

ROCKFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Issued: 03/06/2014
ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION Regulation 2.170R	Responsible: Superintendent or designee
REGULATION MANUAL Board Policy 2.170 Procurement of Professional Services Regulation- Qualification Based Selection	Approved: <u> /s/ Ehren Jarrett </u> Superintendent Endorsed: <u> /s/ Lori L. Hoadley </u> General Counsel

Regulation

Procurement and Evaluation of Professional Services-Qualification Based Selection

These procedures describe how the District will procure architectural, engineering, and land surveying services; the Local Government Professional Services Selection Act will control in the event of a conflict (50 ILCS 510/). The Superintendent will modify these procedures whenever the School Board determines by resolution that an emergency exists and a firm must be selected in an expeditious manner, or the cost of architectural, engineering, and land surveying services for the project is expected to be less than \$25,000 (50 ILCS 510/8).

Actor	Action
Architectural, engineering, or land surveying firms	May annually file a statement of qualifications and performance data with the District. 50 ILCS 510/4.
Superintendent and/or Designee	<p>Store statements of qualifications and performance data received from firms engaged in architectural, engineering, or land surveying services.</p> <p>Unless the District has a satisfactory relationship for services with one or more firms, mail notices of the proposed project to those firms that have current statements of qualifications and performance data on file. In addition, or alternatively, the project may be advertised in the local and area newspapers. 50 ILCS 510/4.</p> <p>Unless the District has a satisfactory relationship for services with one or more firms, evaluate the firms that submitted interest letters, according to criteria for ranking described in the last section of this procedure. The Superintendent and/or designee may conduct discussions with and require public presentations by firms deemed to be the most qualified regarding their qualifications, approach to the project, and ability to furnish the required services. 50 ILCS 510/5.</p> <p>Do not, prior to selecting a firm for contract negotiation, seek formal or informal submission of verbal or written estimates of costs or proposals in terms of dollars, hours required, percentage of construction cost, or any other measure of compensation. 50 ILCS 510/5.</p>

Actor	Action
	<p>Select no less than 3 firms, who would be most qualified to provide services, and rank them in order of their qualifications. If fewer than 3 firms submit interest letters and the Board determines that one or both of those firms are so qualified, negotiate a contract as provided herein. 50 ILCS 510/6.</p> <p>Attempt to negotiate a contract at a fair and reasonable compensation, taking into account the estimated value, scope, complexity, and professional nature of the services to be rendered. 50 ILCS 510/5.</p> <p>If unable to reach agreement on a satisfactory contract, terminate negotiations and proceed to negotiate with the firm ranked next in qualifications. 50 ILCS 510/5.</p> <p>If unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with any of the 3 originally selected firms, inform the Board. The District will re-evaluate the services requested and compile a second list of not less than 3 qualified firms and continue the process. 50 ILCS 510/5.</p>

Criteria for Ranking Firms

Unless the District has a satisfactory relationship for services with one or more firms, the criteria for evaluating the firms submitting letters of interest may include, but are not limited to:

1. The certification/licensure, education, experience, and expertise of the firm's principals and key employees. Note: Require proof of current certification/licensure.
2. The firm's general experience, stability, and history of performance on projects similar to the one under consideration. Note: If firm is incorporated, require proof that firm is in good standing.
3. Availability of adequate personnel, equipment, and facilities to do the required work expeditiously.
4. The name, or names, of individuals in the firm who will be assigned key project responsibilities, with particular attention to their qualification, competence, and past performance.
5. The firm's approach to the planning, organizing, and management of a project effort, including communication procedures, approach to problem solving, data gathering methods, evaluation techniques, and similar factors.
6. Facilities and equipment owned by the firm, including computer capability, reproduction and communication equipment, laboratory and testing equipment, or other specialized equipment applicable to the project under consideration.
7. Present workload with attention to current and future commitments of available personnel, particularly those key persons expected to be assigned to the project.

8. Financial stability, with particular attention to avoiding a situation in which the firm is solely dependent on income from the project at hand for its existence.
9. Recommendations and opinions of each firm's previous clients as to its ability to meet deadlines and remain within budget. Prior clients may also be able to provide information as to each firm's sense of responsibility; attitudes of key personnel; concern for economy, efficiency, and environment; and quality of service.
10. If practical, observation of each firm's facility and the sites of current and/or completed projects.
11. Proximity of the engineering firm to the proposed project site and/or the agency's office.
12. The reputation and integrity of the engineering firm within the professional field and the community.
13. Awards received by the firm and technical papers authored by employees.
14. Special considerations for some projects might include staff conversant in foreign languages and qualified minority representation.
15. The local agency has worked with a specific firm and can cite any or all of the following advantages:
 - a. The firm's personnel are acquainted with the agency's organization and local conditions.
 - b. Information from the files of past assignments is of great importance.
 - c. Compatibility with agency organization is assured.
 - d. A smooth start-up and satisfactory progress will result because both parties will be dealing with known factors.
16. The weight given each evaluation criterion in the ranking process may vary from project to project. For example, criterion "6" would be more heavily weighted than criterion "11" if the bulk of the project tasks involve computer analysis and design. However, the reverse would be true for a project with an extensive construction oversight provision.

At the conclusion of each project each architectural and engineering firm should be evaluated using the attached evaluation form.