

# Complaints Summary

## 1<sup>st</sup> Oct-11 to 31<sup>st</sup> Dec-11 QTR 3



### 1. Summary of complaints received for quarter 3

A total of 22 stage 1 complaints have been received in the Qtr 3 (equal to the number received in Qtr 2 and down from 42 for the same period last year)

The table below provides details of the stage 1 complaints received by service area;

Service area	% of complaints received
Cyclical & planned	14%
Reactive repair	50%
Anti- Social Behaviour /Nuisance	5%
Other	9%
Staff behaviour	23%

Please note; "Other" complaints (9%, x2 complaints) – x1 related to parking and x1 related to the concierge service

The table below provides details of the stage 1 complaints received by type;

Complaint type	% of complaints received
Service delivery	73%
Member of staff	18%
Policy/procedure	5%
Work quality	5%

- The most common cause of complaint is against the overall service delivery accounting for just under three quarters of complaints received (16 received in total) – this is equal to the number received in QTR 2
- Four complaints related to staff and included two about poor communication and two complaints directly against the staffs behaviour
- 21 complaints have been fully responded to and one holding reply was sent due to more time required to fully investigate the complaint (relating to Anti-Social Behaviour).
- Of those responded to 16 (76%) were upheld (including five which were partially upheld). Five complaints were not upheld

### 2. Summary of Stage 2 and 3 complaints

Summary of the complaints that have escalated to the higher stages;

Brief description of complaint (can be lifted off Orchard notes)	Outcome of complaint (whether it was upheld or not, and what actions were taken)
Stage 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customer complained property was not let in a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complaint partially upheld</li> <li>• Repairs completed</li> </ul>

# Complaints Summary

## 1<sup>st</sup> Oct-11 to 31<sup>st</sup> Dec-11 QTR 3



<p>suitable condition with repairs outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Customer had reported these issues but no action was taken</li> <li>Escalated directly to stage 2 on the basis that the original complaint was not acknowledged within the agreed timescale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£100 goodwill payment offered</li> </ul>
<p>Stage 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complaint relates to outstanding repairs (noisy pipes)</li> <li>Customer had reported these issues but no action was taken</li> <li>Escalated directly to stage 2 on the basis that the original complaint was not acknowledged within the agreed timescale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complaint response is not yet due</li> </ul>
<p>Stage 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complaint relates to poor workmanship (kitchen unit repairs)</li> <li>Escalated to stage 2 on the basis that the repairs agreed at stage 1 were not successful in resolving the issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Upheld at stage 2</li> <li>Investigation found damage to units was likely to have been caused by tenant misuse</li> <li>Repairs agreed but to be re-charged to customer if completed</li> </ul>
<p>Stage 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complaint relates to handling of a compensation claim</li> <li>Escalated to stage 2 on the basis that the complainant claimed to have been provided with inconsistent information from Old Ford in relation to the claim</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upheld at stage 2</li> <li>Inconsistent information was provided</li> <li>Correct information now provided so the claim can be progressed</li> </ul>
<p>Stage 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complaint relates a shower repair</li> <li>Escalated to stage 2 on the basis that the repairs agreed at stage 1 were not successful in resolving the issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Upheld at stage 2</li> <li>Investigation found repairs were sufficient and no evidence of any service failure</li> </ul>

### 3. Summary of any Housing Ombudsman Service (HOS) complaints

- One HOS complaint was received during the period relating to dissatisfaction with decision not to increase the level of compensation offered following a Carbon Monoxide leak. The complaint was not upheld at stage 3 and the Panel did not feel it was appropriate to offer any compensation. The complainant is requesting £10k. The Ombudsman investigation is ongoing.

### 4. Lessons learnt from complaints:

Lessons learned have been identified by the lead handler from all upheld complaints.

# Complaints Summary

## 1<sup>st</sup> Oct-11 to 31<sup>st</sup> Dec-11 QTR 3



Service Improvement identified	How this has been/ will be implemented
Poor communication during ANTI-Social Behaviour case	Customer Services Manager team to be briefed on the Anti-Social Behaviour process to ensure issue not repeated - to be completed by end of 2011
Failure to meet service standards	Tenant was not communicated effectively, Out of Hours service could have been more sympathetic to elder tenants
Lead handler identified some poor communication regarding the replacement of the door	Recommend that Circle 33 promote the door replacement programme to residents to avoid similar complaints in the future.
Missed appointment	Issue with Customer Services Advisor booking appointments - to be raised with Head of Customer Services
Delay in diagnosing and then dealing with low water pressure affecting heating and hot water	<p>With the objective of reducing the number of unnecessary repeat visits, Old Ford is now monitoring repeat repair issues to ensure that action is taken at an earlier stage. An action plan is also in place to improve the number of repairs completed at the first visit.</p> <p>Old Ford has put in place an action plan to increase the number of appointments made and kept and is currently seeing an improvement in performance for this area. In addition, a system has been implemented to ensure all follow up actions relating to complaints are monitored through to completion. The Panel have also recommended Old Ford implements a system to ensure that contractors are aware of where repair jobs relate to an ongoing complaint.</p>
Poor management of Decent Homes works by Circle 33	Having spoken with Group Performance Manager at Circle 33, he advised that in future he will ensure that each Decent Homes Officer takes full ownership of their Decent Homes programme and ensure that residents are properly communicated with. He also advised that OFHA Decent Homes Team will take over the Decent Homes works to Circle 33 managed residents.
The alleged comments made by the security guard were unacceptable	Concierge service; Improved management and training by Circle Living to increase levels of customer satisfaction.
X1 missed appointment	If contractor is unable to attend they need to inform Apollo or the Regeneration Team so they can advise the resident. Need to reinforce this message to Apollo's contractors.
Staff conduct	Action taken via Apollo disciplinary procedure

# Complaints Summary

## 1<sup>st</sup> Oct-11 to 31<sup>st</sup> Dec-11 QTR 3



Missed appointment / poor communication	
Poor management of repairs issues (Circle 33) by Customer Services Manager	Historical issue - Customer Services Managers are now aware of the escalation process for repairs and to take ownership of issues through to resolution
Poor communication leading to repair delays and missed appointment	Better communication from Customer Services Advisor and Mears contractors with regards to booking appointments and follow up on repairs visits. Customer Services Advisors to return calls when messages are left.
Poor communication leading to repair delays	Confirm the key points and summarise the nature of the call to the resident at the end of every call.  Notes to be made on the Orchard
Poor communication leading to delays and missed appointment	Ensure correct information is given to residents and appointments are entered correctly on the system.
Delay in raising repairs following surveyors visit	Lead recommended a Service Level Agreement for surveyors to call back the customer within 48 hours of inspection.
Accepted that some delays in processing the re-housing application were due to OFHA	Stage 3 Panel recommendations: Training for Customer Services Managers on immigration Checklist for re-housing applications to be introduced Change in circumstances to trigger a tenancy audit
Inconsistent information provided in relation to compensation claim	Historical issue - Customer Services Advisors and Customer Services Managers aware of the compensation process
Delays in restoring heating and hot water - poor customer service when customer was submitting his compensation claim to Usher Rd	To avoid this complaint we could have carried out a periodic electrical test following the installation of the new wire and this may have reassured the customer.
OFHA did not ensure that the shower was repaired within the accepted service level agreement of 21 days	When staff are raising repairs to external companies, they need to ensure that they are following up with the company and the resident that an appointment has been booked and kept and that the resident is satisfied with the repair.
Customer recharged for repair in error	The notes on Orchard should have been checked to see what information was on the system before the resident was distressed with a recharge letter.