



**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING &  
CONTRACT COMPLIANCE**

**CONTRACTORS PERFORMANCE REPORT**

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

Report Period Start	Report Period End	Contract Period Start	Contract Period End
7/1/2021	12/31/2021	1/1/2021	12/31/2021
Purchaser Order Number		Purchase Order Date	
031621-0412		3/16/2021	
Department			
Real Estate and Asset Management			
Bid Number		Service Commodity	
18ITB113946C-BKJ		Janitorial Services for Group E	
Contractor			
Chi-ADA Corporation			
<b>Performance Rating</b>			
0 = Unsatisfactory	Archives contract requirements less than 50% of the time not responsive, effective and/or efficient; unacceptable delay; incompetence; high degree of customer dissatisfaction.		
1 = Poor	Archives contract requirements 70% of the time. Marginally responsive, effective and/or efficient; delays require significant adjustments to programs; key employees marginally capable; customer somewhat satisfied.		
2 = Satisfactory	Archives contract requirements 80% of the time. Generally responsive, effective and/or efficient; delays are excusable and/or results in minor programs adjustments; employees are capable and satisfactorily providing service without intervention; customers indicate satisfaction.		
3 = Good	Archives contract requirements 90% of the time. Usually responsive; effective and/or efficient; delays have not impact on programs/mission; key employees are highly competent and seldom require guidance; customers are highly satisfied		
4 = Excellent	Archives contract requirements 100% of the time. Immediately responsive; highly efficient and/or effective; no delays; key employees are experts and require minimal directions; customers expectations are exceeded.		
1. Quality of Goods/Services		(Specification Compliance – Technical Excellence – Reports/Administration – Personnel Qualification)	
<input type="radio"/>	0	Chi-Ada has provided satisfactory service in the South libraries during this rating period. There have been many challenges during the pandemic, but the project manager has shown a willingness to make necessary adjustments. More focus on training front line workers, along with increased quality control could improve results. Chi-Ada has demonstrated a	
<input type="radio"/>	1		
<input type="radio"/>	2		
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3		
<input type="radio"/>	4		
2. Timeliness of Performance		(Were Milestones Met Per Contract – Response Time (per agreement, if applicable) – Responsiveness to Directions/ Change – On Time Completion Per Contract)	
<input type="radio"/>	0	Chi-Ada's project manager has been generally responsive during this period, and they have generally met milestones. At times a more rigid scheduling of periodic tasks may lead to an improvement in overall timeliness.	
<input type="radio"/>	1		
<input type="radio"/>	2		
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3		
<input type="radio"/>	4		

3. Business Relations		(Responsiveness to Inquires – Prompt Problem Notifications)
<input type="radio"/>	0	Business relations with Chi-Ada management have been good during this rating period. Most of the time, inquiries are handled in an adequate time frame. Communications have been open between Chi-Ada and County staff.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	
4. Customer Satisfaction		(Met User Quality Expectations – Met Specification – Within Budget – Proper Invoicing – No Substitutions)
<input type="radio"/>	0	During this period, concerns received from Library staff have generally been addressed by Chi-Ada in a timely manner. Customers have expressed an adequate level of satisfaction over all.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	2	
<input type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	
5. Contractors Key Personnel		(Credentials/Experience Appropriate – Effective Supervision/Management – Available as Needed)
<input type="radio"/>	0	Chi-Ada's Project Manager has a good working knowledge of best janitorial practices. They could still make some improvement with more thorough training of cleaning personnel and a stronger quality control program.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	

Overall Performance Rating	2.80	Date	1/4/2022
Would you select/recommend this vendor again?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Rating completed by:	Darwin White		
Department Head Name:	Joseph N. Davis		
Department Head Signature	<i>Joseph Davis</i>		

After completing the form:  
 Submit to Purchasing  
 Print a copy for your records  
 Save the form

Submit

Print

Save





**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING &  
CONTRACT COMPLIANCE**

**CONTRACTORS PERFORMANCE REPORT**

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

Report Period Start	Report Period End	Contract Period Start	Contract Period End
7/1/2021	12/31/2021	1/1/2021	12/31/2021
Purchaser Order Number		Purchase Order Date	
031621-0411		3/16/2021	
Department			
Real Estate and Asset Management			
Bid Number		Service Commodity	
18ITB113946C-BKJ		Janitorial Services Groups F, G and H	
Contractor			
Quality Cleaning Services			
<b>Performance Rating</b>			
0 = Unsatisfactory	Archives contract requirements less than 50% of the time not responsive, effective and/or efficient; unacceptable delay; incompetence; high degree of customer dissatisfaction.		
1 = Poor	Archives contract requirements 70% of the time. Marginally responsive, effective and/or efficient; delays require significant adjustments to programs; key employees marginally capable; customer somewhat satisfied.		
2 = Satisfactory	Archives contract requirements 80% of the time. Generally responsive, effective and/or efficient; delays are excusable and/or results in minor programs adjustments; employees are capable and satisfactorily providing service without intervention; customers indicate satisfaction.		
3 = Good	Archives contract requirements 90% of the time. Usually responsive; effective and/or efficient; delays have not impact on programs/mission; key employees are highly competent and seldom require guidance; customers are highly satisfied		
4 = Excellent	Archives contract requirements 100% of the time. Immediately responsive; highly efficient and/or effective; no delays; key employees are experts and require minimal directions; customers expectations are exceeded.		
1. Quality of Goods/Services		(Specification Compliance – Technical Excellence – Reports/Administration – Personnel Qualification)	
<input type="radio"/>	0	Quality Cleaning's Manager continues to demonstrate a good working knowledge of cleaning practices, and has been responsive with special requests during the pandemic at these facilities. They have been flexible in a way that allows the needs of the County and requirements to be met.	
<input type="radio"/>	1		
<input type="radio"/>	2		
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3		
<input type="radio"/>	4		
2. Timeliness of Performance		(Were Milestones Met Per Contract – Response Time (per agreement, if applicable) – Responsiveness to Directions/ Change – On Time Completion Per Contract)	
<input type="radio"/>	0	During this period, Quality has been responsive to change and direction in a way that leads to a good level of timeliness in the delivery of services. The manager generally responds quickly and is able to resolve any concerns / issues.	
<input type="radio"/>	1		
<input type="radio"/>	2		
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3		
<input type="radio"/>	4		

