



3. Part C. Post Occupancy Phase Services  
Should be completed when project has achieved final completion through the end of the basic building warranty phase. This evaluation shall include performance in assembling and delivery of project closeout deliverables, addressing warranty issues during warranty phase.
  - B. Combined Part A/Part B/Part C Evaluations.  
In the event the evaluation period spans Part A, Part B and Part C phases in any combination, all applicable parts should be rated and the respective weights will each be adjusted to 10; if Part A & C or B & C are used, weight is adjusted to 20; if Part A & B are used, weight adjusted to 12.5; if only Part A, B or C is used alone, weight adjusted to 25. If Part A and/or Part B are used, the weight for Part C = 5; If only Part C is used, weight = 25. Put it simply, each Part weighs equally no matter what combination of Part A, B and C are scored.
  - C. Final Rating for Future Interview/Selection Process.  
The "Total Score" is divided by 5 to determine the 20-point based rating as an input to SUS ratings database. This calculation is used as current firm score in the consultant interview/selection process.
  - D. Ratings for Joint Ventures.  
Identical evaluation is prepared for each party to the joint venture.
  - F. Ratings for Design/Builder.  
The Design/Build firm or a team shall be evaluated separately as Design Professional and Contractor. When Design/Build team is reconstituted for consideration of future project, past individual evaluations scores shall be combined; if at that time either or both parts of the design/build team has no qualifying evaluation on record then an arithmetic average of current evaluations of all Design Professional and Contractor, as appropriate, will be used in the current rating score.
  - G. Signatures.  
The USF Project Manager completes the form and secures the signature of the Director of [FM-DC](#) to complete the process.
- V. Administration of the Evaluation Form.
- A. Transmittal of Rating to Firm.  
The [FM-DC](#) sends a copy of the completed evaluation form to the rated firm, certified mail, return receipt requested. The transmittal letter must contain the following statement: "If you feel that your firm has been rated unfairly, you may appeal this rating in accordance with [Chapter 120 \(Administrative Procedures Act\), Florida Statutes](#) by sending written notice stating the basis for your appeal. In order to be considered, such notice must be received by the university within [thirty \(30\)](#) days of receipt of this letter."
  - B. Appeal of Ratings.  
If a Contractor appeals its rating within the required time, the USF Project Manager will discuss the rating with the firm and attempt to resolve the differences informally. If informal discussions do not result in a resolution, [FM-DC](#) will notify the firm in writing of the time and place to appear before the Contractor Rating Committee. This notification shall be sent certified mail, return receipt requested. The decision of the Committee is final.
- VI. Maintenance of Rating Data Base.  
[FM-DC](#) maintains the data base of ratings for firms on contract with the University. The overall rating for each firm will be updated each time a new rating is awarded. The overall rating is used as the "Current Rating" score in architect/engineer selections. For firms with no rating history, an arithmetic average of current evaluations of all firms will be used in the current rating score. The rating for each firm will be mathematically averaged with the final evaluation(s) of previous project(s) performed by the firm. Any evaluation more than [three \(3\)](#) years old at the time of the consultant interview/selection process shall be deleted; if at that time the firm has no qualifying evaluation on record then an arithmetic average of current evaluations of all firms will be used in the current rating score.