



<b>Report for:</b>	<b>Housing and Communities Overview &amp; Scrutiny</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>19 March 2012</b>
<b>PART:</b>	<b>1</b>
If Part II, reasc	<b>AGENDA ITEM: 11</b>

**SUMMARY**

<b>Title of report</b>	<b>Performance</b>
Contact:	Margaret Griffiths, Portfolio Holder for Housing  Responsible Officer – Andy Vincent, Group Manager, Tenants and Leaseholders  Author – Nicola Charman – Development Officer, Supported Housing Service
Purpose of report:	1 To advise Housing and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee members regarding the past three months performance of SeniorLink Eldercare, community alarm provider for the Supported Housing Service.
Recommendations	1. Officers to continue monitoring contract
Corporate objectives:	This report supports the following Council objective: Affordable Housing
Implications:	<u>Financial</u>  None  <u>Value for Money</u>
'Value For Money Implications'	Effective Contract Monitoring is essential in delivering Value for Money within the HRA
Risk Implications	Risk reference 05 in the Housing Landlord Risk register refers to effective financial and operational control of contractors.
Equalities Implications	Equality Impact Assessment - None required for the purpose of this report.

Health And Safety Implications	None
Consultees:	Elliott Brooks – Assistant Director, Housing Landlord  Andy Vincent – Group Manager, Tenants and Leaseholders
Background papers:	PH/050/09 – Part 2 Decision – Appointment of a Contractor to provide a Community Alarm Monitoring and Call Answering Service to Residents in Sheltered Schemes and Dispersed Sheltered Accommodation, Out of Hours Emergency Homelessness and Emergency Repairs Call-Out Services.  Housing and Communities Overview and Scrutiny committee report and minutes – 14 <sup>th</sup> September 2011

## 1.0 Background

1.1 Dacorum Borough Council's community alarm monitoring service provider is Seniorlink Eldercare. At the Housing and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee 14<sup>th</sup> September 2011, Members received an extensive presentation from Seniorlink Eldercare regarding their organisation and the service they deliver under contract on behalf of Dacorum Borough Council. A further report was considered by Housing and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2011.

1.2 The Committee agreed that in addition to the two critical performance indicators in the code of practice that refer to, call handling, two further indicators should be added these are:

- % of calls answered within 90 seconds
- Undertake a customer satisfaction survey on a quarterly basis

## 2.0 Performance

2.1 The table below illustrates Eldercare's performance since the last report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee in November 2011. The second table shows the results of the Customer Satisfaction Survey carried out between October and December 2011 and which was sent out to customers who used their community alarm or Lifeline during that period. There is also an explanation of the responses from users who were dissatisfied with the service.

2.2 Performance for percentage of calls answered within one minute has risen since the beginning of December, with performance showing marked improvement. Between the beginning of December 2011 and end of February 2012, target was achieved 7 weeks out of 13 weeks and sustained within toleration for a further 3 of the 13 weeks. The target set for calls answered within 90 seconds is 99%. Performance is just under this figure for the period December to end of February. Apart from one week, the target for calls answered within 3 minutes has been achieved.

