

Education Leeds

The Schools Traded Services

Customer Satisfaction Survey 2010

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 decreased from 122 last year to 117 this year. There were 104 responses from the primary phase, 12 responses from the secondary phase and 1 response from the special/PRU sector. This year saw an increase in responses from the primary sector and a decrease in the secondary and special/PRU sectors.
- ❑ Financial Services of Education Leeds received the most responses with 117, next was Human Resources also provided by Education Leeds with 115 responses.
- ❑ There were 40 recorded service providers across the services with 38 of those operating at a very good, good or highly satisfactory level of performance. This has slightly decreased from the previous year when only one service provider was operating below highly satisfactory.
- ❑ This year, only one service provider, Financial Services, provided by Education Leeds, recorded a score of very good, the highest attainable level.
- ❑ Of those operating at below the highly satisfactory level last year, Carillion PLC providing a grounds maintenance service recorded a small sample this year so could not be scored.
- ❑ Two service providers recorded a score of satisfactory or below this year. This was Pinnacle psg UK, providing a cleaning service to schools who were satisfactory and RM Education providing ICT support who recorded a score of below satisfactory.
- ❑ RM Education, providing ICT support to Leeds schools, recorded the lowest ever score in the Traded Services Survey and is a real cause for concern. Schools appear unhappy with the service levels received and immediate actions must be taken to rectify this.
- ❑ Credit should be given to Central Payments, Leeds City Council who have shown a marked improvement in this year's survey. Last year a recorded score of 3.42 was on the satisfactory / highly satisfactory border. The service implemented an improvement plan which has resulted in a score of 2.96 in this year's survey; the service is now comfortably a highly satisfactory one.
- ❑ Of all the service providers recorded in both last year's survey and this year's survey 58.0% recorded better scores, whilst 39.0% of service providers recorded worse scores. In the same respect last year the average performance of all providers was 2.60 while this year it was 2.52, a very slight improvement of 1.12%.

- 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. The majority of service provision is already at a highly satisfactory level, or better, and providers are continuing to further improve delivery. However, it should be noted that there are areas of concern that need to be addressed.

Summary report

Response rate

This year is the sixth year the survey has been circulated having started in 2004/05, 117 schools responded representing 43.77% 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
2009/10	117

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

The number of responses from schools this year is down by 4.1% from last year. Feedback in the main still tends to come from Headteachers and administrative staff with some input coming from other members of staff such as site managers and business 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
2009/10	40	38	2

Table 2: Performance level of service providers

The results indicate a trend that service provision has reached a peak in terms of reaching the minimum standard of highly satisfactory and the majority of providers must work towards achieving good status. 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 year's survey. The full table of results is listed in **Appendix A pt. 5**

2008/2009		2009/010	
Better	15	Better	22
Worse	15	Worse	15
New	12	New	2
No Change	0	No Change	1

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

This year saw a much higher number of service providers performing better. Of those recorded in last year's survey 58% achieved improved scores. The one provider addressed by last year's survey, for providing only a satisfactory service, Carillion PLC, providing a grounds maintenance service did not record enough responses to be included in the survey. However, the small sample recorded suggests Carillion are now operating at highly satisfactory level.

There were 39% of service providers who witnessed their score worsen; one provider, RM Education, has fallen below the minimum requirement of highly satisfactory by recording a score of below satisfactory. There were only 2 new service providers recorded for the first time, School ICT Services are providing a good service where as Pinnacle psg UK providing a cleaning service failed to meet the standard by recording a score of satisfactory from a sample of 5 responses.

Highest average performing service providers

There were 23 service providers operating at a good or very good level in this year's survey compared to 18 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	117	1.38	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 117. These schools provided a wealth of positive feedback citing an *excellent personal supportive service, absolutely brilliant* and *our finance officer and other members of the team are an excellent resource and give a high quality support*.

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 above 3.5. This year there are two instances where a provider has fallen below this minimum target. These providers have 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
RM Education	ICT Support	6	4.50	Below Satisfactory
Pinnacle psg UK	Cleaning	5	3.60	Satisfactory

Table 5: Lowest average score by service providers

RM Education is a provider of ICT services mainly to Building Schools for the Future (BSF) schools. Within the BSF programme there are no alternatives for these schools. There is a small number of responses but RM Education recorded the lowest score in the history of the Traded Services Survey and is a genuine cause for concern. Schools noted a *lack of knowledge, inferior quality of equipment purchased - at much greater expense than high street prices, response time variable, never think to be proactive* and *do not seem to have enough staff on site which has effect on teaching and learning*.

