

Report to: The Executive Board
Month: July 2008
From: Fiona Paterson
For: Noting and Discussion
Subject: Service Delivery Complaints – Quarter 1
Status: Open

1. Purpose

To provide the Executive Board with a summary of the nature and outcome of service delivery complaints received by the SPSO in the first quarter of 2008-09 and any learning that has resulted from these complaints.

2. Contribution to the Business Plan

Strategic objective 1 – to provide a high quality, independent complaint handling service.

3. Key points

Service delivery complaints (SDCs) during the first quarter of 2008-09 were determined under the interim Service Delivery Process on the departure of Carolyn Hirst, the Independent Service Reviewer. This interim process is currently under review by the Ombudsman and Director of Investigations.

Six SDCs were recorded in this quarter (a similar amount to the third and fourth quarters of last year). Of these, only one complaint has not yet been determined. The main reasons for complaint were issues relating to delay and communication.

Learning from Service Quality Complaints

Two of the six complaints determined were fully upheld and one was partly upheld. There were no systemic problems identified from these complaints and the individuals concerned in each case have taken on the advice provided.

4. Resource Implications

None

5. Recommendations

None

6. Actions required

Completion of process review project – due August 2008.

Quarter 1 Service Delivery Complaints

Main Reason for Complaint	Upheld	Partly upheld	Not upheld	Discontinued	Ongoing	Total Cases
Delay	1				1	2
Communication	1		2			3
Mixed: delay, communication, process		1				1
Q1 Total	2	1	2		1	6

SQC #	Date Received	Case #	Outcome	Summary of complaint, including feed-back / learnings for upheld complaints - Individual coaching, cross-office issues, tech update
SDC08/01	01/04/08	200502961	Partly Upheld	<p>DELAY – upheld, apologies given</p> <p>COMMUNICATION – upheld, regarding expression of regret by CI that he was being complained about – discussion with line manager about appropriate communication.</p> <p>PROCESS – not upheld. Errors in draft changed for final report, did not affect findings.</p>
SDC08/02	02/04/08	200502668	Not upheld	COMMUNICATION – Claim that incorrect information given by front office regarding Scrutiny Review. Line Manager explained the confusion and confirmed the information given was correct.
SDC08/03	24/04/08	200601783	Ongoing	DELAY
SDC08/04	08/05/08	200503430	Upheld	DELAY – CI promised due dates in good faith but failed to deliver due to sickness and workload. Lessons learned – very careful when giving target dates that they can be delivered on.
SDC08/05	15/05/08	200800406	Upheld	COMMUNICATION - One question not answered properly - could have responded in a more clear fashion after consulting with other colleagues. One question misinterpreted resulting in further enquiries. Request that if complaint is made, different staff members will deal with the case. Ombudsman agrees to request.
SDC08/06	15/05/08	200800149	Not upheld	<p>COMMUNICATION – not upheld. Letters examined by Manager and communication found to be appropriate.</p> <p>CORRUPTION – not upheld, no evidence provided.</p>