

**CRISIS LINE SERVICES - OUTCOMES REPORT APRIL 1<sup>ST</sup> 2015 – MARCH 31<sup>ST</sup> 2016**

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION** The Crisis Line program provides telephone crisis intervention services. These services are available to people in crisis, who are depressed, or who are in emotional need. The Crisis Line services philosophy encourages an approach to telephone intervention that communicates support and the exploration of meaningful options through the use of calm, non-judgmental, and respectful tones and language.

**PURPOSE** – This report is intended for board, management, program staff, stakeholders, and persons served. Feedback and suggestions to assist with continuous quality improvement planning are both solicited and encouraged. The data referenced in this report was collected, recorded, and collated via the use of *iCarol* database system. Past Participant and Stakeholder feedback data are recorded in spreadsheets created in-house.

Key Demographic Indicators	2011 2012	2012 2013	2013 2014	2014 2015	2015 2016	5Yr. comparative Average	Findings
Male	1141	696	667	1137	1102	949	This result is consistent with male/female caller ratios, noted over the past three years. The trend continues whereby females once again comprise more than 50% of Crisis Line callers. Other (gender diverse and unidentified callers) were reported at significantly less numbers than in the prior year. This result is attributed to enhanced 1 <sup>st</sup> responder training specific to caller identification. The number of excluded and missed calls was also reduced over last year, and is attributed to increased Crisis Line coverage ratios. The overall number of calls, while down marginally, remains similar with the prior year.
Female	942	1838	1942	2424	2453	1919	
Gender Diverse	9	2	2	23	9	9	
Gender unidentified	390	154	98	63	36	128	
*Excluded calls	674	532	447	537	463	490	
<b>CL Sub-total</b>	3156	3222	3156	4184	4059	3555	*excluded hang-ups, silent calls, wrong numbers and telemarketer calls.
Missed Calls	781	95	326	626	456	457	
<b>CL Total</b>	3937	3317	3482	4810	4515	4013	
Average Age of Caller (if known /identified)	41	41	46	57.5	57.5	49	This data is collected in age range categories. Similar to last year, the 40-64 age range was the most predominant caller category.
Median length of call	10.75	11.67	10.13	10.16	10.8	11	This year's call length median is consistent with prior years' averages.

**Main Administration**  
39 - 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue South  
Cranbrook BC V1C 2V4  
Phone: 250-426-5222  
Fax: 250-426-2134

**Trail Center**  
1939 Columbia Avenue  
Trail BC V1R 1K5  
Phone: 250-368-5223  
Fax: 250-368-5230

**Nelson Center**  
302 Anderson Street  
Nelson BC V1L 3Y1  
Phone: 250-354-1236  
Fax: 250-352-3652

<b>Caller Issues</b> <i>Data Sources: iCarol</i>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>5 Yr.</b> <b>Comparative Average</b>	<b>Findings</b>
	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>		
Mental Health	1848	1043	1357	1559	1435	1441	Mental health issues reported were 8% less this year.
Addictions	371	107	65	99	106	164	This year there was an increase in the reporting of addiction, abuse, violence, and suicide issues. Staff will continue to monitor for trends.
Abuse/Violence	107	76	65	84	117	90	
Suicide	43	72	64	96	101	70	
Homelessness	12	31	14	41	23	24	
Individual/Family Issue	Data not Collected	451	423	905	991	693 (4yr comparative)	Family issues reported this year were up by 8%.
Information	Data not Collected	438	319	283	213	313 (4yr comparative)	Callers requesting information were marginally less than the prior year.
Physical Health	Data not Collected	329	234	360	377	325 (4yr comparative)	Reported physical health issues have increased slightly this year.
Financial	Data not Collected	70	86	88	98	86 (4yr comparative)	Results similar to the prior year.
Legal Issues	Data not Collected	26	39	60	49	44 (4yr comparative)	18% less callers, than last year, reported legal issues as the reason for their crisis call.
<b>Referrals made to Callers by Crisis Line Responders</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>5 Yr.</b> <b>Comparative Average</b>	<b>Findings</b>
	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>		
Emergency Medical	8	136	93	83	53	66	In the majority of the referral categories identified to the left, there were significantly less referrals made in each category (ranging from 8-55% less). The exceptions were the counseling and support categories in which more referrals were made this year. When analyzing this data on an aggregate basis it seems apparent, fluctuations made in each of the referral categories occurs year over year.
Medical-Non-Emergency	67	276	239	230	122	159	
Emergency Mental Health	10	67	45	94	65	56	
Mental Health-Non-Emergency	52	203	195	966	438	371	
Police Emergency	17	61	55	47	45	45	
Ambulance/Paramedics	10	31	29	21	31	24	
MCFD/Child Protection	4	9	7	11	12	9	
Counseling/Therapy	57	371	261	289	330	219	
Support Groups	41	158	90	177	190	114	
Family/Friends	72	487	271	438	380	330	
Other	692	1870	310	2377	1313	1265	
Qualified Call-back Invitation	Data not Collected	Data not Collected	Data not Collected	Data not Collected	1904	No comparative data	

