

Appendix D – Exert from Resident Board Minutes 30/06/20

	<p>Attendees: Nigel Pacey Independent Chair Omer Farooq Ishaq Fazal Christine Griffin Mandy Mathu Tanieque Noel-George Trevor Pollard Bushra Raj</p> <p>In Attendance: Cllr Hulme, Chair, Neighbourhood & Communities Committee Scott Hughes, Account Director, Osborne Property Services Wendy Butler, Call Centre Manager, Osborne Property Services Ian Stone, Contract Manager, SBC Tony Turnbull, Neighbourhood Manager, North, SBC Amanda Talbot, Leasehold Serv. & Right to Buy Manager, SBC Karen Wilkinson, Service Improvement Co-Ordinator, SBC Karen Lewis, Note Taker</p>
7.	Osborne Draft Annual Report
7.1	NP noted that a copy of the annual report had been circulated to members prior to the meeting and invited SH to present the key points to the Board.
7.2	SH explained that the report covered year 2 of the contract which generally been positive with some lessons learned as Osborne and SBC continued to shape the contract. SH added that it was key for customers that Osborne demonstrate what had been achieved and the impact of their work.
7.3	SH explained that the customer experience is captured through operatives PDAs together with some telephone surveys. 250 compliments had been received against 170 complaints with the call centre taking 41,000 calls over the course of the year with 2,750 lost calls, adding that a significant piece of work had been done to improve call handler retention.
7.4	SH summarised the key points from the report noting that the most significant area was compliance with statutory Health & Safety legislation which had remained at 100% for the past 20 months which had been validated by an external auditor.
7.5	In relation to caretaking and cleaning services, SH acknowledged that more work needed to be done however the caretakers had recently been allocated PDAs which would allow them to capture live data for monitoring these services. SH noted his intention to now take these services to the next level.
7.6	SH noted that Osborne had invested in Resident Liaison Officers to support residents through the planned works process which had involved a significant

	amount of work relating to fire safety which were ongoing together with the boiler replacement programme.
7.7	SH explained that the Slough contract employs 10 full time apprentices in both front line and back office roles and a Community Investment Officer responsible for delivering Social Return On Investment activities. The contract employs 40 member of staff who live locally and of the 45 supply chain partners, 11 have Slough postcodes.
7.8	In response to a question from CG, SH explained that the report covered 1.12.18 to 30.11.19 and accepted that it did not cover the last financial year. CG noted that she had read an article in local newspaper which stated that Osborne were 4 months behind on repairs and that they would be losing 75 members of staff and asked, if this was the case, how they would catch up on outstanding repairs. SH explained that the redundancies were being made from Osborne's wider construction services and not the Slough contract. SH added that due to the impact of the pandemic there had been a build up of repairs which he was currently working with Osborne's supply chain to try to speed things up.
7.9	In response to a question from NP, SH explained that he had drafted an initial plan to tackle the backlog using a triage system to determine priorities and the resources required to manage this. SH agreed to share the plan with the Board.
7.10	In response to a question from IS, SH confirmed that there would be no redundancies in relation to Osborne's contract with Slough.
7.11	OF asked whether, as Contract Manager, IS was satisfied with Osborne's performance and IS replied that the report needed to be more up to date as a lot of the issues were recent and therefore not covered in the report. SH agreed to amend the report to cover the full financial year to 31.3.20. IS acknowledged that SH had only recently been appointed to the Account Director role and will work with him to update the report.
7.12	OF reiterated his question as to whether IS was happy with the performance information in the report and IS responded that he was looking to verify some of the data.
7.13	OF noted that the Board had experienced a number of meetings with residents over the past year and it was clear to them that there were problems with the contract which made the report misleading. NP emphasised that the Board were extremely unhappy with Osborne's performance adding that, as an independent member of the Board, he had seen and heard that residents views of Osborne and some of the figures in the report appeared to be fantasy and demonstrated a disconnect between the data and residents' experience of the service.
7.14	OF explained that his biggest concern was that neither Osborne nor SBC were calculating the human cost and the stress being caused to residents, including

