

# Education Leeds

## The Schools Traded Services

### Customer Satisfaction Survey 2009

## Overview

The traded services survey is an annual review, commissioned by the Traded Services Forum and carried out by the Commissioning, Procurement and Business Development team of Education Leeds. It aims to gauge the views of all Leeds' schools on the performance of private and public service provision. The information generated is used to promote the effective delivery of services, through a pool of high quality providers, from which schools can make real choices.

The results are presented to the Traded Services Forum. The forum has representatives from schools and governing bodies as well as strategic managers from Leeds City Council and Education Leeds and exists to highlight and respond to any issues regarding traded services. The forum demands and endorses action plans to ensure that service providers are operating at a highly satisfactory level or better and will develop ways of tackling those providers failing to attain this level.

The survey itself asks schools to provide feedback on the most commonly purchased traded services. Questions generate feedback on markets in terms of quality, value for money and scope for improvement.

## Key findings

- ❑ The response rate for this year's survey increased from 94 last year to 122 this year. There were 100 responses from the primary phase, 18 responses from the secondary phase and 2 responses from the special/PRU sector. There were also 2 anonymous responses received. This year saw an increase in responses from the primary and secondary sectors whilst the special/PRU sector remained the same.
- ❑ Financial Services of Education Leeds and the Leeds Learning Network were the services who received the most responses with 120, next was the Central Payments Service provided by Leeds City Council with 118 responses.
- ❑ There were 42 recorded service providers across the services with 41 of those operating at a very good, good or highly satisfactory level of performance.
- ❑ This year, only one service provider, Financial Services, provided by Education Leeds, recorded a score of very good, the highest attainable level.
- ❑ A new entrant to the *good* category, Enterprise MSL, deserve much credit for their cumulative improvement of 24% since the 2006 survey. It is regrettable therefore that they have opted to focus on their core business and pull out of MIS support to the schools of Leeds.
- ❑ Of those operating at below the highly satisfactory level last year, Connaught Baldwin are no longer trading under that name and are now a part of Connaught Partnerships Ltd. Mitie Cleaning Services recorded a small sample this year so could not be scored.
- ❑ Only one service provider recorded a score of only satisfactory this year. This was Carillion PLC, providing a grounds maintenance service to PFI schools.
- ❑ Of all the recorded service providers recorded in both last years survey and this years survey 50.0% recorded better scores, whilst 50.0% of schools recorded worse scores. In the same respect last year the average performance of all providers was 2.66 while this year it was 2.60, a very slight improvement of 0.84%.
- ❑ Feedback in general, from the comments made in free text, produces a favourable overview of the performances of both private and public sector providers of support services. Service provision is already at a highly satisfactory level, or better, and providers are continuing to further improve delivery.

## Summary report

### Response rate

This year is the fifth year the survey has been circulated having started in 2004/05, 122 schools responded representing 45.19% of the schools of Leeds **Appendix A pt.1-3**

Year	Responses
2004/05	171
2005/06	115
2006/07	121
2007/08	94
2008/09	122

Table 1: Total number of responses from Leeds school per year

The number of responses from schools this year is up by 29.8% from last year. Feedback in the main still tends to come from Headteachers, bursars and administrative staff with some input coming from other members of staff such as site managers.

### Performance level

Service providers are graded on a sliding scale with 1 being very good and 7 being very poor. The results for each provider are collated and an average score is calculated. A service provider is only recorded in the report if they receive five or more responses. It is the overall aim for all providers to be operating at a highly satisfactory or better level, Table 2 shows the number of service providers meeting this target.

Year	Total number of providers	Highly satisfactory or better	Below highly satisfactory
2004/05	32	26	6
2005/06	32	28	4
2006/07	39	36	3
2007/08	34	32	2
2008/09	42	41	1

Table 2: Performance level of service providers

The results indicate a trend of service providers performing better. The complete table of service providers and the average scores attributed to them is listed in **Appendix A pt.4**

### Rates of improvement

One of the aims of the Traded Services Forum and of both schools and service providers is to see a continual trend for improvement in service delivery. The below table, Table 3 shows the breakdown of how providers performed compared to last years survey. The full table of results is listed in **Appendix A pt. 5**

2007/2008		2008/2009	
Better	15	Better	15
Worse	13	Worse	15
New	5	New	12
No Change	1	No Change	0

Table 3: Change of performance of service providers since 2007/08

This year saw a marginally lower number of service providers performing better, only 50.0%, of those recorded in last years survey 51.7% achieved improved scores. Of the two providers addressed by last years survey, for providing only a satisfactory service, Connaught Baldwin, providing a property maintenance service have not been recorded in this years survey as they are now part of Connaught Partnerships Ltd. Mitie Cleaning Service, did not record enough responses to be included in the survey.

