



Agency Operations Toolkits

Scheduling Control. Toolkit.

Six working tools to turn scheduling from emergency dispatch into reliable operations, from intake to mobile shift execution.

BUILT FOR

Growing home-care agencies in Canada, past 30 clients, before 200

A practical companion to the article *"Why Growing Home Care Agencies Break at Scheduling"*

© ConsidraCare

Why this toolkit exists.

Scheduling is not clerical work. It is the operating centre of home care, and the place agencies usually break first.

The owner wins the referral. The family books the assessment. The recruiter finds the caregiver. Then the scheduler has to make all of it real, the right caregiver, the right client, the right time, the right travel, the right notes, the right family expectations. When growing agencies crack, this is usually where: the scheduler becomes the shock absorber for every upstream weakness, and reliability starts to depend on heroics.

The operating reality

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| 5x Gap in gross margin between a tight, well-routed day and a broken-route day, same revenue, very different economics. <i>Source: ConsidraCare operating model. See Tool 3.</i> | \$3,200+ Future revenue at risk per cascading missed-shift pattern, once a family loses trust in reliability. <i>Source: ConsidraCare cost model. See cost page.</i> | 9 Critical exception signals an owner should review weekly, before the family has to call. <i>Source: ConsidraCare operating model. See Tool 6.</i> | 6 Upstream inputs that have to be right before the calendar can be: intake, care plan, caregiver profile, availability, geography, coverage. <i>Source: ConsidraCare operating model.</i> |
|--|--|---|---|

The implication.

Scheduling problems are rarely just scheduling problems. They are the visible result of weak intake, thin care plans, incomplete caregiver data, poor routing, missing bench strength and unclear escalation. Buying another calendar will not fix any of that. The agencies that grow past 100 clients do so by fixing the inputs, not by hiring tougher schedulers.

What one missed shift really costs you.

Owners calculate this too narrowly. The four lost hours are only the obvious cost.

A missed shift triggers four immediate costs, and a much larger one that arrives weeks later, in the form of a client who quietly leaves. Use the figures below as a working model. Even rough estimates show why protecting reliability is a margin strategy, not a service nicety.

| Cost item | Typical (CAD) | When it lands | How to estimate |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Lost visit revenue | \$160 | Today | 4 hours × \$40/hour billing rate. |
| Scheduler + supervisor recovery time | \$40 – \$80 | Today | 1–2 hours of admin time at \$40/hour. |
| Emergency replacement premium or overtime | \$25 – \$75 | Today | Short-notice pay, travel, or premium rate. |
| Family complaint follow-up | \$25 – \$75 | This week | Manager + admin time handling the call. |
| Immediate exposure per missed shift | \$250 – \$390 | Same week | Before considering churn risk |
| Future revenue at risk if the client churns | \$3,200 – \$12,800+ | 5 – 20 weeks | 4 hrs/week × \$160/wk × tenure at risk |

Read this number twice.

The scheduling desk is not just protecting today's shift. It is protecting the client relationship. One missed visit is a \$250 problem. A pattern of missed visits, even just two or three over a quarter, is a \$10,000 problem the agency will pay for whether or not it notices.

How to use this toolkit.

Six tools. One operating loop. Built for a weekly 30-minute review, not a 200-page binder.

The tools are sequenced. Tool 1 finds the leak. Tools 2–5 fix the operating breakdowns. Tool 6 makes the whole system visible week over week. Work through them in order the first time.

| # | Tool | What it's for | Time |
|---|--|--|-------------------|
| 1 | Scheduling Leak Diagnostic | Find which upstream input is breaking the schedule, and whether the scheduler is overloaded. Diagnostic. | 20 min |
| 2 | Risk Triage & Rescue Protocol | Classify every scheduling issue by impact, then run the right escalation when a shift goes critical. | Once, then revise |
| 3 | Zone-Based Scheduling Planner | Manage geography deliberately. Less travel time. Better margins. Fewer late arrivals. | 60 min |
| 4 | Best-Fit Matching Scorecard | Replace random calling with structured matching, without removing the scheduler's judgment. | Per assignment |
| 5 | First-Shift Handoff Checklist | Confirm the caregiver has everything they need before the shift starts. No verbal-memory handoffs. | 5 min/shift |
| 6 | Weekly Exception Dashboard | Nine signals an owner should review every Monday, if not every day— with the decision rights to act on them. | Weekly/Daily |

Three working principles

01

Scheduling is the operating centre of home care, not clerical work.