**EFFECTIVENESS OUTCOMES** – Effectiveness outcomes are: a. Did the caller indicate / feel the call to the Crisis Line was helpful (caller reported); b. Was the caller given the opportunity (able) to explore options (as assessed by the 1<sup>st</sup> Responder); and c. Provided community resources (worker reported). This year a total of 4059 calls were answered. Of these, 463 were not measured (excluded) because they were considered bogus, prank, silent, hang-ups, wrong number, telemarketer, line transfer, or missed calls. The remaining 3596 were measured for effectiveness in each of the three identified categories.

Objective: Effectiveness Measures	Indicator	Who Applied to	Target Goal Expectancy	Actual Result	Met or Exceeded
1. Call effectiveness (was the call helpful) Total Answered Calls <b>4059</b> Minus Excluded Calls <b>463</b> Total Measured Calls <b>3596</b>	Percentage of callers who stated or implied the call was helpful as recorded on the iCarol database system <i>NB: this statistic is also used as a Program Satisfaction measure.</i>	All callers who indicated that the call was helpful (2878 of 3596 calls)	85%	80% (2878 of 3596)	<b>x</b>
2. Callers who were given the opportunity (able) to explore options. Measured calls <b>3306</b>	Percentage of callers who were able to explore options.	All measured callers (3306 of 3596)	85%	92% (3306 of 3596)	✓
3. Callers who were provided community resource(s) Measured calls <b>3596</b>	Percentage of callers for whom worker confirms that at least ONE community resource was provided.	All measured callers (3494 of 3596))	85%	97% (3495 of 3596)	✓
<b>Findings:</b> Overall staff are pleased with the achievement ratios of the three targeted effectiveness measures. The first measure (was the call helpful) was skewed somewhat, by a chronic caller who repeatedly phoned the Line for several months. The caller's issues were well beyond the scope of Crisis Line's intended support role and, as such, responders were unable to assist. Therefore, the caller felt that the Crisis Line was not helpful. The second and third effectiveness measures were met well above the achievement target.			<b>Recommendations:</b> Continue to monitor effectiveness outcomes at identified target achievement levels of 85%. Monitor the 2016-17 Program Plan and document areas where additional reporting requirements may be needed.		

**PROGRAM EFFICIENCIES:** The efficiencies measured by Crisis Line staff included service utilization rates and number of volunteer hours logged on the Crisis Line. These measures are retrieved from the iCarol database system. Target goals were established to ensure minimum averages are maintained over the term of the fiscal year. Efficiency results have been tabulated below.

Objective: Efficiency Measures	Indicator	Who Applied to	Target Goal Expectancy	Actual Result	Met or Exceeded
1. To increase service utilization rates	Call Rates $= (4059) / (30.42 * 12)$	All Callers	8 calls per day	11.2 calls/day	✓
2. To increase the number of hours volunteer log on the Crisis Line	Volunteer Hours $952.5 / 52 \text{ weeks} = 18.32$	All CL Volunteers	25 hrs. per week	18.32 hrs./ week	<b>X</b>
<b>Efficiency Findings:</b> The Crisis Line staff team is pleased to have averaged 11.2 calls per day which exceeds our service utilization target. The second efficiency measure was not achieved but the number of volunteer hours per week did increase by 1.15 average hours per week over the prior year.			<b>Recommendations:</b> Continue to monitor call volume and to increase the targeted service utilization rate for the 2016-2017 year from 8 to 10 calls per day. Continue to recruit volunteers to increase the number of Crisis Line volunteer hours. Continue to target an average of 25 volunteer hrs. / week.		