Pinnacle psg UK is a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) provider of cleaning 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 *if cleaning staff are absent, they are not always replaced, meaning the existing staff struggle to maintain standards and CRB Procedures not fully in place or followed.* However, some schools commented that the *cleaning was satisfactory and the cleaners are great.*

It should be noted that Pinnacle psg UK also provide a catering, grounds maintenance, property advice and maintenance service to PFI schools but did not record enough results to be included in the survey for these sections. From the small number of responses received it is suggested that the catering service is highly satisfactory but the other services do not meet the standard set by the Traded Services Forum.

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 2007/08		Results 2008/09		Change Between 2007/08 and 2008/09	Results 2009/10		Change between 2008/09 and 2009/10
		R	Avg.	R	Avg.		R	Avg.	
AEDAS	Property Advice			7	2.57		8	1.88	9.73%
DRT Services	Property Maintenance	17	2.94	32	3.31	-5.18%	21	2.71	8.34%
Capita Education Resourcing	Supply Teachers	9	3.33	13	2.92	5.74%	6	2.33	8.22%
Protocol Teachers	Supply Teachers	15	2.44	15	3	-7.84%	15	2.47	7.47%

Table 6: Greatest rate of increase in service standards

This year the rate of increase in performance was much greater than the previous year. For example, the largest degrees of change in last year's survey were 5.88% and 5.74% where as this year the largest improvements are 9.73% and 8.34%. This is reflected in the overall performance of service providers to schools which continues to improve all be it slightly.

AEDAS recorded the greatest rate of increase. They are a provider of property advice services mainly for Catholic schools. This year AEDAS recorded a 9.73% increase on last year's score, moving from highly satisfactory to good. The majority of responses were from the primary phase with one secondary response. Feedback included *the service from initial enquiry to completion of building was excellent, progress meetings held regularly, plans and work to be completed always clearly explained, snagging chased up effectively.* A common theme was that the service was expensive but good.

DRT Services are a private sector provider of property maintenance services. They recorded an increased score of 8.34% on last year's performance remaining a highly satisfactory service. DRT have responded to last year's survey when the companies score decreased by 5.18%. Schools noted that DRT Services *respond quickly when required, very professional, give good advice, quick call outs, quick quotes, quick work, in other words 'quick' and good reliable, value for money.*

Capita Education Resourcing are a private sector supply teaching agency, who are not currently part of the Education Leeds framework agreement for supply teaching. They recorded an increase of 8.22% on last year's score moving from a *highly satisfactory to a good* service. This increase builds on the increase made during last year's survey. Responses include *always email information re CRB/List99/qualifications etc. ring for feedback on supply staff to enable them to compile a personal school supply list and good telephone manner.*

Protocol Teachers are a private sector supply teaching agency who are part of the Education Leeds framework agreement for supply teaching. They recorded an increase of 7.47% on last year's score moving to a good service. This increase also takes the service out of *the service providers with the greatest rate of decline in performance score.* Responses include *very proactive. offering good deals, decent staffing in the main and prompt efficient response to contact.*

Central Payments, Leeds City Council have shown an improvement in this year's survey that should be noted. Last year a recorded score of 3.42 was on the satisfactory / highly satisfactory border. The service implemented an improvement plan which has resulted in a score of 2.96 in this year's service. The service is now comfortably a highly satisfactory one after the 6.38% improvement and credit must go to the service for this.

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 2007/08		Results 2008/09		Change Between 2007/08 and 2008/09	Results 2009/10		Change between 2008/09 and 2009/10
		R	Avg.	R	Avg.		R	Avg.	
Blue Recruitment	Supply Teachers			7	1.71		7	2.86	-16.07%
RM Education	ICT Support			5	3.4		6	4.50	-15.41%
Connect-up	ICT Support	10	2.30	17	2.18	1.68%	69	2.67	-6.82%
Hays	Supply Teachers	19	2.68	28	2.61	0.98%	18	3.06	-6.24%

Table 7: Greatest rate of decline in service standards

Blue Recruitment, a private sector provider of supply teachers to schools and not part of the Education Leeds framework agreement for supply teachers recorded the greatest rate of decline with a shift of 16.07%. The service provider remains in the highly satisfactory category. Comments regarding Blue Recruitment in the main seem to be positive reflecting the score of highly satisfactory. The only comment received suggesting reasons for the decline in score was *we use to be highly satisfied with Blue Recruitment but we have found that, at times when supply staff are in great demand we haven't been sent the staff we had originally booked.*

RM Education is a provider of ICT services mainly to Building Schools for the Future (BSF) schools. The service recorded the next greatest decline in scores with a shift of 15.41%. The service has fallen from highly satisfactory to below satisfactory. This is the lowest recorded score in the history of the Traded Services Survey. Comments regarding RM Education included *lack of knowledge, inferior quality of equipment purchased - at much greater expense than high street prices, response time variable, never think to be proactive, do not seem to have enough staff on site which has effect on teaching and learning and Calls can take a while to resolve once logged with RM.*