There were 50% of service providers who witnessed their score worsen, however, none of these providers have fallen below the minimum requirement of highly satisfactory. There were ten new service providers recorded for the first time and two providers who returned to the survey after a years absence, eleven of whom met the standard of highly satisfactory. The only provider to fall below the standard of highly satisfactory was Carillion PLC providing a Grounds Maintenance Service. From the smallest possible sample they recorded a score of satisfactory thus falling below the standard set by the Traded Services Forum.

### Highest average performing service providers

There were 18 service providers operating at a good or very good level in this years survey compared to 12 last year. The full table of results is listed in **Appendix A pt. 4**. This year, there was one provider operating in the very good bracket, this is the highest attainable score; this score demonstrated a slight improvement in the score achieved last year.

The below table, Table 4 shows this.

Service provider	Service	Responses	Avg. Score	Performance level
Financial Services, Education Leeds	Financial support to schools	120	1.41	Very Good

Table 4: Highest average score by service providers

Financial Services, provided by Education Leeds offers financial support to schools within a service level agreement. This was the only provider recorded within this service sector and is used by both the primary and secondary phases yielding a high number of responses of 120. These schools provided a wealth of positive feedback citing an *excellent service - prompt, accurate, helpful, excellent pro-active support and training, always there when needed* and *prompt responses – sound advice, reliable support, excellent training and guidance*.

### Lowest average performing service providers

To achieve the target set as the minimum threshold by the Traded Services Forum a service provider must record an average performance score of 3.5 or above. This year there is one instance where a provider has fallen below this minimum target. This provider has a small sample size, diminishing the reliability of the result. The below table, Table 5 shows this.

Service provider	Service	Responses	Avg. Score	Performance level
Carillion PLC	Grounds Maintenance	5	3.8	Satisfactory

Table 5: Lowest average score by service providers

Carillion PLC is a Privately Funded Initiative (PFI) provider of grounds maintenance services to PFI schools. Within this sector there are no alternatives for the PFI schools. There was a small sample of responses for this provider and schools noted *shrubs were allowed to excessively over grow this year which stopped visibility in the car park thus creating a risk*. However, from the responses one school did note that *staff are always very professional and the grounds are maintained well*.

## Service providers with the greatest rate of improvement.

By using the results from last year's survey the progress made by providers can be calculated. The table below, Table 6 assesses those service providers with the greatest recorded improvement.

Service Provider	Service	Results 2006/07		Results 2007/08		Change Between 2006/07 and 2007/08	Results 2008/09		Change between 2007/08 and 2008/09
		R	Avg.	R	Avg.		R	Avg.	
PACE (Personnel Administration and Contracts of Employment)	Personnel	106	2.66	91	2.80	-1.96%	117	2.38	5.88%
Capita Education Resourcing	Supply Teachers	5	1.80	9	3.33	-19.88%	13	2.92	5.74%
Teaching Personnel	Supply Teachers	7	2.86	10	2.90	-0.56%	7	2.57	4.62%
Cleaning Services, LCC	Cleaning Services	44	3.16	24	3.33	-2.38%	29	3	4.62%

Table 6: Greatest rate of increase in service standards

This year the rate of increase in performance was dramatically less than the previous year. For example, the largest degrees of change in last years survey were 14.42% and 12.04% where as this year the largest improvements are 5.88% and 5.74%. However, the overall performance of service providers to schools continues to improve all be it slightly

PACE (Personnel Administration and Contracts of Employment) recorded the greatest rate of increase. They are an Education Leeds provider of personnel services to Leeds schools. This year PACE recorded a 5.88% increase on last years score, moving from a *highly satisfactory* to a *good* service. Responses were spread between both the primary and secondary phases with many schools commenting on improvements being made. Positive feedback looked at the service providing *very helpful telephone advice, generally a prompt service, very helpful with queries, staff are always courteous, helpful and polite and overall support very good*. Schools also commented on the improvement; *training and information provided continues to improve and much improved service*.