## PROGRAM SATISFACTION

Objective: Caller and Stakeholder Input	Indicator	Who Applied to	Target Expectancy	Actual Result	Met or Exceeded
1. To maintain caller satisfaction levels	Percentage of callers who stated or implied they were satisfied with the Crisis Line support provided by indicating the call was helpful to them	All callers who indicated they were satisfied with the service because the call was helpful to them (2878 of 3596 calls)	85%	80% (2878 of 3596)	x
2. To maintain stakeholder satisfaction levels	% of stakeholders who report the service meets their expectations	All stakeholders: 18 surveys sent out with 16 responses. 16 answered questions related to meeting expectations.	85%	89% (16 of 18)	✓
<b>Findings:</b> As noted above (pg. 2) under effectiveness measures the caller satisfaction levels were skewed somewhat, by a chronic caller who repeatedly phoned the Line for several months. The caller's issues were well beyond the scope of Crisis Line's intended support role and, as such, responders were unable to assist. Therefore, the caller felt the Crisis Line was not helpful.			<b>Recommendations:</b> Continue to regularly monitor satisfaction rates to ensure a minimum of 85% caller and stakeholder satisfaction rates are maintained.		

**PROGRAM ACCESSIBILITY:** The Crisis Line is part of a regional network (Interior Crisis Line Network), which endeavours to provide telephone support services to any/all callers. "Crisis" is self-determined and any reasonable requests will be supported as long as standard program procedures are followed. (i.e. not abusive or illegal). As a telephone service, there are no physical accommodation/access issues that regularly come into play. This does, however, exclude text only options that are unavailable at this time. In the event non text accessibility issues arise during the call, "reasonable accommodations" are evaluated by the Crisis Line worker during the course of a call. In the event accommodation resulting from language barriers arises, a language interpretation line is accessible to Crisis Line workers. During the 2015-2016 fiscal, no requests for accommodations were received. On-going accessibility is measured through the number of missed calls, in comparison with Crisis Line telephone records' call answer rates.

Objective: Access Measures	Indicator	Who Applied to	Target Expectancy	Actual Result	Met or Exceeded
ICLN Call Answer Rate Missed calls (includes sub-lines 310 Mental Health /1-800 Suicide Lines)	# of calls answered versus # of calls missed (4059)	Missed calls as recorded by volunteers and staff. (459)	60% (call answer rate established by funder)	89% (456 of 4059)	✓
<b>Findings</b> Call answer rates were well above contractual requirements and staff, again as noted earlier in this report, attribute this to increased Crisis Line staff coverage ratios.			<b>Recommendations:</b> Continue to record missed calls; and internally establish call answer targets at 75%.		

## ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES:

Objective: Key Administrative Tasks	Indicator	Who Applied to	Target Expectancy	Actual Result	Met or Exceeded
1. Increase Crisis Line 1 <sup>st</sup> responder training options (to promote enhanced training results)	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder trainings will be predominately one to one trainings (85%)	CL 1 <sup>st</sup> Responders	85%	95% (390 of 412 hrs.) 1 <sup>st</sup> responders trained in a 1-1 format	✓

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES (CONTINUED):**

Objective: Key Administrative Tasks	Indicator	Who Applied to	Target Expectancy	Actual Result	Met or Exceeded
2. Increase CL staff professional development options.	A minimum of two professional development opportunities offered during the course of the year	CL Staff Members	100%	100% (2 of 2 trainings)	✓
<b>Findings:</b> CL staff report they are pleased with the success of the one to one training for Crisis Line 1 <sup>st</sup> responder volunteers and will continue to utilize this training format, as much as possible, going forward. . Program supervisors' acknowledge the value of ongoing training opportunities for program staff and will continue to explore relevant and affordable professional development opportunities over the coming year.			<b>Recommendations:</b> a. Continue to provide one to one training for Crisis Line 1 <sup>st</sup> responders as this method has proven to be effective in the recruitment and training of 1 <sup>st</sup> responders. b. Continue to support the professional development of CL staff by exploring and making available, as funding affords, a minimum of two Pro-D opportunities during the 2016-17 year.		

**Data Confirmed by:** Crisis Line Supervisory and Senior Staff  
**Report Reviewed and approved by:** Janice Ivan, Executive Director

**Date:** May 18, 2016