Every promise the agency makes lands here. Treat the desk as strategic infrastructure, not back office.

02

Most scheduling problems start before the schedule.

Weak intake, vague care plans, stale availability and unclear preferences create the crisis. Fix inputs first.

03

The scheduler cannot be the system.

If reliability depends on one person remembering everything, the agency has a ceiling at the clients that person can hold in their head.

Scheduling Leak Diagnostic.

Find which upstream input is breaking the schedule, before buying another tool or blaming the scheduler.

Score each leak area 0 to 2 based on the last 30 days. 0 = working well · 1 = some friction · 2 = serious leak. The benchmark column tells you what 'good' looks like.

| Leak area | Warning signs | What 'good' looks like | Your score | Fix first if... |
|--------------------------|--|---|-------------|---|
| Intake | Calls back to family to clarify visit window or access after the assessment. | <i>Visit window, parking, access, family expectations, mobility captured at intake.</i> | 0 1 2 | Scheduler regularly calls to fill in basics. |
| Care plan | Caregiver arrives underprepared. Care plan is vague. | <i>Care plan has tasks, risks, escalation path and routine notes.</i> | 0 1 2 | First-shift issues trace back to thin care plans. |
| Caregiver profile | Scheduler relies on memory for skills, zones, language. | <i>Skills, credentials, zones, radius, transport, preferences are structured data.</i> | 0 1 2 | Profile fields are blank, stale or scattered. |
| Availability | Accepted shifts get refused later. Same caregivers say no on the day. | <i>Availability refreshed weekly. Refusals tracked by caregiver and reason.</i> | 0 1 2 | Availability lives in texts, calls and memory. |
| Geography | Late arrivals cluster in the same zones. Routes feel chaotic. | <i>Travel time and lateness tracked by zone. Caregivers clustered to served areas.</i> | 0 1 2 | There is no zone map; city is one territory. |
| Coverage | Panic calls when a shift breaks. No defined on-call bench. | <i>On-call bench by risk window. Two pre-approved backups per complex client.</i> | 0 1 2 | Reliability depends on 20 phone calls. |
| Communication | Family learns about a problem before the agency does. | <i>Alerts and escalation templates trigger before families have to call.</i> | 0 1 2 | Family complaints arrive that you could have prevented. |
| TOTAL SCORE | <i>Sum your scores across all seven areas.</i> | <i>Use the interpretation guide below.</i> | / 14 | |

Read the score. Watch the desk.

What your total score means, and how to spot scheduler burnout before it costs you the scheduler.

Your total score

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>0 – 4</p> <p>Schedule is sound. Fix your highest single-score area. Re-run in 30 days.</p> | <p>5 – 8</p> <p>Material leakage. Fix two highest-scoring inputs first. Use Tools 2, 3 and 5.</p> | <p>9 +</p> <p>System overload. Scheduler is absorbing too much. Reliability is one resignation away.</p> |
|---|---|--|

Scheduler burnout, six signals to watch this week

Burnout at the desk is rarely a desk problem, it is the system flashing red. The scheduler is absorbing weak inputs from everywhere. Each fix below treats the root cause, not the symptom.

| Signal | What it usually means | Fix to test this week |
|---|--|--|
| After-hours work is rising. | Coverage model is too reactive. No cutoff rules. | Define after-hours escalation tiers and a hard cutoff. |
| The same questions repeat daily. | Intake or care-plan fields are incomplete. | Add required fields before scheduling can proceed. |
| Scheduler relies on memory for caregivers. | Profiles are not structured. | Clean key skills, zone and preference fields this week. |
| Family complaints hit the desk first. | Alerts and proactive communication are weak. | Add message templates and risk-tier triggers. |
| High caregiver refusal rate. | Matching or geography is poor. | Review refused shifts by caregiver, zone and client. |
| Manager interrupts schedulers constantly. | Decision rights are unclear. | Define approval thresholds (see Tool 6 decision rights). |

OWNER ACTION

Have the burnout conversation this week.

