in delivery of a quality product at a lower than expected cost. Clear personal investment in the project/product. Accurate and thorough records and invoices were maintained and timely. Coordination with subconsultants and their deliverables was very effective in all aspects.
	A- (27 pts.)	Very good management of the project/task. The budget was used efficiently, resulting in delivery of a quality product at a slightly lower than expected cost. Demonstrated investment in the project/product. Accurate and thorough records and invoices were maintained and timely. Coordination with subconsultants and their deliverables was effective in all aspects.
	B (24 pts.)	Good management of the project/task. The budget was used fairly efficiently, resulting in delivery of a quality product at or below the expected cost. There was some ownership in the project/product, with a good amount of pride in the work. Accurate and thorough records and invoices were maintained and timely. Coordination with subconsultants and their deliverables was effective in most aspects. Some work was needed by MDT to help manage subconsultants.
	C (20 pts.)	Satisfactory management of the project/task. The project/product was delivered on budget. Personal ownership in the project/product was slightly lacking. Records were maintained, but often at the request of MDT. Invoices were accurate for the most part, but were sometimes in error. Coordination with subconsultants and their deliverables was very effective for the most part; however some work was needed by MDT to help manage subconsultants.
	D (10 pts.)	Poor management of the project/task. The budget was overrun, and amendments were pursued to continue in-scope work. Little to no ownership in the project/product. Maintenance of records was lacking. Invoices were routinely inaccurate. Coordination with subconsultants and their deliverables was ineffective. Significant amount of work was needed by MDT to ensure progress of the project/task, and some corrective counseling was needed.
	F (0 pts.)	Unsatisfactory management of the project/task. The budget was overrun, and amendments were routinely pursued to continue in-scope work. No ownership in the project/product. Maintenance of records was seriously lacking. Invoices were routinely inaccurate. Coordination with subconsultants and their deliverables was ineffective. Extraordinary amount of work was needed by MDT to ensure progress of the project/task, despite repeated attempts at corrective counseling.
	N/A (not included)	Not applicable to this evaluation.
Management Your score:	Choose a letter grade	

MDT Consultant Performance Evaluation Criteria & Standards

Updated 11/25/2025

Area of Evaluation	Letter Grade Descriptions and Point Values	
Knowledge of Department Needs and Design Value ***Focus Areas: Value of work product(s), innovation, subject expertise.*** Questions to ask: Did the Consultant deliver a product that met the Department's needs? Was extensive coaching needed to get a product that met expectations? Were viable alternative solutions presented to overcome construction budget constraints? Were opportunities to incorporate innovative features sought out (if applicable)? Was an appropriate level of design and risk analysis done?	**A** (30 pts.)	An exceptional work product(s) was delivered that met all of MDT's needs. Virtually no coaching or direction was needed. An appropriate number of alternatives and associated costs and risks were analyzed and Consultant provided viable recommendations.
	A- (27 pts.)	A very good work product(s) was delivered that met all of MDT's needs. Minimal coaching or direction was needed. A number of alternatives and associated costs and risks were analyzed, somewhat at the direction of MDT. Good recommendations were made.
	B (24 pts.)	A good work product(s) was delivered that met most of MDT's needs. An acceptable amount of coaching or direction was needed, with no repeated coaching needed. A number of alternatives and associated costs and risks were analyzed, somewhat at the direction of MDT. Recommendations were made, but may have slightly lacked overall value.
	C (20 pts.)	A satisfactory work product(s) was delivered that met most of MDT's needs. An acceptable amount of coaching or direction was needed, and there was some repeated coaching or direction needed. A limited number of alternatives and associated costs and risks were analyzed, primarily at the direction of MDT. Valuable recommendations may or may not have been provided.
	D (10 pts.)	A poor work product(s) was delivered that met some of MDT's needs. A significant amount of coaching or direction was needed, often times repeatedly. Limited, if any, alternatives and associated costs and risks were analyzed. Alternatives analyzed were either at the direction of MDT or were not viable. Recommendations that were made generally lacked overall value.
	F (0 pts.)	An unacceptable work product(s) was delivered. MDT had to repeatedly give direction to Consultant. Recommendations that were provided were unsatisfactory and showed lack of overall value.
	N/A (not included)	Not applicable to this evaluation.
Knowledge of Department Needs and Design Value Your score:	Choose a letter grade	

MDT Consultant Performance Evaluation Criteria & Standards

Updated 11/25/2025

Recap of Scores	
Category	**Score**
Schedule and Deadlines	0
Quality of Work	0
Cooperation	0
Management	0
Knowledge of Department Needs and Design Value	0

Reference Key
A (30 pts.)
A- (27 pts.)
B (24 pts.)
C (20 pts.)
D (10 pts.)
F (0 pts.)