Connect-up are a private sector provider of ICT Services. Connect-up were awarded the contract for Schools ICT Support in April 2009 which has resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of responses received, moving from 17 responses to 69; an increase of over 300%. In terms of how many Leeds schools Connect Up supports this has risen from 22 before April 2009 to 176 today. The service has recorded a decrease in performance score of 6.82% falling from a good to a highly satisfactory service. Schools noted a variety of positive and negative comments including *staff are always willing to help but occasionally delays in getting problems resolved do occur. However, in the main the school is happy with the service their rates are competitive and the technician who visits each week is extremely helpful and supportive, recent quotes for the ICT suite have confirmed that Connect-up still offer best value to schools, first year with Connect-up so far very helpful, take over was very smooth although some schools noted slow in responding to logged calls, very disappointed with this service and they haven't helped us to solve our ICT problems - sometimes causing additional problems.*

Hays are a private sector provider of supply teachers to schools and again not part of the Education Leeds framework agreement for supply teachers. The service recorded a decline in scores with a shift of 6.24%. The service, however, remains highly satisfactory. Comments *regarding Hays included not good value for money, teachers arrive late, no planning, poor behaviour management strategies etc* but some were positive *stating long working relationship with Hays - they know our needs.*

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
February 2010

Appendix A

1. 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 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%
2009/10	117	43.33%

Table 1: Total number of responses by year.

2. Response breakdown - 2009/10

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.

Phase	
Type	Number
Primary	104
Secondary	12
Other	1
Wedge	
Type	Number
North West	29
North East	18
West	22
East	24
South	24

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.

Type	Number
Headteacher	71
Bursar	6
Administrator	13
Business Manager	7
Finance Manager	8
Other	12

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	117	1.38	Very Good
School Delivery – In House	Catering Service	10	1.60	Good
Pudsey Computers	ICT Support	10	1.70	Good
Insurance Section, LCC	Insurance	104	1.81	Good
Associated Waste Management	Waste Collection	16	1.88	Good
AEDAS	Property Advice	8	1.88	Good
School ICT Services	ICT Support	32	2.00	Good
School Library Service, Education Leeds	Library Service	98	2.03	Good
Chevin Landscapes	Grounds Maintenance	10	2.10	Good
Artforms, Education Leeds	Music Support	90	2.19	Good
Human Resources, Education Leeds	Personnel	115	2.23	Good
School Delivery – In House	Cleaning Service	41	2.24	Good
Datacable Ltd	ICT Support	19	2.32	Good
PACE (Personnel Administration and Contracts of Employment)	Personnel	112	2.32	Good
Legal, Licensing and Registration, LCC	Legal Services	87	2.33	Good
Select Education	Supply Teachers	15	2.33	Good
Academic Appointments	Supply Teachers	9	2.33	Good
Capita Education Resourcing	Supply Teachers	6	2.33	Good
Parks and Countrysides Service, LCC	Grounds Maintenance	67	2.36	Good
Protocol Teachers	Supply Teachers	15	2.47	Good
Payroll Services, Business Support Centre, LCC	Payroll	112	2.48	Good
Celsian	Supply Teachers	29	2.48	Good
Governor Support Service, Education Leeds	Governor Support	105	2.49	Good
David Yeadon Ltd	Property Advice	25	2.52	Highly Satisfactory
Teaching Personnel	Supply Teachers	7	2.57	Highly Satisfactory
Connect-up	ICT Support	69	2.67	Highly Satisfactory
Strategic Design Alliance, LCC	Property Advice	40	2.70	Highly Satisfactory
DRT Services	Property Maintenance	21	2.71	Highly Satisfactory
Blue Recruitment	Supply Teachers	7	2.86	Highly Satisfactory
Cleaning Services, LCC	Cleaning Services	28	2.89	Highly Satisfactory
Connaught Partnerships Ltd	Property Maintenance	22	2.95	Highly Satisfactory
Central Payments Service, LCC	Payments	113	2.96	Highly Satisfactory
Leeds Learning Network, LCC	ICT Support - LLN	112	2.98	Highly Satisfactory
Reed Education	Supply Teachers	16	3.00	Highly Satisfactory
Hays	Supply Teachers	18	3.06	Highly Satisfactory
Catering Services, LCC	Catering Service	89	3.06	Highly Satisfactory
Veolia Environmental Services	Waste Collection	41	3.20	Highly Satisfactory
Biffa Waste Services Ltd	Waste Collection	46	3.41	Highly Satisfactory
Pinnacle psg UK	Cleaning Services	5	3.60	Satisfactory
RM Education	ICT Support	6	4.50	Below Satisfactory