Ask your scheduler: which two of these six signals describe last week? Their answer points directly to which leak area to fix first. Do not make the scheduler tougher. Make the inputs better.

Risk Triage & Rescue Protocol.

Stop treating every scheduling issue the same. Classify the impact, then trigger the right escalation.

How to use this

Use the Risk Triage Matrix every time a scheduling issue lands. Decide impact first. When a shift is at risk of breaking, the Rescue Protocol on the next page takes over, every minute has an owner and an action. The goal is to make reliability predictable rather than dependent on one person's instincts.

Step 1 · The Risk Triage Matrix

For each issue: identify the likely cause, rate the impact and choose the right response path. High-impact issues need same-day escalation. Repeated medium-impact issues need pattern review.

| Scheduling issue | Likelihood | Likely reason | Impact | Service impact |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|
| Late arrival | High | Route assumptions are unrealistic. | Medium | Family confidence erodes gradually. |
| Missed visit | Medium | Backup coverage failed. | High | Essential care may be missed. |
| Too many caregiver changes | Medium | Continuity rules are unclear. | High | Client trust and comfort decline. |
| Poor schedule-change comms | High | Alerts and escalation are manual. | High | Family confidence drops quickly. |
| Vague care-plan handoff | Medium | Care plan lacks scheduling detail. | High | Care quality becomes inconsistent. |
| Caregiver preference mismatch | Medium | Preferences not captured clearly. | Medium | Caregiver frustration accumulates. |

Step 2 · Escalation rules

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | HIGH IMPACT | Review root cause within 24 hours. Assign a fix owner. Service-recovery call to family if affected. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | MEDIUM, REPEATED | Move to the weekly operations review. Watch the pattern. Two repeats in a month = treat as high impact. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | LOW IMPACT | Handle through normal scheduling workflow. Log it. Do not let it pull manager attention. |

The Last-Minute Shift Rescue Protocol.

When a shift is at risk of breaking, every minute has an owner and an action.

Reliability cannot depend on heroics

Some shifts will always be at risk. The agency's job is not to prevent every emergency, it is to respond to emergencies predictably, so the family experiences a managed problem instead of a missed visit.

The minute-by-minute protocol

| Time before visit | Action | Owner | Message / decision |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| 60+ min before | Confirm caregiver status and route. | Scheduler | Reminder ping. Response required to confirm. |
| 45 min before | Flag shift as at-risk. | Scheduler | Start backup search. Update status in system. |
| 30 min before | Activate on-call bench. | Scheduler / manager | Offer shift to backup with full client context. |
| 20 min before | Notify family if risk remains. | Manager | Set expectations before they call you. |
| 15 min before | Escalate to supervisor. | Manager | Approve replacement, premium pay or reschedule. |
| After event | Record root cause. | Scheduler | No blame. Feed back into Tool 1 diagnostic. |

Coverage bench, design rules

Backup capacity has to be planned, not improvised. Standby pay arrangements depend on local employment rules, the principle here is the operating design, not the legal structure.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Morning / evening risk windows | At least one confirmed backup for every high-risk start window. |
| Complex-care clients | Two pre-approved backups per client, each with care-plan access. |
| Weekend coverage | Standby list confirmed before Friday noon, not Friday at 5 pm. |
| Repeat-offender caregivers | Review reliability data quarterly. Adjust matching rules before adjusting the bench. |

Zone-Based Scheduling Planner.

Manage geography deliberately. The wrong route can erase a day's margin before lunch.

Why zones matter, the route economics

A full schedule is not the same as a profitable schedule. Two visits with 15 minutes between homes and a tight 8 km route can net \$60 of gross margin. The same two visits with a 90-minute gap and 30 km between them net \$12. Same revenue. One fifth of the margin. Geography is a margin lever, not a logistics detail.

