Rating Sheet for Statement of Qualifications
Value Engineering of Projects for Performance and Delivery #0801151
January 25, 2008

SCORING GUIDELINES

A. Assessment Team (36 pts.)	**Poor**	**Average**	**Good**	**Excellent**
A1. Qualifications/Expertise of team members. (24 pts.)	Poor qualifications; Many areas of expertise lacking; Few roles match experience; Few professional registrations/licenses. (0-6 pts.)	Average qualifications; Some areas of expertise lacking; Some roles match experience; some professional registrations and licenses. (7-12 pts.)	Good qualifications; Few areas of expertise lacking; Most roles match experience; Most professional registrations and licenses. (13-18 pts.)	Excellent qualifications: None or almost no areas of expertise lacking; All or almost all roles match experience; All professional registrations and licenses. (19-24 pts.)
A2. Experience associated with other efforts of similar type and scope (12 pts.)	0-1 efforts of similar type and scope; None or limited description of services; No significant application of experience to this efforts; No current or relevant references. (0-3 pts.)	2-3 efforts of similar type and scope; Some description of some services related to this type of review; Little application of experience to this effort; Few relevant references. (4-6 pts.)	Several efforts of similar type and scope; Good description of most services; Good application of experience to this effort; Relevant references to efforts. (7-9 pts.)	Several efforts of similar type and scope; Excellent description of all or almost all services related to efforts; Excellent application of experience to this effort; Relevant references for all or almost all efforts. (10-12 pts.)
B. Management of Assessment (20 pts.)	**Poor**	**Average**	**Good**	**Excellent**
B1. Approach to management issues and tools to be utilized for oversight. (20 pts.)	Limited discussion of oversight, budget, schedule, and processes needed to assure assessment moves forward effectively and efficiently. Limited use of management tools. (0-5 pts.)	Some discussion of oversight, budget, schedule, and processes for updating assessment to assure effort moves forward effectively and efficiently. Identification and use, to some degree, of management tools. (6-10 pts.)	Significant discussion of oversight, budget, schedule, and processes for updating to assure assessment efforts move forward effectively and efficiently. Demonstrated intent to use management tools to track overall efforts. (11-15 pts.)	Excellent discussion of oversight requirements, impact on budget, schedule, and processes for regular updating to assure assessment efforts move forward effectively and efficiently. Use/updating/sharing of information critical to support successful management of effort. (16-20 pts.)

Rating Sheet for Statement of Qualifications

Value Engineering of Projects for Performance and Delivery #0801151
January 25, 2008

C. Scope of Work (36 pts.)	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
C1a. Knowledge and understanding of assessment's elements, outcomes, and deliverables. (6 pts.)	Minimal discussion of scope, elements, outcomes and assessment requirements. (0 pts.)	Discussion of scope, elements, outcomes and assessment requirements was limited to a summary of initial SOQ language. (1-2 pts.)	Discussion of scope, elements, outcomes and assessment requirements reflected an above average understanding of effort. (3-4 pts.)	Discussion of scope, elements and overall assessment requirements reflected significant understanding of effort. (5-6 pts.)
C1b. Strategy for work effort, scheduling, and development of useable end products. (6 pts.)	Minimal discussion of approach to analysis and overall work efforts. (0 pts.)	Discussion of approach and overall work effort limited to a summary of initial SOQ language. (1-2 pts.)	Use of historic approaches with potential new approaches for analysis, scheduling and production of end products. Some creativity demonstrated. (3-4 pts.)	Provided both historic and new approaches for analysis, scheduling, and production of potential end products. Demonstrated creativity and flexibility. (5-6 pts.)
C1c. Strategy to develop and use creative and innovative thinking within assessment effort. (8 pts.)	Minimal discussion of creative/innovative approaches for effort. (0-2 pts.)	Approach to being creative/innovative with overall work effort repeated comments similar to initial SOQ language. (3-4 pts.)	Provided historic and touched upon some potential new approaches/areas for creative and innovative thinking within analysis. (5-6 pts.)	Provided both historic and new approaches/areas for creative and innovative thinking within analysis. Demonstrated creativity and innovation in comments. (7-8 pts.)
C1d. Review and incorporation of other potential areas that would enhance overall analysis. (8 pts.)	Minimal discussion of other areas to review, which could impact/enhance analysis efforts. (0-2 pts.)	Discussion of some potential areas to expand review efforts that may benefit the analysis. No real new ideas/comments. (3-4 pts.)	Discussion of potential areas to expand review efforts with reasoning behind a review of these areas. Some creativity demonstrated. (5-6 pts.)	Significant comments on areas to further review and explore, along with discussion of interrelation between these new areas and those already identified. Demonstrated creativity and flexibility. (7-8 pts.)

Rating Sheet for Statement of Qualifications
Value Engineering of Projects for Performance and Delivery #0801151
January 25, 2008

C1e. Identification of potential issues/challenges, their impact, and efforts/strategies for addressing/overcoming. (8 pts.)	Minimal discussion of potential issues, challenges, and concerns associated with analysis efforts. (0-2 pts.)	Discussion of some potential areas where challenges/issues could arise, but no new ideas/thoughts suggested. (3-4 pts.)	Provided comments where there is potential for challenges/concerns that could influence analysis. Provided some recommendations to address/resolve. (5-6 pts.)	Identified specific areas where there is potential for challenges/concerns that could influence analysis. Provided both historic and new approaches for addressing and overcoming these. (7-8 pts.)
D. Professionalism of written statement	**Poor**	**Average**	**Good**	**Excellent**
Review of Statement (neg. pts. for deficiencies)	Confusing organization & formatting, low readability, frequent spelling & grammar inaccuracies (-8 to -10 pts.)	Average organization & formatting, average readability, sometimes accurate spelling & grammar (-4 to -7 pts.)	Good organization & formatting, good readability, generally accurate spelling & grammar (-1 to -3 pts.)	Excellent organization & formatting aids reader, high readability, accurate spelling & grammar (0 pts.)