**Calls performance – 4<sup>th</sup> December 2011 – 26<sup>th</sup> February 201**

<b>Week Commencing</b>	<b>4/12</b>	<b>11/12</b>	<b>18/12</b>	<b>25/12</b>	<b>1/01</b>	<b>8/01</b>	<b>15/01</b>	<b>22/01</b>	<b>29/01</b>	<b>5/02</b>	<b>12/02</b>	<b>19/02</b>	<b>26/02</b>
<b>% of calls answered within 1 minute ( Target – 97.5% 2% toleration)</b>	<b>93.69</b>	<b>94.76</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97.54</b>	<b>97.69</b>	<b>96.64</b>	<b>97.35</b>	<b>98.06</b>	<b>97.94</b>	<b>97.5</b>	<b>97.82</b>	<b>97.41</b>	<b>97.75</b>
<b>Number of calls answered within 1 minute</b>	<b>1430</b>	<b>1475</b>	<b>1416</b>	<b>1243</b>	<b>1767</b>	<b>1950</b>	<b>1706</b>	<b>1665</b>	<b>1465</b>	<b>1325</b>	<b>1617</b>	<b>1376</b>	<b>1358</b>
<b>% of calls answered within 90 seconds</b>	<b>Not Available</b>	<b>Not Available</b>	<b>Not Available</b>	<b>98.36</b>	<b>98.7</b>	<b>98.61</b>	<b>98.7</b>	<b>98.72</b>	<b>98.62</b>	<b>99.08</b>	<b>98.45</b>	<b>98.49</b>	<b>98.84</b>
<b>% of calls answered within 3 minutes ( Target 99% 2% toleration)</b>	<b>99.16</b>	<b>99.52</b>	<b>99.41</b>	<b>99.56</b>	<b>99.85</b>	<b>99.58</b>	<b>99.83</b>	<b>99.79</b>	<b>99.82</b>	<b>99.91</b>	<b>99.67</b>	<b>99.65</b>	<b>98.84</b>
<b>Number of calls answered within 3 minutes</b>	<b>1513</b>	<b>1549</b>	<b>1481</b>	<b>1268</b>	<b>1806</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1750</b>	<b>1694</b>	<b>1493</b>	<b>1354</b>	<b>1648</b>	<b>1408</b>	<b>1373</b>
<b>Total volume of calls per week</b>	<b>1526</b>	<b>1557</b>	<b>1490</b>	<b>1274</b>	<b>1809</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>1753</b>	<b>1694</b>	<b>1496</b>	<b>1355</b>	<b>1653</b>	<b>1413</b>	<b>1389</b>

## Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Survey carried out on tenants and residents who made emergency calls between Sept 2011 – Dec 2011

	Contact with Control Centre					Total	Speed of response					Total	Staff Helpful & Supportive					Total
	Very Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Neither/Nor	Fairly Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied		Very Good	Fairly Good	Neither/Nor	Fairly Poor	Very Poor		Very Good	Fairly Good	Neither/Nor	Fairly Poor	Very Poor	
<b>Results from combined customer/tenant</b>	86	13	1	3	1	<b>104</b>	76	17	1	1	0	<b>95</b>	86	7	0	1	0	<b>94</b>
<b>% of customers</b>	82.5%	12.5	1%	3%	1%		80%	18%	1%	1%	0		91%	7.5%	0	1.5%	0	

### **3.0 Results of Survey**

3.1 The one return which stated they were very dissatisfied with the contact with the control centre did not respond to the other two questions.

3.2 The one return which stated they were neither satisfied or dissatisfied with the control centre did not respond to the other two questions.

3.3 The first of the 3 fairly dissatisfied returns was from a lady whose husband was admitted to hospital the day she had used the alarm and died later the same day. This lady also felt the speed of the response was fairly poor but the staff were fairly good.

3.4 The second of the fairly dissatisfied returns was from a lady who lives in a privately run scheme. The resident pressed her alarm after she had fallen at the side of her bed. She was unable to hear the operator or make her situation clear to them. A family member was called to attend but an ambulance was not sent for until the daughter had arrived and explained that her mother was on the floor. In all three calls were made during the incident.

We were asked to investigate the call with Eldercare and the following actions were taken:

- Eldercare gave supervision and retraining to an operator who took the second call from the resident because they had not liaised with the operator who took the first call.
- The warden at the scheme was asked to update the resident's medical and personal details to reflect the changes in her health, hearing and the distance her daughter lived from the scheme.

Both Eldercare and the warden have reported to say that these actions have been taken. The resident has also used the alarm since and has not reported any further issues. The resident did not sustain any injuries resulting from her fall.

3.5 The third of the fairly dissatisfied returns did not make any comments in the space provided so we were unable to ascertain the reason for their dissatisfaction.