

Received date	Decision Date	Response Details	Outcome Group	Outcome	Outcome fulfilled date
06/05/2011	09/08/2011	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
16/06/2011	07/09/2011	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
13/07/2010	01/09/2010	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
25/08/2010	27/10/2010	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
22/12/2011	17/05/2012	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Apology given and staff feedback	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
09/11/2010	04/01/2011	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
07/03/2011	29/06/2011	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
26/01/2011	14/03/2011	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
21/01/2012	30/03/2012	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
23/01/2012	23/02/2012	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
15/02/2012	08/03/2012	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)	Some Upheld	Some Upheld	Docs destroyed, no detail available (not held)
15/01/2013	01/02/2013	I have recommended that the head of complaint standards should apologise to you for any confusion caused by his mistakenly referring, in his letter of 21 Dec 2012, to a review. I do not uphold any other aspects of your service complaint.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	06/03/13 letter issued
03/01/2013	28/01/2013	SPSO's head of complaint standards has already apologised to you for the delay in completing the case, including through waiting for the Commission. Additionally, I recommend that the head of complaint standards should specifically apologise on behalf of SPSO that the reason for the delay by the Commission was not made clearer to you. In all other respects, I do not uphold your service complaint.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	08/02/13 letter issued
28/02/2013	08/05/2013	"It would have been helpful if the Ombudsman had given reasons for his jurisdiction decision of 23 Feb 2012. I consider that SPSO should apologise for not clarifying the basis on which your case was reopened, which would have avoided some subsequent misunderstanding. * I agree that the HCCS's letter of 23 Nov 2013 did not deal specifically with the additions to your service delivery complaint in your email of 12 Nov 2012. I consider that the SPSO should apologise for that. * It was careless of SPSO to send its email of 13 Feb 2012 to you, rather than its intended internal recipient. But no harm was caused, and I do not consider that it was sufficiently serious to require an apology. * It is impossible for me now to decide conclusively whose account of the phone conversation of 9 mar 2012, about financial compensation, is correct. I do not consider this had any impact on the subsequent investigation and decision of your complaint against the University. * I consider that SPSO provided you with adequate information about its service delivery complaint procedures, and adequate information about my contact details, but I have no objection to SPSO routinely providing my email address as well as my postal address. * For the reasons explained below, I do not uphold any other aspects of your service delivery complaint.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	05/06/17 letter issued
23/07/2013	19/08/2013	As you can see, I have carefully considered the issues you raised. I do not consider that there was any shortfall in service, save in two respects – which I recommend that SPSO should acknowledge: ? It would have been better if the ombudsman's letter of 17 Apr 2013 had specifically mentioned the type of form you had used and asked if you wished the matter to go on to be treated also as a service complaint. ? I agree with you that the response from the head of complaint standards should have dealt specifically with the question of what you said about requesting a meeting and accepting evidence on academic issues.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	02/09/13 letter issued
03/01/2013	07/02/2013	In summary: ? You cannot 'appeal' to me over any aspects of SPSO's decisions about your complaints. ? I recommend that SPSO should apologise to you for the delay between the original complaint reviewer's letters of 19 Jun 2012 and 17 Jul 2012. ? I think it would have been better practice if the complaint reviewer's letter of 2 Nov 2012 had also given you an alternative contact name just in case. ? I recommend that SPSO should apologise to you for the head of complaint standards not responding to the service complaint in your letter of 11 Aug 2011 until later. ? As I suspect that you may not have access to the internet, I also ask SPSO to send you a printed copy of the annual report.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	12/02/13 letter issued
09/11/2012	07/02/2013	In summary: ? You cannot 'appeal' to me over any aspects of SPSO's decisions about your complaints. ? I recommend that SPSO should apologise to you for the delay between the original complaint reviewer's letters of 19 Jun 2012 and 17 Jul 2012. ? I think it would have been better practice if the complaint reviewer's letter of 2 Nov 2012 had also given you an alternative contact name just in case. ? I recommend that SPSO should apologise to you for the head of complaint standards not responding to the service complaint in your letter of 11 Aug 2011 until later. ? As I suspect that you may not have access to the internet, I also ask SPSO to send you a printed copy of the annual report.	Fully Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	12/02/13 letter issued
07/03/2013	03/04/2013	? I note that, in her letter of 17 Aug 2012, the complaint reviewer said that she would be in touch with you within the next two weeks – but the next contact was not until 26 Sep 2012, when you phoned her to find out what was happening. ? I consider that it would have been good practice for the complaint reviewer to write to you, before closing the case, to warn you that the case would be closed if you did not accept SPSO's complaint summary within some specified time limit. These are both matters for which I think the head of complaint standards should apologise to you on behalf of SPSO – though it seems improbable that you would have heeded such a warning, as you did not take up the offer in the ombudsman's letter of 29 Nov 2012.	Some Upheld	Apology given and staff feedback	23/04/13 letter issued