How travel and idle time can erase margin

| Scenario | Revenue | Caregiver time | Travel / idle | Mileage | Gross margin |
|--|---------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|
| Tight local route <i>Two 2-hour visits, 15 min between homes, 8 km travel.</i> | \$160 | \$88 | \$6 | \$5.84 | \$60.16 |
| Loose route <i>Two 2-hour visits, 45 min between homes, 22 km travel.</i> | \$160 | \$88 | \$19 | \$16.06 | \$36.94 |
| Broken route <i>Two 2-hour visits, 90 min gap, 30 km travel.</i> | \$160 | \$88 | \$38 | \$21.90 | \$12.10 |

Assumptions: \$40/hour billing, \$22/hour caregiver wage, \$25/hour travel/idle, \$0.73/km federal mileage allowance. Adjust to your local rates, worker classification and payroll rules.

The six steps to building zones that hold.

Drawing a map is the easy part. Building data behind it is what makes zones work.

| # | Decision | Practical rule |
|---|----------------------|--|
| 1 | Define service zones | Use neighbourhoods, drive time and traffic patterns, not just postal codes. A zone that crosses a bridge or rail line at rush hour is two zones. |
| 2 | Set visit minimums | Short visits in hard-to-route zones should not be accepted without margin review. A 1-hour visit 25 km out is usually a loss. |
| 3 | Map caregiver radius | Record preferred zones, travel radius, car access, transit constraints. This must be structured data, not notes in someone's head. |
| 4 | Cluster demand | Group recurring visits before accepting scattered one-off work. Anchor zones with reliable clients first. |
| 5 | Price exceptions | Remote, short or awkward routes need pricing or schedule rules. 'We can do it' should not mean 'we should do it.' |
| 6 | Review weekly | Track late arrivals and travel time by zone, not just by caregiver. Patterns by zone reveal route design problems. |

Zone mapping worksheet

Fill in your top zones below. Risk level = green (healthy), amber (watch), red (margin or service risk).

| Zone | Core neighbourhoods | Current clients | Active caregivers | Risk | Action |
|------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------|--------|
| | | | | ● ● ● | |
| | | | | ● ● ● | |
| | | | | ● ● ● | |
| | | | | ● ● ● | |
| | | | | ● ● ● | |

Best-Fit Caregiver Matching Scorecard.

Replace random calling with structured matching, without removing the scheduler's judgment.

Why structured matching matters

Every experienced scheduler has instincts. That judgment is valuable, but it should not be trapped inside one person's head. A structured scorecard narrows the field intelligently before the scheduler decides. Bad matches don't just cost a shift; they tell the caregiver the agency doesn't understand their limits, and they tell the family the agency doesn't understand the client. Repeated bad matches produce churn on both sides.

Eight-criteria match scorecard

Score each criterion 1–5. Weight the four 'High' criteria more heavily. A match scoring below 3.5 average on the High criteria should be reviewed before assignment.

| Criterion | Weight | Score | Evidence to check |
|---------------------------|--------|-----------|--|
| Skill fit | High | 1 2 3 4 5 | Dementia, transfers, personal care, nursing, language. |
| Continuity fit | High | 1 2 3 4 5 | Can the caregiver realistically stay on this case for the expected duration? |
| Geography / route | High | 1 2 3 4 5 | Travel time, zone, parking, transit access. See Tool 3. |
| Risk readiness | High | 1 2 3 4 5 | Escalation history, complex-care comfort, incident-handling experience. |
| Availability fit | Medium | 1 2 3 4 5 | Visit window, weekends, evenings, overnights, matched to caregiver pattern. |
| Client preference | Medium | 1 2 3 4 5 | Gender, language, routine, personality fit if specified by family. |
| Caregiver preference | Medium | 1 2 3 4 5 | Hours, client type, distance, schedule preferences. |
| Documentation reliability | Medium | 1 2 3 4 5 | Notes completion, clock-ins, task completion history. |

The matching rule.

Do not assign complex or high-risk clients on availability alone. Fit must include skills, route, continuity and care-plan readiness. Availability is a constraint, it is not a match. A caregiver who is free is not the same as a caregiver who is right.

Continuity vs flexibility, explicit choices

Family, caregiver and agency preferences cannot all win all the time. Make the trade-off rule explicit so each decision does not become a negotiation.

