

## Appendix C – Cleaning

### 1. Cleaning service - overview

Your cleaning service provider should deliver a clean school to the standard and frequency agreed. The provision should be offered by staff trained in health and safety, customer care, environmental awareness, cleaning tasks and procedures, quality assurance systems and who have been CRB checked. The service should be carried out appropriately using the correct procedures within colour coded cleaning systems.

### 2. Response rate

The total number of schools responding to this question is shown below in Table 1 from 2004/05 to 2009/10. It also shows how this figure equates to the total survey population.

Year	Number of responses	% of Leeds Schools
2004/05	56	20.58%
2005/06	82	30.00%
2006/07	88	32.35%
2007/08	73	26.83%
2008/09	98	36.30%
2009/10	86	31.85%

Table 1: Total number of responses by year.

### 3. Service providers

Those service providers recording five or more responses are shown below in Table 2. The table lists the total responses for 2005/06, 2006/07, 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10 and further breaks down the responses into primary, secondary and other phases for 2009/10.

Service Provider	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10			
	Total	Total	Total	Total	Primary	Secondary	Other	Total
Cleaning Services, Leeds City Council	31	44	24	29	24	4	0	28
School Delivery, in house provision	29	29	43	50	36	4	1	41
Carillion PLC	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
Pinnacle psg UK	-	-	-	-	5	0	0	5

Table 2: Total number of responses by service provider

Cleaning Services and School in house provision have maintained a similar number of responses. Carillion PLC did not record enough response this year to be included in the survey. Pinnacle psg UK, a private sector PFI provider, recorded 5 responses for the first time.

### 4. Performance level

The key performance level review is measurable on a scale of 1 = very good, 2 = good, 3 = highly satisfactory, 4 = satisfactory, 5 = unsatisfactory, 6 = poor and 7 = very poor. The mean performance level is shown in Table 3 below. The full list of unedited comments is listed in [Annex C](#)

Service Provider	2007/08		2008/09		2009/10		
	Avg	Performance Level	Avg	Performance Level	Avg	Performance Level	Change
Cleaning Services, Leeds City Council	3.33	Highly satisfactory	3.00	Highly Satisfactory	2.89	Highly Satisfactory	Better
School Delivery,	2.21	Good	2.46	Good	2.24	Good	Better

in house provision							
Carillion PLC	-	-	3.40	Highly Satisfactory	-	Small Sample	-
Pinnacle psg UK	-	-	-	-	3.60	Satisfactory	-

Table 3: Performance level by cleaning service providers

The Cleaning Service provided by Leeds City Council again recorded a score of highly satisfactory this year. The service continues to improve year on year. School's own in-house delivery is operating at a good level which is the same as last year. Pinnacle psg UK recorded a score of satisfactory which is below the minimum threshold set by the Traded Services Forum although comments suggest that the cleaning standard is ok other issues regarding the service have caused the score to fall. Carillion PLC did not record enough responses to be included in this year's survey.

#### 5. Service providers – value for money

Schools were asked to record whether or not the service provider was delivering value for money. The responses are listed below in Table 4. The table sub-divides the responses into primary and secondary phases.

Service Provider	Primary			Secondary			Total		
	Yes	No	No comment	Yes	No	No comment	Yes	No	No comment
Cleaning Services, Leeds City Council	15	5	4	3	1	0	18	6	4
School Delivery, in house provision	29	1	6	4	0	0	34	1	6
Pinnacle psg UK	1	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	3

Table 4: Value for money by service providers

Cleaning Services, Leeds City Council and school's own provision recorded favourable results whilst the majority of schools did not provide comment on Pinnacle's value for money.

#### 6. Service providers – improvement

Schools were asked to record how the service provider could improve their service delivery and what steps they were taking to ensure that this was taking place. Table 5 lists the response to this question.

Service Provider	Primary			Secondary			Total		
	Yes	No	No comment	Yes	No	No comment	Yes	No	No comment
Cleaning Services, Leeds City Council	11	6	7	3	0	1	14	6	8
School Delivery, in house provision	23	5	8	2	0	2	26	5	10
Pinnacle psg UK	3	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	2

Table 5: Expected improvement by service providers

All service providers are expected to improve. The full unedited comments attributed to this question are available in [Annex C](#). Those schools with the Council focussed their response on communication and the level of monitoring done centrally. School's delivering their cleaning service in-house looked at again improving the workforce through monitoring and training. Those schools with Pinnacle commented that it was issues other than the cleaning that caused the score to fall.

