

# Gloucester City Homes



## Mystery Shopping Evaluation

### Repairs Service

### May 2008

### Introduction

Gloucester City Homes currently gains feedback from customers in various ways including satisfaction surveys, focus groups, resident groups, block and street representatives, compliments, comments and complaints. Mystery shopping enables us to identify where our service standards and procedures need to be developed.

On this occasion, we evaluated advice given to our customers when they contacted Morrison regarding a repair.

### Timing of Exercise

The mystery shop was conducted between 19<sup>th</sup> May 2008 and 27<sup>th</sup> May 2008.

### Summary

Six trained tenant mystery shoppers carried out the exercise. There were six scenarios: three rechargeable and three non-rechargeable repair requests. Within each category, two requests were non-urgent and one was an emergency.

In summary, the Mystery Shop exercise found a mixed response from the Morrison call centres. Remedial action to be taken in response to the weaknesses identified is given in the corresponding Reaction Report.

## Results

### How the calls were answered

The mystery shoppers recorded how long it took for the telephone to be answered once they had selected the relevant option from the automated service.

|                                    |                   |   |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| How quickly was the call answered? | Less than 10 secs | 2 |
|                                    | 10-20 secs        | 3 |
|                                    | 20-30 secs        | 1 |
|                                    | Answer phone      | 1 |

#### Comments

- Staff were courteous, prompt and helpful.
- I left a message on the answer phone 13:45 27/05/08 but no one phoned me back. I called again 13:45 28/05/08 and got through to someone this time. They explained they had not returned the call as they had been very busy.

Results continue on next page.



## Scenarios 2a,b,c – Non-rechargeable repair requests

Three mystery shoppers contacted Morrison to make a request for a repair that should NOT be recharged to the tenant. The scenarios were:

**2a (non-urgent during office hours):** faulty window mechanism in lounge – will not close.

**2b (non-urgent during office hours):** dripping kitchen tap.

**2c (emergency outside of office hours):** burst pipe under the kitchen sink has flooded the kitchen.

### Results of enquiry

|   |   |
|---|---|
| They confirmed that they do that repair.  | 3   |
| They took your address details.   | 3   |
| They asked a series of questions to help identify what the problem is.  | 1 (2a)  |
| They referred you to the Repairs handbook to help diagnose the problem or gave you handy hint advice.   | 0   |
| They identified what category of repair your request falls into (i.e. emergency, urgent or routine).  | Emergency 1 (2c)<br>Urgent 0<br>Routine 0   |
| They advised you of the likely timescale for completing the work.   | Timescale:<br>a) 24 hrs (2a)<br>b) 4 days (2b)<br>c) 4 hours (2c)   |
| When they offer you an appointment say that you are not available during the day. Did they ask whether you could arrange for a friend or neighbour to wait in for you and did they state this person must be someone over 16 years of age? Did they offer a Saturday morning appointment? <b>NB only asked in Sc 2b</b> | Friend/neighbour can wait in 1<br>Saturday morning 0<br>Comments:<br>a) I felt I was being difficult because I said I was not available during the day. There was no mention of the minimum age of the person to wait in. I was expected to call back with a suitable day before the repair was logged. I was told work is not done on Saturdays. |
| Did they give you a job number?   | Yes 1 (2c)<br>No 2  |
| Was the member of staff courteous?  | Yes 2<br>No 1 (2b)<br>Comments:<br>a) Staff member was quite brusque  |
| Was the member of staff helpful?  | Yes 2<br>No 1 (2b – see above comment)  |
| Were you referred to someone else to help you?  | 0   |

## Results Analysis

### How the calls were answered

#### Strengths

- All calls that were answered were picked up within 30 seconds. This achieves Morrison's service standard of answering 95% of calls within 30 seconds.
- One mystery shopper found the staff member "courteous, prompt and helpful".

#### Weaknesses

- One shopper had to leave a message on the answer phone and noone returned the call within 24 hours.

### Rechargeable repair requests

#### Strengths

- Morrison offered to carry out the work for two out of the three scenarios.
- Appointments for both of the above scenarios were made within the appropriate timescales (28 days for routine repairs and 4 hours for emergencies). In particular, the appointment for the non-urgent repair was made within 24 hours.
- All shoppers found the Morrison staff courteous and two out of the three found them helpful.

#### Weaknesses

- The emergency repair (tenant locked out of property) was not recharged to the tenant as should be the case.
- There was no offer of advice or help for the shopper who reported the broken security door chain.

### Non-rechargeable repair requests

#### Strengths

- Morrison confirmed they are responsible for all three repairs.
- All appointments were made within the target timescales.

#### Weaknesses

- None of the callers were referred to the Repairs Handbook or given handy hint advice (although this may not have been deemed necessary for these particular repairs).
- One shopper felt the staff member was "brusque" when they said they were not available during the day. There was no mention of the minimum age of the person to wait in for Morrison in place of the tenant. Furthermore, the Morrison staff member incorrectly advised that Saturday appointments were not available.
- Two of the callers were not given a job number.

## Conclusion

In summary, the Mystery Shop exercise found a mixed response from the Morrison call centres. Remedial action to be taken in response to the weaknesses identified is given in the corresponding Reaction Report.