

Tracking Vendor Performance Form

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Performance Period: Final <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/> | | Date Prepared: |
| Agency / IHE: | | Prepared By: |
| Vendor: | | Contract Title: |
| Contract # / P.O/ #: | | |
| Contract Amount: \$ | | |
| Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): | | |
| <p>Performance Ratings: In applying Performance Ratings, comments should summarize the vendor's performance and the rating circled should best describes performance in that category. See Tracking Vendor Performance Guidance for explanations of categories and Ratings (Above Standard, Standard, Below Standard*) * Note that these Ratings have been developed for use in the Statewide Contract Management System and for use with any type of contract and project specific Scope of Work.</p> | | |
| Category | Rating | Comments (Brief) |
| Vendor Requirements met as to QUALITY of Goods / Services | Above Standard Standard Below Standard | |
| Vendor Requirements met as to TIMELINESS of Delivery or Performance (Deadlines, Milestones, Schedule) | Above Standard Standard Below Standard | |
| Vendor Requirements met as to PRICE/BUDGET (Cost Control) | Above Standard Standard Below Standard | |
| BUSINESS RELATIONS (professionalism, responsiveness, change management) | Above Standard Standard Below Standard | |
| SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS INCLUDED IN THE SOW (list major requirements separately) | Above Standard Standard Below Standard | |
| Average Rating | Above Standard Standard Below Standard | |

Tracking Vendor Performance Guidance

Monitoring and evaluating a contractor/vendor that is providing goods and/or services to the State is a learned process. Much can be done to try and standardize the process through developing forms and creating criteria, however, unless two or more vendors are supplying the same or similar products or services, for the same agency, and for the same project, a standard set of criteria will not apply to all vendor performance evaluations.

Most often, the different State agencies will hire different vendors to perform different work for different projects. As a result, the Scope of Work and the performance monitoring plan and, consequently, the performance evaluation will be different. Criteria will have to be adjusted for individual vendors and the work each was selected to perform.

This document is meant only as an example of the range of variables an agency can be adopted and modified for use in a particular vendor contract. The forms provided are intended as a starting point and should be changed for use with a specific vendor and specific project. The monitoring information collected throughout the life of the contract will supply the data necessary for input into the Statewide Contract Management System and lead to the assessment of interim vendor performance ratings leading up to the final rating required by Colorado Statute.

Areas of Evaluation

Vendor performance is usually evaluated in the areas of pricing, quality, timeliness, delivery, and service. Each area varies in the number of factors deemed critical by an agency towards “successful” vendor performance. Ratings should reflect how well (how close) the contractor complied with the specific contract performance requirements for each area

General descriptions of each of the performance areas:

Quality of Work:

Vendor consistently achieved desired outcomes with a minimum of avoidable errors and problems. Work met the requirements, expectations, or desired outcomes. The work was accurate and complete. The work was done in an efficient and effective manner.

Timeliness of Work:

Work is happening or done at the right time or an appropriate time as agreed to under contract. Agreed to dates of delivery were met. The vendor kept the project on schedule. Service hours and effort were as agreed.

Business Relations:

Vendor was professional, responsive, proactive. Proposed limited changes without cost impacts. Vendor was reliable and managed the project effectively.

Pricing of Work:

The forecasted costs were close or identical to billed costs. Costs were managed effectively. Costs needed to be renegotiated to meet contract requirements. The value received supported costs.

Specific factors within each evaluation area:

Pricing factors can include (and are not limited to) the following:

- Price stability. Prices should be reasonably stable over the term of the contract.
- Price accuracy. There should be a low number of variances from initial agreed to prices and the costs on received invoices.
- Advance notice of price changes. The vendor should provide adequate advance notice of price changes.
- Sensitive to costs. The vendor should demonstrate respect for the bottom line and show an understanding of the agency’s needs. Possible cost savings could be suggested.

- Billing. Vendor's invoices should be accurate. Estimates should not vary significantly from the final invoice. Effective vendor bills are timely and easy to read and understand.

Quality factors can include (and are not limited to) the following:

- Compliance with the contract. The vendor should comply with terms and conditions as stated in the agreement. The vendor should show an understanding of the agency's expectations.
- Conformity to specifications. The product or service must conform to the specifications identified in the original solicitation and contractual agreement. The product should perform as expected. The services should be provided as expected.
- Reliability. The rate of product failure is within reasonable limits.
- Reliability of repairs. All repairs and rework is acceptable.
- Durability. The time until replacement is necessary reasonable.
- Support. Quality support should be available from the vendor. Immediate response to and resolution of the problem is always desirable.
- Warranty. The length and provisions of warranty protection offered should be reasonable. Warranty problems should be resolved in a timely manner.
- State-of-the-art product/service. The vendor offers products and services consistent with the industry state-of-the-art. The vendor should consistently refresh product life by adding enhancements.

Timeliness & Delivery factors can include (and are not limited to) the following:

- Time. The vendor delivers products and/or services on time. The actual receipt date is on or close to the promised date. The promised date should correspond to the vendor's published lead times.
- Quantity. The vendor should deliver the correct items or services as the contracted for quantity.
- Lead time. The average time for delivery is comparable to that of other vendors for similar products and services.
- Documentation. The vendor should furnish proper documents (packing slips, invoices, technical manual, etc.).

Service factors can include (and are not limited to) the following:

- Vendor approach. Good vendor representatives have sincere desire to serve. Vendor reps display courteous and professional approach, and handle complaints effectively. The vendor should also provide up-to-date catalogs, price information, and technical information, etc.
- Technical support. The vendor should provide technical support for maintenance, repair, and installation situations. The vendor should provide technical instructions, documentation, and general information. Support personnel should be courteous, professional, and knowledgeable. The vendor should provide training on the effective use of its products or services.
- Emergency support. The vendor should provide emergency support for repair or replacement of a failed product.
- Problem resolution. The vendor should respond in a timely manner to resolve problems. An excellent vendor provides follow-up on status of problem correction.

Suggested Performance Ratings Guidelines

| Rating | General Factors |
|-----------------------|---|
| Above Standard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This rating represents consistent exceptional and documented performance or consistently superior achievement beyond regular assignments and expectations. • Significant positive impact to the project. • Meeting and exceeded performance requirements. • Delivery of quality results. • Quickly resolved cost issues. • Reduced costs while meeting contract requirements • All deliveries on-time with some early. • Delivery issues quickly resolved. • Highly professional, responsive and proactive. • High user satisfaction • Significantly exceeded expectations. |
| Standard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This rating encompasses a range of expected performance to support the project. • Vendor exhibits competency in the assignments and consistently meets the desired expectations of the project. • Meets standards and objectives and all performance requirements; • Sometimes exceeds expectations. • Met overall price estimates. • Deliveries on-time. • Schedule not impacted • Met expectations. • Adequate user satisfaction. • Met goals. |
| Below Standard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This rating encompasses vendors whose performance does not consistently meet expectations defined in the contract. • Work is clearly unsatisfactory and consistently fails to meet expectations. • Close supervision of the vendors was necessary to progress the work. • Most performance requirements were not met. • Performance requirements were not met. • Did not meet cost estimates. • Significant cost overruns. • Many schedule slips with negative cost impact. • Lack of cooperation. • Unnecessary changes. • Lack of user satisfaction. |