

Automatic call quality analysis

Customer Care QA · Period: July 12, 2026 – Aug. 11, 2026

200 calls analyzed	100% coverage (vs. 2–3% typical of manual QA)	30 h of audio processed	75.0% average script compliance
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---

Executive summary

Over the last 30 days, the center handled 200 calls with a weighted compliance score of 75.0% and an average score of 74.3%. While greeting and diagnosis performed well, significant gaps exist in script adherence (67.7%) and customer identity verification (69.2%). A critical performance disparity is evident between shifts; the day shift achieved a 78.7% average score, whereas the night shift lagged at 64.5% with a higher critical error rate of 3.2%. Negative sentiment reached 26.0% overall, peaking at 30.9% during the third week of the period. The primary contact drivers were delayed shipment inquiries (26.5%) and billing disputes (18.0%). Although critical errors remained low at 1.5% overall, three instances of unauthorized promises were recorded in the handling section. Improving script adherence and night shift performance is essential to raising the goal achievement rate from the current 69.0%.

Quality scorecard — results by criterion

Evaluation criterion	Weight	Result	Trend vs previous period	Observation
Greeting and company identification	10%	87.3%	—	Strongest area with 87.3% compliance across all calls.
Customer identity verification	19%	69.2%	—	Major compliance gap at 69.2%; requires immediate attention.
Call recording notice	10%	70.5%	—	Underperforming at 70.5%; represents a regulatory risk.
Correct diagnosis of the reason for the call	14%	84.2%	—	Solid performance; correctly identifying reasons in 84.2% of calls.
Adherence to the resolution script	19%	67.7%	—	Lowest compliance area at 67.7%; needs urgent reinforcement.
Objection handling and tone	14%	68.5%	—	Weak handling at 68.5%; likely impacting customer sentiment.

Evaluation criterion	Weight	Result	Trend vs previous period	Observation
No promises outside policy	5%	97.6%	—	High compliance (97.6%) but contains all 3 critical errors.
Closing, summary and next steps	10%	77.6%	—	Moderate performance at 77.6% average score.
Weighted overall compliance	100%	75.0%	—	

Every call is evaluated against the full rubric; per-agent, campaign and shift results are available in the interactive dashboard alongside this report.

Contact reasons — automatic classification

Reason	Calls	% of volume	Signal
Delayed shipment status inquiry	53	26.5%	Highest volume driver at 26.5% of total calls.
Unrecognized / disputed billing charge	36	18.0%	Significant volume (18.0%); likely linked to negative sentiment.
Damaged shipment / formal damage claim	29	14.5%	High-stakes topic representing 14.5% of volume.
Delivery address change	27	13.5%	Frequent request at 13.5%; requires strict verification protocols.
Shipping quote request	18	9.0%	Routine inquiry; 9.0% volume share.
Delivery rescheduling	14	7.0%	Moderate volume at 7.0% of total interactions.
Packaging requirements for fragile items	4	2.0%	Low volume (2.0%); specialized inquiry type.
Shipment cancellation and refund request	3	1.5%	Minimal volume (1.5%) but high risk for critical errors.
Other (9 categories)	16	8.0%	—

Key findings

1. Significant Shift Performance Gap

The day shift significantly outperforms the night shift across all metrics, including a 14.2-point higher average score and a much lower critical error rate (0.7% vs 3.2%). Night shift agents also face higher negative sentiment at 32.3% compared to 23.2% during the day.

2. Compliance Gaps in Script and Verification

Adherence to resolution scripts (67.7%) and customer identity verification (69.2%) are the lowest-performing criteria. These gaps directly impact the overall weighted compliance score and represent the primary areas for process improvement.

3. Sentiment Trends and Volume Drivers

Negative sentiment peaked at 30.9% during the week of July 27, which aligns with high volumes of delayed shipment inquiries (26.5%). Alejandro Rueda recorded the highest individual negative sentiment at 55.6% across 18 calls.

Agent performance

Agent	Calls	Compliance	Negative sentiment	Coaching priority
Alejandro Rueda	18	62.3%	56%	High: Reduce 55.6% negative sentiment and improve 62.3 score.
Bruno Salcedo	17	54.4%	29%	High: Address 11.8% critical error rate and 54.4 score.
Héctor Navarro	15	86.3%	40%	Low
Emilio Vargas	11	72.6%	36%	Medium: Improve 54.5% goal reached rate.
Mariana Gutiérrez	10	79.4%	10%	Low
Diego Fernández	10	84.2%	20%	Low
Ricardo Peña	10	80.2%	10%	Low
Óscar Salinas	9	80.1%	33%	Low
Mateo Zamora	8	82.4%	25%	Low
Camila Duarte	8	68.8%	0%	High: Boost 37.5% goal reached rate and 68.8 score.
Tomás Aguilar	8	63.8%	13%	High: Address 12.5% critical error rate and 63.8 score.
Isabela Márquez	7	80.7%	29%	Low
Sofía Ramírez	7	82.8%	0%	Low
Iván Castillo	7	75.1%	43%	Medium: Address 42.9% negative sentiment.
Renata Campos	7	80.8%	0%	Low
Andrés Molina	7	74.7%	43%	Medium: Address 42.9% negative sentiment.
Daniela Ortiz	7	71.8%	43%	Medium: Improve 71.8 score and 42.9% negative sentiment.
Valeria Soto	7	68.9%	29%	Medium: Improve 68.9 score and script adherence.
Paola Cruz	7	64.1%	29%	Medium: Improve 64.1 score and 57.1% goal reached rate.
Fernanda Ríos	6	86.8%	0%	Low

Agent	Calls	Compliance	Negative sentiment	Coaching priority
Ximena Flores	5	83.6%	0%	Low
Jorge Luna	5	82.1%	20%	Low
Lucía Herrera	4	74.3%	25%	Medium: Improve 74.3 score and script adherence.

Prioritized recommendations

- Standardize Night Shift Training**
Implement targeted coaching for night shift staff to bridge the 14.2-point score gap and reduce the 3.2% critical error rate. This should focus on aligning their performance with day shift standards for verification and script adherence.
- Reinforce Script Adherence Protocols**
Conduct workshops focused on the resolution script and objection handling, as these areas currently score below 69%. Improved adherence is expected to increase the goal reached percentage from the current 69.0%.
- Address Unauthorized Policy Promises**
Review the three critical errors related to unauthorized promises to ensure all agents understand policy limits. This will mitigate legal and financial risks associated with the 1.5% critical error rate.

Methodology and confidentiality note

Calls are transcribed automatically (with speaker identification) and each one is evaluated against the quality rubric defined with the client: script compliance, regulatory requirements, contact reason, sentiment and resolution. Results are delivered in a navigable dashboard with access to the audio and the transcript of every evaluated call. Processing can run on the client's own infrastructure (self-hosted), so the data never leaves their environment.