## Annex C – Cleaning

### Cleaning Services, provided by Leeds City Council

#### 1. Please explain why you rate the service provider this way?

##### Positive responses

- Good support with some issues. Good standard e.g. for a holiday clean. Very helpful managers.
- Management always respond promptly to issues raised.
- We currently have no Caretaker and so some cleaning tasks such as buffing the floors is not done because the staff are not trained. We have brought in a Caretaker from a local school to help.
- Excellent communication is the key to high standards, good relationships and essential flexibility.
- Very High Standard. Good group dynamics. Very Good leadership on site.
- The building is cleaned thoroughly and the cleaners take pride in keeping the school looking spruce. There are difficulties for them in that the school is used for extended schools lettings and they are sometimes unable to access areas being used for this purpose. They work afternoons only.
- Generally good cleaning service, but not happy that school will have to supply own big equipment - this would not provide value for money. Quite high turnover of staff therefore not much commitment to schools standards
- Again service very responsive and sympathetic to the pressure on school. Standard of cleaning very good this year, we are happy with our present staffing.
- Our current cleaners are generally conscientious and provide a good level of service and standards are usually quite good.
- Particular member of staff is very reliable and does a good job.
- Standards are high and the members of staff are reliable friendly and helpful.

##### Negative responses

- Often problems with temp staff due to sickness absence. Sometimes they do not clean up to standard.
- Currently reviewing the cleaning contract in light of the newly built/refurbished school and the requirements.
- Cleaning is one area that I have been asked by the governors to look into with a view to costs and whether there are any potential savings/best value improvements to be gained.
- Agency cleaners have been the issue.
- School not kept particularly clean.
- Service expensive and not all that good. It is not responsive to change and the management don't have much control over the staff and their quality control is not up to much. Some individual cleaners are wonderful. The organisation seems buried in old-fashioned custom and practice.
- Standard of cleaning varies depending on staff.
- We decided that because of the very poor service we received from cleaning services that we would go in house with our cleaning. We did so from September and are now extremely pleased with our service.
- Management of staff in school could be better and communication to staff in school could be better.
- Some issues over attitude of cleaners and over timing and hours. These issues settled quickly and satisfactory by the service.
- Often not cleaned to the standard set out in the guidelines. We have had a more regular cleaner this year.

## School Delivery – In House Provision

### 1. Please explain why you rate the service provider this way?

#### Positive responses

- Able to monitor and review in house, divert resources as needed. Although covering absent staff can sometimes be an issue. Have used agency staff in the past but do not always get continuity with this.
- All in place and working fine.
- The service is cheaper and flexible. We have reliable staff who feel part of our whole school team.
- Working very well since April 09.
- We manage our staff and ensure that they are deployed effectively. We will introduce some QA to provide constructive feedback on the service.
- Reliable, efficient and high standards.
- Excellent cleaning standards with high expectations.
- Well managed. Well trained. High expectations. Well motivated, local people (some are parents), pride in the school.
- Overall satisfactory (mostly). Have had a lot of building work recently and we are now ready to review our whole cleaning regime.
- Service designed to meet the schools needs, flexible and reliable.
- They are our own cleaners, know the school and work reasonably well for us.
- Been in house I feel we have more control over standards and procedures than an outside company.
- Great quality and service.
- Our own staff.
- Need to remind caretaker of areas missed on a regular basis. Very willing however with maintenance.
- The caretaker and assistant clean our school in a very efficient manner no complaints.
- Good quality of work - value for money.
- Cleaning team highly committed and proud.

#### Negative responses

- Needs support from line manager.
- Increase in staffing level just agreed, further training required.
- Difficult to access any form of training - LA should provide this.
- Old Building.
- No regular cleaner this year - staffing issues. Agency cleaners have been up and down. Is there any training for superintendents to keep them updated as to what the latest H and S procedures etc are?
- Some difficulty covering absent staff - Leave of absence, sickness + retirement. Looking at appointment of relief cleaners.
- The deep clean should be better over the holidays but I am not necessarily here to supervise.
- Do have continual problems with absence which does lead to other cleaners covering etc

## Pinnacle psg UK

### 1. Please explain why you rate the service provider this way?

#### Positive responses

- The cleaners are great but they are frequently down on a cleaner and no replacement is sent. This means they are rushing around to get done.

**Negative responses**

- Cleaning hours currently being negotiated.
- If cleaning staff are absent, they are not always replaced, meaning the existing staff struggle to maintain standards.
- CRB Procedures not fully in place or followed. Cleaning satisfactory.