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| CONTINUITY FIRST | Dementia, complex personal care, palliative, high family anxiety. | <i>Protect the match. Move the schedule before moving the caregiver.</i> |
| BALANCED | Stable clients with moderate care needs, family is comfortable with rotation. | <i>Match scheduler judgment with continuity targets, but flexibility is allowed.</i> |
| FLEXIBLE | Light companionship, short relief visits, clients open to a small care team. | <i>Optimise for route, availability and caregiver hours. Continuity is not the priority.</i> |

First-Shift Handoff Checklist.

Make sure the caregiver arrives with enough information to deliver safe, consistent care, not just an address and a phone number.

Confirm before the visit starts

| Done? | Item | What must be clear | Owner |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Address, parking, access | Building entry, key/code location, parking notes, who to call if entry fails. | Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Visit time, duration, route | Start, end, travel time checked. Caregiver knows when to leave home. | Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Care plan tasks visible on mobile | Tasks present in the caregiver app, not in a PDF emailed earlier. | Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Client risks highlighted | Falls, dementia, mobility, medication prompts, behaviour triggers, allergies, pets. | Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Family preferences + routine noted | Names, routines, communication style, topics to avoid, cultural notes. | Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Caregiver has required skills | Skill, credential and experience match for this client's needs. | Scheduler |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Escalation contact + after-hours path | Specific names and numbers. Not 'call the office.' | Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Documentation expectations clear | Notes, tasks, clock-in/out, what is required, when, on which tool. | Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Family communication plan | Who from the family hears what, when, by what channel. | Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | First-shift check-in scheduled | Supervisor or coordinator will check in within the shift or just after. | Supervisor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Backup caregiver identified | For high-risk cases, a confirmed backup is named and briefed. | Scheduler |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Post-shift review assigned | Within 24 hours. Whoever owns this gets the debrief, captures issues, feeds Tool 1. | Supervisor |

Client: _____ Caregiver: _____ Follow-up time: _____

Rule of thumb

If the checklist cannot be completed, postpone the shift. Postponing is cheaper than a missed visit, a refused caregiver or a family complaint. The first shift is not the place to improvise.

Weekly Scheduling Exception Dashboard.

Review exceptions, not calendars. The owner should see patterns before families complain.

The dashboard is an early-warning system, not a report.

Most owners review revenue, new clients and open shifts. Those numbers matter, but they do not show whether scheduled care is actually being delivered as promised. Exception signals surface visits that may not have started, visits that closed late, missed tasks, missing notes, location mismatches and pending messages, before the family has to call.

Nine signals to review every Monday

| Signal | Impact | Owner question | Status |
|----------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Pending clock-ins | <i>Visits may not have started.</i> | Which shifts need immediate follow-up? | ● ● ● |
| Late clock-ins | <i>Routes or schedules may be unrealistic.</i> | Are lateness patterns tied to geography or workload? | ● ● ● |
| Pending clock-outs | <i>Visits may not have closed properly.</i> | Are caregivers completing shift workflows? | ● ● ● |
| Late clock-outs | <i>Visits may be running over.</i> | Are care plans or visit lengths realistic? | ● ● ● |
| Missed shifts | <i>Service delivery failed.</i> | Was backup coverage triggered fast enough? | ● ● ● |
| Missed tasks | <i>Care may be incomplete.</i> | Which clients or caregivers need review? | ● ● ● |
| Missed notes | <i>Documentation is missing.</i> | Are we losing proof of service? | ● ● ● |
| Far clock-ins / clock-outs | <i>Location or routing may be wrong.</i> | Are addresses, routes or check-ins reliable? | ● ● ● |
| Pending messages | <i>Communication is delayed.</i> | Which families or caregivers need a response? | ● ● ● |

Weekly review, pick the pattern

| | |
|---|--|
| Top repeating exception this week | |
| Likely root cause (use Tool 1) | |
| Fix owner + target metric for next week | |

Decision rights, who acts on what.

Schedulers cannot scale if every decision requires a manager. Managers cannot scale if every decision needs the owner.

Without decision rights, exceptions become bottlenecks.

A dashboard that surfaces problems is only half the system. The other half is who is allowed to act on what. Define authority clearly and the scheduler can resolve most exceptions without escalation, which keeps the manager available for the ones that actually matter.