3. Business Relations		(Responsiveness to Inquires – Prompt Problem Notifications)
<input type="radio"/>	0	Communications and business relations with Quality Cleaning continue to be open and positive. The Project Manager's knowledge of County facilities allows for a timely and effective delivery of the required services. He is polite and professional in all communications.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	
4. Customer Satisfaction		(Met User Quality Expectations – Met Specification – Within Budget – Proper Invoicing – No Substitutions)
<input type="radio"/>	0	Customers have generally expressed a good level of satisfaction with the services provided by Quality during this rating period. Though the pandemic has presented some challenges, concerns are generally resolved quickly. At times, they may benefit from some additional hands-on training of front line staff.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	2	
<input type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	
5. Contractors Key Personnel		(Credentials/Experience Appropriate – Effective Supervision/Management – Available as Needed)
<input type="radio"/>	0	Mr. Featherstone's experience is evident, and his knowledge of County facilities and practices is a benefit to the County.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input type="radio"/>	3	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	4	

Overall Performance Rating	3.00	Date	1/5/2022
Would you select/recommend this vendor again?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Rating completed by:	Darwin White - Carlos Gordon		
Department Head Name:	Joseph N. Davis		
Department Head Signature	<i>Joseph Davis</i>		

After completing the form:  
 Submit to Purchasing  
 Print a copy for your records  
 Save the form

Submit

Print

Save





**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING &  
CONTRACT COMPLIANCE**

**CONTRACTORS PERFORMANCE REPORT**

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

Report Period Start	Report Period End	Contract Period Start	Contract Period End
10/1/2021	12/31/2021	1/1/2021	12/31/2021
Purchaser Order Number		Purchase Order Date	
022221-0296		2/22/2021	

Department

Real Estate and Asset Management

Bid Number

Service Commodity

19RFP120741C-GS

Janitorial Services for (Group B) Justice Center Facilities- DFACS

Contractor

American Facility Service, Inc.

**Performance Rating**

0 = Unsatisfactory	Archives contract requirements less than 50% of the time not responsive, effective and/or efficient; unacceptable delay; incompetence; high degree of customer dissatisfaction.
1 = Poor	Archives contract requirements 70% of the time. Marginally responsive, effective and/or efficient; delays require significant adjustments to programs; key employees marginally capable; customer somewhat satisfied.
2 = Satisfactory	Archives contract requirements 80% of the time. Generally responsive, effective and/or efficient; delays are excusable and/or results in minor programs adjustments; employees are capable and satisfactorily providing service without intervention; customers indicate satisfaction.
3 = Good	Archives contract requirements 90% of the time. Usually responsive; effective and/or efficient; delays have not impact on programs/mission; key employees are highly competent and seldom require guidance; customers are highly satisfied
4 = Excellent	Archives contract requirements 100% of the time. Immediately responsive; highly efficient and/or effective; no delays; key employees are experts and require minimal directions; customers expectations are exceeded.

1. Quality of Goods/Services

(Specification Compliance – Technical Excellence –  
Reports/Administration – Personnel Qualification)

<input type="radio"/>	0	During this rating period, AFS has achieved contract requirements 90% of the time in their efforts at the Justice Center facilities and the DFACS building. Their management has demonstrated a willingness to provide necessary training in order to achieve desired results and have worked to achieve specification compliance.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	

2. Timeliness of Performance

(Were Milestones Met Per Contract – Response Time (per agreement, if applicable) – Responsiveness to Directions/ Change – On Time Completion Per Contract)

<input type="radio"/>	0	Overall, AFS has completed tasks in a timely manner at the Justice facilities and the DFACS building. They have responded quickly when issues arise to reach a resolution.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	

3. Business Relations		(Responsiveness to Inquires – Prompt Problem Notifications)
<input type="radio"/>	0	Business relations with AFS have been positive and productive at the assigned facilities. Supervisory staff responds quickly and often in person when notified of problems.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	
4. Customer Satisfaction		(Met User Quality Expectations – Met Specification – Within Budget – Proper Invoicing – No Substitutions)
<input type="radio"/>	0	AFS has worked to meet quality expectations of the County, and they are accurate with invoicing. Overall, customers have been generally satisfied with their services at the Justice facilities and the DFACS building.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	2	
<input type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	
5. Contractors Key Personnel		(Credentials/Experience Appropriate – Effective Supervision/Management – Available as Needed)
<input type="radio"/>	0	Management and supervisory staff of AFS has been professional and responsive. They routinely show that they are making efforts to meet requirements, and communication is open and positive.
<input type="radio"/>	1	
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	3	
<input type="radio"/>	4	

Overall Performance Rating	2.80	Date	1/4/22
Would you select/recommend this vendor again?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Rating completed by:	Valarie Tillman-Logan - Darwin White		
Department Head Name:	Joseph N. Davis		
Department Head Signature	<i>Joseph Davis</i>		

After completing the form:  
 Submit to Purchasing  
 Print a copy for your records  
 Save the form

Submit

Print

Save