Capita Education Resourcing are a private sector supply teaching agency. They recorded an increase of 5.74% on last years score remaining a *highly satisfactory* service. This increase also takes the service out of *the services providers with the greatest rate of decline in performance score*. Responses include *good teachers, they have a good range of teachers and support staff and lately have improved*

Teaching Personnel providing supply teachers to schools improved by recording a 4.62% increase on last year's score and remain in the category of *highly satisfactory*, yet close to the *good* threshold. Responses include *supply staff are a good quality and reliable, they know my standards and will act on requests*.

Cleaning Services, a public sector provider of cleaning services to schools by Leeds City Council also recorded a 4.62% improvement on last years score, it remains in the *highly satisfactory* category. Responses include: *Generally high level of cleaning, we were listened to and since the new cleaner came the school looks and smells clean and in general a good cleaning service is provided*

Enterprise MSL have significantly moved from being a *satisfactory* provider in 2006 to a *good* one in the 2009 survey. An impressive improvement of 1.73 points or 24.23%. Their contract with Leeds City Council ends in March 2009 and they have chosen not to bid for a place on the new Framework Contract as they do not consider it to be commercially viable for them and their strategic direction now has a focus on their core business of providing Infrastructure Maintenance Services.

## Service providers with the greatest rate of decline in performance score

By using the results from last year's survey the progress made by providers can be calculated. The table below, Table 7 assesses those service providers with the greatest recorded decline in performance score.

Service Provider	Service	Results 2006/07		Results 2007/08		Change Between 2006/07 and 2007/08	Results 2008/09		Change between 2007/08 and 2008/09
		R	Avg.	R	Avg.		R	Avg.	
Central Payments, LCC	Payments			87	2.80		118	3.42	-8.68%
Protocol Teachers	Supply Teachers			15	2.44		15	3	-7.84%
Connaught Partnerships	Property Maintenance	5	2.80	23	2.73	0.98%	33	3.27	-7.56%
Veolia Environmental Services	Waste Collection	53	3.11	41	2.88	3.22%	49	3.37	-6.86%

Table 7: Greatest rate of decline in service standards

Central Payments, a public sector payments service provided by Leeds City Council recorded the greatest rate of decline with a shift of 8.68%. The service provider remains just in the *highly satisfactory* category. Comments regarding Central Payments include: *I have a few problems with payments of invoices and the queries seem to take a long time to be cleared, there seems to be a long wait whilst invoices are processed, too many misplaced invoices and failure to pay invoices, poor – increasing number of bills not paid on time and regret the loss of an individual named contact.*

Protocol Teachers are a private sector provider of supply teachers to schools. The service recorded the next greatest decline in scores with a shift of 7.84%. The service, however, remains *highly satisfactory*. Comments regarding Protocol Teachers included *too many teachers turn up late, just before children come in and sometimes have to chase up when we have requested supply as they haven't got back to us.*

Connaught Partnerships Ltd, a private sector provider, providing property maintenance for schools and Veolia Environmental Services providing a waste collection service for schools recorded the next greatest decline in scores of 7.56% and 6.86.% respectively. Comments regarding Connaught Partnerships Ltd include *we have been disappointed with Connaught and responsive but need to improve the quality of work.* Veolia Environmental Services: *do the job but are expensive and very poor at responding to enquiries / queries.*

## Survey review

The Traded Services Survey performs an important assessment of service provision for service users, service providers and those making strategic decisions whether to provide or secure services for the schools of Leeds.

The survey provides schools with a voice to both praise performance and address concerns. Through this platform the Traded Services Forum can target action plans to those areas that are of foremost importance in order to maintain the highest levels of service delivery. This year, like last year, the forum will continue to address any areas of concern and make workable recommendations.

The success of the survey is solely dependent on the feedback provided by schools and we thank those that have taken time to respond. As ever we hope schools will continue to help us in future exercises.

**Ian Westlake**  
**Commissioning, Procurement and Business Development**  
**January 2009**

## Appendix A

### 1. Response rate

The total number of schools responding to this question is shown below in Table 1 from 2004/05 to 2008/09. It also shows how this figure equates to the total survey population of Leeds schools; percentages are calculated from a total survey population of 270 schools.

Year	Number of responses	% of Leeds Schools
2004/05	171	62.86%
2005/06	115	42.27%
2006/07	121	44.5%
2007/08	94	34.8%
2008/09	122	45.19%

Table 1: Total number of responses by year.

