



CRISIS LINE SERVICES - OUTCOMES REPORT APRIL 1ST 2017 – MARCH 31ST 2018

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 | 2013 2014 | 2014 2015 | 2015 2016 | 2016 2017 | 2017- 2018 | 5Yr. comparative Average | Findings |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Male | 667 | 1137 | 1102 | 1027 | 1001 | 986.8 | This result is consistent with male/female caller ratios, noted over the past five years. The trend continues whereby females once again comprise more than 50% of Crisis Line callers. This result is attributed to enhanced 1 st responder training specific to caller identification. The number of excluded and missed calls was increased due to staff/supervisor turn over last year, and is attributed to decreased Crisis Line coverage ratios. The overall number of calls is up marginally. *excluded hang-ups, silent calls, wrong numbers and telemarketer calls. |
| Female | 1942 | 2424 | 2453 | 2069 | 2393 | 2256.2 | |
| Gender Diverse | 2 | 23 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 7.2 | |
| Gender unidentified | 98 | 63 | 36 | 37 | 42 | 55.2 | |
| *Excluded calls | 447 | 537 | 463 | 269 | 268 | 396.8 | |
| CL Sub-total | 3156 | 4184 | 4059 | 3402 | 3706 | 3701.4 | |
| Missed Calls | 326 | 626 | 456 | 724 | 1274 | 681.2 | |
| CL Total | 3482 | 4810 | 4515 | 4126 | 4980 | 4382.6 | |
| Average Age of Caller (if known /identified) | | 57.5 | 57.5 | 52 | 52 | 54 | This fiscal, the most dominate age group of callers were from the age of 40-64; however, 1381 callers did not identify with a specific age category. |
| Median length of call | | 10.16 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 11.64 | This year's call length median has increased with prior years' averages. |

| Caller Issues <i>Data Sources: iCarol</i> | 2013 2014 | 2014 2015 | 2015 2016 | 2016 2017 | 2017- 2018 | 5 Yr. Comparative Average | Findings |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Mental Health | 1357 | 1559 | 1435 | 1784 | 1871 | 1601.2 | Mental health issues reported slightly increased this year. |
| Addictions | 65 | 99 | 106 | 143 | 142 | 111 | This year reporting of addiction and abuse/ violence, remained similar to the previous fiscal year. This year there was a substantial increase in suicide. |
| Abuse/Violence | 65 | 84 | 117 | 155 | 153 | 114.8 | |
| Suicide | 64 | 96 | 101 | 89 | 157 | 101.4 | |
| Homelessness 2017-18 is tracking housing/emergency shelter' | 14 | 41 | 23 | 69 | 136 | 56.6 | Significantly higher reporting of homelessness issues this year over the prior years. *The homelessness category will be put back on call reports |
| Individual/Family Issue | 423 | 905 | 991 | 480 | 594 | 678.6 | Family issues reported seen an increase this year. |
| Information | 319 | 283 | 213 | 196 | 170 | 236.2 | Callers requesting information were marginally less than the prior year. |
| Physical Health | 234 | 360 | 377 | 248 | 293 | 302.4 | Reported physical health issues have increased slightly this year. |
| Financial 2017-2018: financial/employment | 86 | 88 | 98 | 26 | 36 | 66.8 | Reports of financial struggle have increased a fair bit but remain less than 2-5 years ago. |
| Legal Issues | 39 | 60 | 49 | 86 | 147 | 76.2 | Reported legal issues as the reason for their crisis call have increased significantly. |
| Referrals made to Callers by Crisis Line Responders | 2013 2014 | 2014 2015 | 2015 2016 | 2016 2017 | 2017 2018 | 5 Yr. Comparative Average | Findings |
| Emergency Medical | 93 | 83 | 53 | 70 | 66 | 73 | This fiscal year remained similar to the previous year in the Emergency medical, Emergency Police, and Ambulance/Paramedics categories. Slight decreases were made in referrals to Non-emergency Medical, while larger decreases were seen in non-emergency Mental health. Referrals that saw a significant increase in use were Emergency Mental Health, MCFD/Child |
| Medical-Non-Emergency | 239 | 230 | 122 | 156 | 142 | 177.8 | |
| Emergency Mental Health | 45 | 94 | 65 | 71 | 94 | 73.8 | |
| Mental Health-Non-Emergency | 195 | 966 | 438 | 174 | 142 | 383 | |
| Police Emergency | 55 | 47 | 45 | 64 | 61 | 54.4 | |
| Ambulance/ | 29 | 21 | 31 | 23 | 21 | 25 | |



| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|--------|--|
| Paramedics | | | | | | | protection/Counseling/therapy, support groups, Family/Friends, other, and QCBI |
| MCFD/Child Protection | 7 | 11 | 12 | 4 | 19 | 10.6 | |
| Counseling/Therapy | 261 | 289 | 330 | 240 | 270 | 278 | |
| Support Groups | 90 | 177 | 190 | 91 | 109 | 131.4 | |
| Family/Friends | 271 | 438 | 380 | 259 | 311 | 331.8 | |
| Other | 310 | 2377 | 1313 | 679 | 785 | 1092.8 | |
| Qualified Call-back Invitation | Data not Collected | Data not Collected | 1904 | 2382 | 2596 | 2294 | |

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 1st Responder); and c. Provided community resources (worker reported). This year a total of 3706 calls were answered. Of these, 268 were not measured (excluded) because they were considered bogus, prank, silent, hang-ups, wrong number, telemarketer, line transfer, or missed calls. The remaining 3438 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 3706 Minus Excluded Calls <u>268</u> Total Measured Calls 3438 | 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 (3320 of 3438calls) | 85% | 97% (3320 of 3438 calls) | ✓ |
| 2. Callers who were given the opportunity (able) to explore options. Measured calls 3199 | Percentage of callers who were able to explore options. | All measured callers (3199 of 3438 calls) | 85% | 93% (3199 of 3438calls) | ✓ |
| 3. Callers who were provided community resource(s) Measured calls 3227 | Percentage of callers for whom worker confirms that at least ONE community resource was provided. | All measured callers (3227 of 3438calls) | 85% | 94% (3227 of 3438calls) | ✓ |



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Findings: The first, second and third effectiveness measures were met well above the achievement target.</p> | <p>Recommendations: Monitor the 2018-19 Program Plan and document areas where additional reporting requirements may be needed. Adjust the effectiveness variables to better measure program effectiveness as these outcome measures do not accomplish this purpose adequately. Establish new effectiveness variable target thresholds based upon the statistical baseline created by the first year effectiveness outcome stats and program goals. Establish a “NA” category so that we do not measure the satisfaction of callers if we do not know why they called, if they were not calling to receive support with coping, or if they were calling solely for interaction with a CLW due to social isolation.</p> |
|--|--|

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 $= (3438) / (30.42 * 12)$ | All Callers | 8 calls per day | 9.42 calls/day | ✓ |
| 2. To increase the number of hours volunteer log on the Crisis Line | Volunteer Hours 499/52 weeks = 9.6 | All CL Volunteers | 25 hrs. per week | 9.6 hrs./ week | X |
| <p>Efficiency Findings: The Crisis Line staff team is pleased to have averaged 9.42 calls per day which exceeds our service utilization target. The second efficiency measure was not achieved but the number of volunteer hours per week; however CL facilitators are implementing team training in order to maximize volunteer potential in the 2018-19 fiscal year.</p> | <p>Recommendations: Going forward, the ICLN will be ringing at all centres simultaneously. This means in a month 730.08 hours will need to be covered. Currently we are staffed 29%, including volunteer coverage (over the past 6 months the average volunteer coverage has been 8 hours per month). Since our new target is to be based upon the five year median average median average of the calls answered along with a figure to account for the call volume increase for the coming year and another number to close the gap between the number of calls to ICLN and the number of calls that are answered by one of the ICLN call centres. ICLN expecting a 5% increase in call volume according to the ICLN manager. We will attempt to close the gap a little by setting our target for number of calls answered at our five year median average plus 12% (3028) or approximately 252 calls per month. Given that the above numbers are based off of 24 hour coverage, our new target is 878.12, 29% of the median +12 %, divided, as we will have less than 12 hours covered per day. This would equate to 73.17 calls per month. When we are able to staff the line with a higher proportion of volunteers, we will increase our Program Accessibility target as human resource capacities allow.</p> | | | | |