Decision rights matrix

| Decision | Scheduler can decide | Manager approval |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Routine shift swap | Yes | No |
| High-risk client caregiver change | No | Yes, manager required |
| Overtime or premium pay authorisation | No | Yes, manager required |
| Family-requested schedule change | Yes, within rules | If care risk or margin impact |
| Late arrival communication to family | Yes, within 15 min rule | If repeated, escalate to manager |
| Backup activation from bench | Yes | No |
| Caregiver disciplinary follow-up | No | Yes, manager + HR |
| Care-plan change request from family | No | Yes, supervisor reviews first |

Red flags to watch this week

These patterns predict service failure before it shows up in complaints. If you see two or more in the same week, treat it as a fire, not turbulence.

| Pattern | What it usually means |
|---|---|
| Pending clock-ins rising mid-morning, every day. | Routes are unrealistic for that time of day, or caregivers are not getting reminders early enough. Re-zone or change the reminder window. |
| Late clock-outs cluster in the same zone. | Visit lengths are not realistic for that geography. The care plan was built without the route in mind. |
| Missed notes from the same 2–3 caregivers, week after week. | Mobile workflow training gap or app friction. Pair them with a supervisor for one week, do not assume disinterest. |
| Far clock-ins from one address. | Address is wrong, GPS is unreliable, or the caregiver is checking in from the parking lot. Verify which before disciplining anyone. |

Your 30-day action plan.

If you only do four things with this toolkit, do these, in this order.

| Week | Focus | What to do | Tool |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Week 1 | Diagnose the leak | Run the Scheduling Leak Diagnostic (Tool 1) with your scheduler and one supervisor. Score honestly. Pick the single highest-scoring leak area. Have the scheduler-burnout conversation in the same session, do not skip it. | Tool 1 |
| Week 2 | Triage + rescue protocol live | Implement the Risk Triage Matrix and Rescue Protocol (Tool 2). Publish the time-based protocol on the wall. Define the on-call bench for at least one high-risk window this week. | Tool 2 |
| Week 3 | Zone + match by design | Draft your zone map (Tool 3). Apply the Matching Scorecard (Tool 4) to every new assignment. Track refused shifts and late arrivals by zone, not just by caregiver. | Tools 3 + 4 |
| Week 4 | Handoff + dashboard live | Use the First-Shift Handoff Checklist (Tool 5) on every new shift. Stand up the Weekly Exception Dashboard (Tool 6) with decision rights. Set a recurring Monday 30-minute review. | Tools 5 + 6 |

After 30 days

- ▶ Re-run the Leak Diagnostic. Has your highest-scoring leak area moved? If yes, attack the new top area. If no, the fix isn't sticking, go deeper on root cause.
- ▶ Compare late arrivals by zone, not by caregiver. Patterns by zone reveal route problems. Patterns by caregiver reveal matching or training problems. Don't confuse the two.
- ▶ Audit your missed-shift recovery. Did the rescue protocol trigger every time? If not, why? Most agencies fail at the 30-minute step because the on-call bench is theoretical, not real.
- ▶ Promote the Monday dashboard review from optional to recurring. Fifteen minutes a week against Tool 6 is enough to stop most service failures before the family calls.

If you can only remember one thing.

Scheduling problems are rarely scheduling problems. They are weak intake, thin care plans, stale caregiver data, missing zones and improvised coverage, all landing on one desk. Fix the inputs and reliability stops being heroic.

Built by operators.

Built for operators.

ConsidraCare is an agency-in-a-box platform for home-care operators. We ran a full home-care service business for four years before pivoting to software, which means our platform is built around what actually breaks when you try to grow an agency: intake, caregiver onboarding, scheduling, care-plan handoff, mobile shift execution, family communication and management reporting.

The toolkit you've just worked through is a paper version of the loop the platform runs continuously. If the scheduling leaks you found are the kind you'd rather not solve manually every Monday, talk to us.

01

Free agency audit

We'll walk through your funnel together and show you where it leaks. 30 minutes. No pitch.

considracare.com/agency-audit

02

Join the partner pilot

We're onboarding a small cohort of growth-minded agencies to the platform. Concierge setup, founder-led support.

considracare.com/book-operational-review

ConsidraCare · Companion to the article · *"Why Growing Home Care Agencies Break at Scheduling"*