5. Progress

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

	Service	Results 2007/08		Results 2008/09		Change Between 2007/08 and 2008/09	Results 2009/10		Change between 2008/09 and 2009/10
		R	Avg.	R	Avg.		R	Avg.	
AEDAS	Property Advice			7	2.57		8	1.88	9.73%
DRT Services	Property Maintenance	17	2.94	32	3.31	-5.18%	21	2.71	8.34%
Capita Education Resourcing	Supply Teachers	9	3.33	13	2.92	5.74%	6	2.33	8.22%
Protocol Teachers	Supply Teachers	15	2.44	15	3	-7.84%	15	2.47	7.47%
Central Payments, LCC	Payments	87	2.80	118	3.42	-8.68%	113	2.96	6.38%
Select	Supply Teachers	10	2.50	18	2.78	-3.92%	15	2.33	6.26%
Leeds Learning Network, LCC	ICT Support - LLN	88	3.24	120	3.34	-1.40%	112	2.98	5.01%
Connaught Partnerships	Property Maintenance	23	2.73	33	3.27	-7.56%	22	2.95	4.42%
School Delivery – In House	Catering Services			9	1.89		10	1.60	4.06%
Strategic Design Alliance, LCC	Property Advice	47	2.94	47	2.98	-0.56%	40	2.70	3.92%
Parks and Countryside, LCC	Grounds Maintenance	58	2.45	66	2.55	-1.40%	67	2.36	2.69%
Insurance Section, LCC	Insurance	83	1.96	111	1.99	-0.42%	104	1.81	2.55%
Veolia Environmental Services	Waste Collection	41	2.88	49	3.37	-6.86%	41	3.20	2.45%
David Yeadon Ltd	Property Advice	19	2.63	30	2.67	-0.56%	25	2.52	2.10%
Celsian	Supply Teachers	28	2.90	38	2.63	3.78%	29	2.48	2.06%
Human Resources, Education Leeds	Personnel	93	2.55	117	2.37	2.52%	115	2.23	1.89%
Artforms, Education Leeds	Music Support	78	2.15	102	2.31	-2.24%	90	2.19	1.70%
Cleaning Services, LCC	Cleaning Services	24	3.33	29	3	4.62%	28	2.89	1.50%
Pudsey Computers	ICT Support			10	1.8		10	1.7	1.40%
PACE (Personnel Administration and Contracts of Employment)	Personnel	91	2.80	117	2.38	5.88%	112	2.32	0.82%
Financial Services, Education Leeds	Financial Support	92	1.46	120	1.41	0.70%	117	1.38	0.48%
Payroll Services, BSC, LCC	Payroll			116	2.5		112	2.48	0.25%
Teaching Personnel	Supply Teachers	10	2.90	7	2.57	4.62%	7	2.57	0.00%
Academic Appointments	Supply Teachers			10	2.3		9	2.33	-0.47%
Legal, Licensing and Registration, LCC	Legal Service	71	2.34	89	2.29	0.70%	87	2.33	-0.61%
School Library Service, Education Leeds	Library Service	84	2.07	107	1.98	1.26%	98	2.03	-0.71%
Datacable Ltd	ICT Support	11	2.09	26	2.23	-1.96%	19	2.32	-1.20%
Governor Support Service, Education Leeds	Governor Support	84	2.30	110	2.25	0.70%	105	2.49	-3.36%
Reed Education	Supply Teachers	14	2.79	12	2.75	0.56%	16	3.00	-3.50%
Associated Waste Management (AWM)	Waste Collection			5	1.6		16	1.88	-3.85%
Chevin Landscapes	Grounds Maintenance	7	1.57	13	1.77	-2.80%	10	2.10	-4.62%
Catering Services, LCC	Catering Services	71	3.02	92	2.72	4.20%	89	3.06	-4.71%

School Delivery – In House	Cleaning Service			50	2.46		41	2.24	-4.96%
Biffa Waste Services Ltd	Waste Collection	45	3.02	53	3.03	-0.14%	46	3.41	-5.36%
Hays	Supply Teachers	19	2.68	28	2.61	0.98%	18	3.06	-6.24%
Connect-up	ICT Support	10	2.30	17	2.18	1.68%	69	2.67	-6.82%
RM Education	ICT Support			5	3.4		6	4.50	-15.41%
Blue Recruitment	Supply Teachers			7	1.71		7	2.86	-16.07%
Pinnacle psg UK	Cleaning service						5	3.60	
School ICT Service	ICT Support						32	2.00	
Enterprise MSL	ICT Support	69	2.60	77	2.47	1.82%	n/a	Withdrawn	
Carillion	Catering Service			5	3.2		n/a	Small Sample	
Carillion	Cleaning Service			5	3.4		n/a	Small Sample	
Carillion	Grounds Maintenance			5	3.8		n/a	Small Sample	
Average Scores		2007/08	2.66	2008/09	2.60	2009/10	2.52		