### 2. Response breakdown - 2008/09

The table below, Table 2 shows the breakdown of responses for this year's survey. The responses are subdivided into primary, secondary and other phases and also into wedges. There were two anonymous surveys returned this year.

Phase	
Type	Number
Primary	100
Secondary	18
Other	2
Wedge	
Type	Number
North West	32
North East	20
West	18
East	30
South	20

Table 2: Responses by wedge

### 3. Respondents breakdown

The table below, Table 3 provides a list of who was responding to this year's survey in terms of respective of job title. There were two anonymous surveys returned this year

Type	Number
Headteacher	78
Bursar	8
Admin	11
Business Manager	2
Finance Manager	3
Other	20

Table 3: Respondents by type.

#### 4. Performance Level

The table below, Table 4 provides the complete list of service providers and the performance level attributed to them.

Service Provider	Service	R	Avg.	Performance Level
Financial Services, Education Leeds	Financial Support	120	1.41	Very Good
Associated Waste Management	Waste Collection	5	1.6	Good
Blue Recruitment	Supply Teachers	7	1.71	Good
Chevin Landscapes	Grounds Maintenance	13	1.77	Good
Pudsey Computers	ICT Support	10	1.8	Good
School Delivery – In House	Catering Service	9	1.89	Good
School Library Service, Education Leeds	Library Service	107	1.98	Good
Insurance Section, LCC	Insurance	83	1.99	Good
Connect-up	ICT Support	17	2.18	Good
Dataable Ltd	ICT Support	26	2.23	Good
Governor Support Service	Governor Support	110	2.25	Good
Legal and Democratic Services, LCC	Legal Services	89	2.29	Good
Academic Appointments	Supply Teachers	10	2.3	Good
Artforms, Education Leeds	Music Support	102	2.31	Good
Human Resources, Education Leeds	Personnel	117	2.37	Good
PACE (Personnel Administration and Contracts of Employment)	Personnel	117	2.38	Good
School Delivery – In House	Cleaning Service	50	2.46	Good
Enterprise MSL	ICT Support	77	2.47	Good
Payroll Services, Business Support Centre, LCC	Payroll	116	2.5	Highly Satisfactory
Parks and Countrysides Service, LCC	Grounds Maintenance	66	2.55	Highly Satisfactory
AEDAS	Property Advice	7	2.57	Highly Satisfactory
Teaching Personnel	Supply Teachers	7	2.57	Highly Satisfactory
Hays	Supply Teachers	28	2.61	Highly Satisfactory
Celsian	Supply Teachers	38	2.63	Highly Satisfactory
David Yeadon Ltd	Property Advice	30	2.67	Highly Satisfactory
Catering Services, LCC	Catering Service	92	2.72	Highly Satisfactory
Reed Education	Supply Teachers	12	2.75	Highly Satisfactory
Select Education	Supply Teachers	18	2.78	Highly Satisfactory
Capita Education Resourcing	Supply Teachers	13	2.92	Highly Satisfactory
Strategic Design Alliance, LCC	Property Advice	47	2.98	Highly Satisfactory
Cleaning Services, LCC	Cleaning Services	29	3	Highly Satisfactory
Protocol Teachers	Supply Teachers	15	3	Highly Satisfactory
Biffa Waste Services Ltd	Waste Collection	53	3.03	Highly Satisfactory
Carillion	Catering Services	5	3.2	Highly Satisfactory
Connaught Partnerships Ltd	Property Maintenance	33	3.27	Highly Satisfactory
DRT Services	Property Maintenance	32	3.31	Highly Satisfactory
Leeds Learning Network	ICT Support - LLN	120	3.34	Highly Satisfactory
Veolia Environmental Services	Waste Collection	49	3.37	Highly Satisfactory
Carillion	Cleaning Services	5	3.4	Highly Satisfactory
RM Education	ICT Support	5	3.4	Highly Satisfactory
Central Payments Service, LCC	Payments	118	3.42	Highly Satisfactory
Carillion	Grounds Maintenance	5	3.8	Satisfactory

## 5. Progress

The table below, Table 5 provides the complete list of service providers and the progress rate attributed to them.