	vulnerable people and asked why this was not being measured. NP advised that this would be covered by Item 9 on the agenda which looked at the relationship between Osborne and SBC.
7.15	TP noted that, in the past, he had regularly asked for information in relation to compliance from SBC's contract managers and received no response and asked for reassurance that SBC were not in breach of their statutory duties. SH confirmed that Osborne were fully compliant and TP asked whether that applied to passenger lifts and fire safety requirements. SH responded that the fire safety reports had been submitted to SBC and TP asked to see a copy of the full report.
7.16	TNG asked for more information about the ongoing training, particularly in relation to customer services. WB noted that she had taken over responsibility for managing the call centre three weeks ago but training plans are in place for all call handlers and she is working with the supervisor to identify further training needs. WB explained that there is a dedicated manager responsible for managing complaints within the call centre and the team have opportunities to discuss complaints with them. NP noted that at a Complaints Panel held on 14.5.20 he had asked Nathan Smith for a copy of the training plan that he had not yet received.
7.17	TNG asked what information was being collected from the caretakers' PDAs and SH confirmed that their arrival and leaving times could be monitored and they had the facility to upload photos to the system.
7.18	TT noted that despite having management responsibility for the service from April 2019 to February 2020, he had not been asked to comment on the report, however in relation to the 100% compliance on gas safety, this was due to joint working between Osborne and the housing management teams who go to court when operatives have failed to gain access to a property.
7.19	NP drew attention to page 10 of the report which gave a figure of 99% satisfaction with the customer experience which Board members had been surprised and TNG agreed that this was not a true reflection based on feedback that the Board had received. MM agreed and asked for quarterly performance reports to be presented to the Board.
7.20	In response to a question from IS, SH confirmed that the data in the replied related solely to the contact centre in Slough. IF noted his surprise at the satisfaction levels adding that this was not reflected in feedback that he had read online via the Trust Pilot website.
7.21	OF expressed his surprise that only 250 complaints had been received. WB noted that Osborne receive complaints from SBC who log them on their system and pass them on. Osborne aim to resolve issues before they become formal complaints. OF asked whether this meant that if someone wanted to complain about one of Osborne's sub-contractors they had to do this through SBC. WB clarified that Osborne would attempt to resolve the issues at the first point of contact, however if they remained unhappy they would need to go through

	SBC's complaints process. OF reiterated his view that the number of complaints reported was not credible.
7.22	BR asked what percentage of repair jobs were tested in terms of satisfaction and SH responded that all operatives carried out surveys using their PDAs for each job and BR responded that she was not always asked to complete a survey and MM confirmed that this was also her experience. CG noted that, in the past, she had been handed the PDA but the operative had told her to just sign to say that he had attended.
7.23	IS agreed that this was not an ideal way to collect satisfaction data which made the figures meaningless however he felt that the complaints data sounded correct based on his own experience.
7.24	NP noted that in his experience as a Housing Director complaints were only made when the complainant was confident that something would be done to resolve things. NP added that the 2019 annual satisfaction survey revealed 56% satisfaction with the repairs service which had caused the Board to question the validity of the survey and the methodology used.
7.25	NP questioned the average call waiting time reported as being 2 minutes and 16 second and BR added that the mystery shopping exercise carried out earlier in the year had failed because residents were waiting between 30 and 50 minutes before giving up and abandoning the call. CG agreed that this reflected her own experience of mystery shopping, adding that the call back service had also failed as she received the call while she was driving and was unable to answer it. IF also added that he had been promised on numerous occasions that a manager would call him back and they hadn't which had left him feeling very frustrated.
7.26	NP asked for Cllr Hulme's thoughts and she emphasised the importance of hearing peoples' experiences of Osborne rather than relying on reports written by senior officers. She added that what she was hearing from the Board was somewhat different to what she had been hearing from officers. Cllr Hulme invited the Board to attend the Scrutiny Committee meeting in September so that members could hear directly from residents as it was vital that they heard this in residents' own words.
7.27	OF noted that, I his experience, he managed to get through to a call handler quite quickly but they did not appear to know what they are doing as the lack training and support. TNG added that she had asked about training earlier because she felt that the report was not a true reflection of her own experience.
7.28	NP concluded that the information in the report seemed fantastical compared to the information that the Board were getting.