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 3320 of 3438calls | 85% | 96% 3320 of 3438calls | ✓ |
| 2. To maintain stakeholder satisfaction levels | % of stakeholders who report the service meets their expectations | All stakeholders: 20 surveys sent out with 20 responses. 20 answered questions related to meeting expectations. | 85% | 87% (21 of 23) | ✓ |
| <p>Findings: For the first program satisfaction measure, continue to regularly monitor satisfaction rates to ensure a minimum of 85% stakeholder satisfaction rates are maintained. For the caller satisfaction measure, also include callers who infer that they are better able to cope. Have training for staff around the determining when a caller is satisfied, implying it, or inferring it and when we have no reason to believe that they are better able to cope. Establish a new effectiveness variable target threshold for the caller satisfaction measure based upon the statistical baseline created by the first year caller satisfaction stats and program goals.</p> | | | <p>Recommendations: Continue to regularly monitor satisfaction rates to ensure a minimum of 85% caller and stakeholder satisfaction rates are maintained.</p> | | |

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.

| 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 (3706) | Missed calls as recorded by volunteers and staff. (1274) | 60% (call answer rate established by funder) | 74% (1274 of 3706) | ✓ |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Findings 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.</p> | <p>Recommendations: It is no longer realistic to maintain the target of answering 75% of all calls because calls from ICLN Call Centres will now ring simultaneously in all call centres (rather than only calls from our region being directed to us first). As we cannot answer 75% of all calls to ICLN centres alone, we need a new target. Our new target will be based upon the five year median average of the calls answered along with a figure to account for the call volume increase for the coming year and another number to close the gap between the number of calls to ICLN and the number of calls that are answered by one of the ICLN call centres. The median average number of calls that we answered per year for the past 5 years is 2830. ICLN is currently missing 17% of all calls and ICLN expecting a 5% increase in call volume according to the ICLN manager. We will attempt to close the gap a little by setting our target for number of calls answered at our five year median average plus 7% (3028) or approximately 252 calls per month. When we are able to staff the line with a higher proportion of volunteers, we will increase our Program Accessibility target as human resource capacities allow. We are measuring only the percentage of calls that we are taking/missing when we actually covering the line as we no longer have 24 hour coverage.</p> |
|--|---|

ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES:

| Objective: Key Administrative Tasks | Indicator | Who Applied to | Target Expectancy | Actual Result | Met or Exceeded |
|---|---|-------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 1. Increase Crisis Line 1 st responder training options (to promote enhanced training results) | 1 st Responder trainings will be predominately one to one trainings (85%) | CL 1 st Responders | 85% | 51% (208.5 Of 412 hrs.) 1 st responders trained in a 1-1 format | ✘ |
| 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% | 17% (1 of 6 trainings) (3 staff members at two trainings each) | ✘ |
| <p>Findings: Darla received MH first aid or Asist this year. Jo-Hannah and Andrew did not received professional development training from Crisis Line.</p> | | | <p>Recommendations: To continue to focus on professional development for staff and training first responders. The CL is currently re-vamping the program training, we are hopeful this will attract more volunteers.</p> | | |

Data Confirmed by: Andrew Fallis, Crisis Line Coordinator
Report Reviewed and approved by: Carey Fraser, Executive Director

Date: August 8 2018