	Service	Results 2006/07		Results 2007/08		Change Between 2006/07 and 2007/08	Results 2008/09		Change between 2007/08 and 2008/09
		R	Avg.	R	Avg.		R	Avg.	
PACE (Personnel Administration and Contracts of Employment)	Personnel	106	2.66	91	2.80	-1.96%	117	2.38	5.88%
Capita Education Resourcing	Supply Teachers	5	1.80	9	3.33	-19.88	13	2.92	5.74%
Teaching Personnel	Supply Teachers	7	2.86	10	2.90	-0.56%	7	2.57	4.62%
Cleaning Services, LCC	Cleaning Services	44	3.16	24	3.33	-2.38%	29	3	4.62%
Catering Services, LCC	Catering Services	97	3.07	71	3.02	0.70%	92	2.72	4.20%
Celsian	Supply Teachers	29	2.83	28	2.90	-0.98%	38	2.63	3.78%
Human Resources, Education Leeds	Personnel	99	2.66	93	2.55	1.54%	117	2.37	2.52%
Enterprise MSL	ICT Support	102	3.06	69	2.60	6.44%	77	2.47	1.82%
Connect-up	ICT Support	5	2.00	10	2.30	-4.20%	17	2.18	1.68%
School Library Service, Education Leeds	Library Service	82	2.15	84	2.07	1.12%	107	1.98	1.26%
Hays	Supply Teachers	13	2.31	19	2.68	-5.18%	28	2.61	0.98%
Financial Services, Education Leeds	Financial Support	106	1.37	92	1.46	-1.26%	120	1.41	0.70%
Governor Support Service, Education Leeds	Governor Support	95	2.33	84	2.30	0.42%	110	2.25	0.70%
Legal and Democratic Services, LCC	Legal Service	89	2.33	71	2.34	-0.14%	89	2.29	0.70%
Reed Education	Supply Teachers			14	2.79		12	2.75	0.56%
Biffa Waste Services Ltd	Waste Collection	45	3.02	45	3.02	No Change	53	3.03	-0.14%
Insurance Section, LCC	Insurance	97	2.14	83	1.96	2.52%	111	1.99	-0.42%
David Yeadon Ltd	Property Advice	21	2.24	19	2.63	-5.46%	30	2.67	-0.56%
Strategic Design Alliance, LCC	Property Advice	57	2.93	47	2.94	-0.14%	47	2.98	-0.56%
Parks and Countryside, LCC	Grounds Maintenance	88	3.48	58	2.45	14.42%	66	2.55	-1.40%
Leeds Learning Network	ICT Support - LLN	104	3.38	88	3.24	1.96%	120	3.34	-1.40%
Datacable Ltd	ICT Support	15	1.93	11	2.09	-2.24%	26	2.23	-1.96%
Artforms, Education Leeds	Music Support	77	2.31	78	2.15	2.24%	102	2.31	-2.24%
Chevin Landscapes	Grounds Maintenance	12	2	7	1.57	6.02%	13	1.77	-2.80%
Select	Supply Teachers	7	2.57	10	2.50	0.98%	18	2.78	-3.92%
DRT Services	Property Maintenance	5	3.8	17	2.94	12.04%	32	3.31	-5.18%
Veolia Environmental Services	Waste Collection	53	3.11	41	2.88	3.22%	49	3.37	-6.86%
Connaught Partnerships	Property Maintenance	5	2.80	23	2.73	0.98%	33	3.27	-7.56%
Protocol Teachers	Supply Teachers			15	2.44		15	3	-7.84%
Central Payments, LCC	Payments			87	2.80		118	3.42	-8.68%
Associated Waste Management (AWM)	Waste Collection						5	1.6	

Blue Recruitment	Supply Teachers						7	1.71	
School Delivery – In House	Catering Services						9	1.89	
Academic Appointments	Supply Teachers						10	2.3	
School Delivery – In House	Cleaning Service						50	2.46	
AEDAS	Property Advice						7	2.57	
Carillion	Catering Service						5	3.2	
Carillion	Cleaning Service						5	3.4	
RM Education	ICT Support						5	3.4	
Carillion	Grounds Maintenance						5	3.8	
Pudsey Computers	ICT Support	5	2	N/A	Small Sample		10	1.8	
Payroll Services, BSC, LCC	Payroll	110	3.09	N/A	Not Surveyed		116	2.5	
Mitie Cleaning Services	Cleaning Service	5	3.8	6	3.66	1.96%	n/a	Small Sample	
Mark Education	Supply Teachers			13	2.38		n/a	Small Sample	
ERN	Supply Teachers			10	3.00		n/a	Small Sample	
<b>Average Scores</b>		2006/07	2.68	2007/08	2.66	2008/09	2.60		