Transportation Consortium of South-Central States

Solving Emerging Transportation Resiliency, Sustainability, and Economic Challenges through the Use of Innovative Materials and Construction Methods: From Research to Implementation

Grantee Performance Assessment System (G-PAS)

Overview

The "Grantee Performance Assessment System" (G-PAS) is a defined set of quantitative and qualitative criteria in which the performance of every project team will be evaluated upon. The assessment/rating will be an important consideration in future award selections. The aim of G-PAS is to encourage high-quality and timely research, technology transfer, educational, and workforce development products. G-PAS is critical to fulfilling Tran-SET's mission and expending public funds as appropriately and efficiently as possible. It is based on the "Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System" (CPARS), established by the Department of Defense and utilized on all federally administered contracts.

As defined in Table 1, G-PAS consists of four main evaluation categories: quality, schedule, cost control, and management.

Table 1. Description of evaluation categories.

Category	Definition	Illustrative Questions
Quality	*Assessment of the Grantee's conformance to task requirements, user expectations, and standards of good workmanship.*	• Did work measure up to commonly accepted technical or professional standards? • Were reports/data accurate? • Did products meet task requirements and user expectations?
Schedule	*Assessment of the timeliness of the Grantee against the completion of tasks, project schedules, and administrative requirements.*	• Were required tasks completed on or ahead of schedule? • Were administrative deadlines met? • If schedule slipped, were appropriate actions taken? Were delays explained/documented? • Was the work adequately scheduled?
Cost Control	*Assessment of the Grantee's effectiveness in forecasting, managing, and controlling costs.*	• Were tasks kept within the total estimated cost? • Did any innovative methods result in cost savings? • Were any appropriate corrective actions taken to keep costs as scheduled?
Management	*Assessment of the integration and coordination of all activity needed to execute the tasks.*	• Were the activities of participating universities and external partners well-coordinated? • Were problems proactively identified and corrective actions taken? • Were interactions between the Grantee and Tran-SET satisfactory? Did the Grantee show a customer-oriented approach?

Each project team will be assessed using the evaluation ratings defined in Table 2.

Table 2. Definition of evaluation ratings.

Rating	Definition
Exceptional	*Performance meets specified requirements and exceeds many to Tran-SET's benefit. Performance of the category or subcategory was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken were highly effective. No significant problems identified.*
Very Good	*Performance meets specified requirements and exceeds some to Tran-SET's benefit. Performance of the category or subcategory was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken were effective. No significant problems identified.*
Satisfactory	*Performance meets specified requirements. Performance of the category or subcategory contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken were satisfactory. No significant problems identified.*
Marginal	*Performance does not meet some specified requirements. Performance of the category or subcategory reflects a significant problem for which proposed corrective actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.*
Unsatisfactory	*Performance does not meet most specified requirements and recovery was/is not likely in a timely manner. Performance of the category or subcategory contains a serious problems(s) for which corrective actions appear/were ineffective.*

Each project team will receive a single, overall rating – as well as overall ratings for each of the four evaluation categories. These ratings are based on subcategory ratings as specified in the next section. The next section also details the specific rating criteria of each subcategory (and its relation to the category's overall rating).

Rating Criteria

QUALITY

Quality of project deliverables is organized into two main subcategories: (1) quality of the *technical* products specified in the proposal and (2) quality of the *administrative* requirements (e.g., quarterly progress and financial reports). These are further explained in Table 3.

Table 3. Subcategories of Quality.

Subcategory	Type of Supporting Data	Description of Supporting Data
Technical	Qualitative; Quantitative	An *overall* qualitative assessment will be determined by the Project Review Committee (PRC) on a biannual basis. This assessment will be supported by quantitative measures, such as the number of peer-reviewed publications and presentations produced.
Administrative	Qualitative	A qualitative assessment will be determined for each administrative requirement (e.g., progress and financial reports) at each respective reporting period (e.g., quarterly).

SCHEDULE

Performance as it relates to Schedule is organized in a similar fashion as Quality: (1) delivery of *technical* products as specified in the proposal timeline and (2) delivery of *administrative* requirements as defined by Tran-SET. Table 4 summarizes these subcategories.

Schedule is mainly a quantitative metric; Table 5 defines its specific rating criteria.

Table 4. Subcategories of Schedule.

Subcategory	Type of Supporting Data	Description of Supporting Data
Technical	Quantitative	Average "schedule variance"[1] (percent ahead or behind schedule as defined in the proposal) for each task at each reporting period (quarterly). Actual "schedule variance"[1] for the most important deliverables: the technical and final report.
Administrative	Quantitative	Average "schedule variance"[2] for each administrative requirement at each respective reporting period.

[1]*For specific rating criteria, please see Table 5. For projects beginning in 2018 or earlier, "schedule variance" is calculated from a simple, assumed linear distribution of work. For projects beginning after 2018, "schedule variance" is calculated from a baseline, s-curve created from the schedule and percent effort/costs (of each task) specified in the proposal.* [2]*Follows the same rating criteria as Table 5. "Schedule variance" is calculated from a simple, assumed linear distribution and the length of the reporting period.*

Table 5. Rating criteria for quantitative Schedule metric: "Schedule variance".

Rating	Criteria
Exceptional	≤ -25% Significantly ahead of schedule
Very Good	> -25% and < 0% Ahead of schedule
Satisfactory	≥ 0% and < +10% On schedule
Marginal	≥ +10% and < +50% Behind schedule
Unsatisfactory	≥ +50% Significantly behind schedule

COST CONTROL

Cost Control is a single, quantitative metric. It is assessed using the average "cost variance" (percent cost overrun or underrun) for each task at each reporting period (quarterly). It is also assessed by the final "cost variance" at project completion. As with Schedule, for projects beginning in 2018 or earlier, "cost variance" is calculated from a simple, assumed linear distribution of expenses. For projects beginning after 2018, "cost variance" is calculated from a baseline, s-curve created from the schedule and estimated percent effort/costs (of each task) specified in the proposal.

Table 6 defines the rating criteria for Cost Control.

Table 6. Rating criteria for quantitative Cost Control metric: "Cost variance".

Rating	Criteria
Exceptional	≤ -25% "Budget underrun"
Very Good	> -25% and ≤ -5% "Under budget"
Satisfactory	> -5% and ≤ +5% "On budget"
Marginal	> +5% and < +25% "Over budget"
Unsatisfactory	≥ +25% "Budget overrun"

MANAGEMENT

Management is a single, qualitative metric. It will be evaluated using the definitions in Tables 1 and 2. It will be evaluated throughout the life of the project, analyzing how the project team is functioning, coordinating activities, and overall progressing through the effort.