21/08/2013	04/10/2013	I have come to the following conclusions on your service delivery complaint: ? I recommend that SPSO should apologise to you for: - the initial complaint summary being overly detailed, encouraging you to think (incorrectly) that all aspects needed to be spelled out; - not doing enough to seek to agree the complaint summary with you before passing the case on to investigation on 28 Nov 2012, and - incorrectly saying, in its letter of 22 Jul 2013 that many of the changes that you had suggested were incorporated. ? I do not consider that these issues prejudiced the investigation of your complaint against the Council. ? I consider that SPSO was correct to acknowledge an error in making a finding on part 5 of the complaint, and was right to apologise for this. ? In the light of what you have told me about what additional evidence you might have submitted, I do not consider that you suffered as a result of this. ? I consider that SPSO was correct to apologise for any confusion caused by the contents of the review leaflet. ? In the light of what you have told me about what additional evidence you might have submitted, I do not consider that you suffered as a result of this.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	14/11/13 letter issued
17/12/2012	07/01/2013	SPSO not replying to your email of 3 Dec 2012 to the head of complaint standards Your email raised six numbered points. You described these as requests for clarification. It appears that the head of complaint standards viewed these, instead, as seeking to further debate the merits of your service complaint – when he had told you the next stage was to refer it to me. If so, it would have been courteous of the head of complaint standards to have at least sent you a brief email indicating why he was not responding to your numbered points – in line with the courtesy that SPSO had extended to you throughout, despite your own confrontational approach. To that extent, I uphold this aspect of your service complaint, but I do not consider that any resulting action is required by SPSO.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	No action required (outcome incorrect)
21/01/2013	31/01/2013	In conclusion SPSO's head of complaint standards has apologised to you for the use of post, rather than email, and for delay in responding to your service complaint at stage 2. I do not uphold any other aspect of your service complaint. But it would be helpful if SPSO were to consider clarifying the wording in its explanatory leaflet – to make it clearer that SPSO will try to agree the summary, but has the final decision on the wording.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	02/03/13 Info leaflet 2 clarified (agreeing complaint)
08/05/2014	25/06/2014	I consider that, in the light of what you said in your letter of 20 Dec 2013, SPSO should have made it clear to you that – as the matter had now passed to the ombudsman – there was unlikely to be a discussion before he issued his decision. I recommend that SPSO should: ? apologise to you for that, and ? consider whether or not it would be helpful to future complainants if its standard guides made it more explicit that there is unlikely to be any communication between acknowledgement of a review request and issue of the ombudsman's decision. I do not consider that there was any other service failure in this case, or that the outcome of the case was materially affected.	Some Upheld	Apology given and other action	15/07/14 letter issued
29/11/2013	23/12/2013	Formally apologise for three failures to send you updates as promised, and the failure to let you know that call of 29 Nov could not be replied to; Do not uphold any other aspects of the service complaint.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	20/01/14 letter issued
12/11/2014	15/04/2015	I recommend that a further apology is provided in line with the SPSO's guidance. I further recommend that the SPSO takes steps to remind its staff not to raise unrealistic expectations on the part of complainants as to how long things will take, or where an understanding is given a priority. Nevertheless, your concerns do demonstrate that it is necessary for each Complaint Investigator to think carefully about whether their background and associations could create an impression of bias and do all they can to avoid perceived conflict of interest situations from arising. I recommend that the SPSO remind staff about this.	Some Upheld	Apology given and staff feedback	No letter on case (not held)
09/04/2015	21/09/2015	RECOMMENDATIONS I recommend that SPSO should consider whether, in the light of my findings with regard to communication there is a need to take action, when there is a change of complaint reviewer, to ensure that confidence and understanding are maintained following the handover. I recommend that SPSO should consider whether the light of my discussion and findings it would be appropriate to expand its published guidance on decision reviews.	Some Upheld	Apology given and other action	01/05/17 Decision Review leaflet updated
06/07/2015	09/10/2015	Final remarks To sum up, I uphold your complaint that SPSO handled your conference enquiry differently from the way it handled other similar complaints and that this was unfair. In my view SPSO should have asked you to clarify the reasons for your interest in the conference before giving any opinion on whether it would be appropriate for you to attend. Although there was a slight delay in responding to your complaint, I am satisfied that an appropriate apology has been offered, and that in other respects SPSO has handled the matter appropriately in line with its service complaints procedure. With regard to the concerns you have raised about confidentiality and the details of the way SPSO has handled your correspondence I have commented as far as I can. The Information Commissioner will be able to consider whether SPSO has complied with the relevant legislation. I recommend that SPSO should offer you an apology for the way in which your conference enquiry was handled	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	16/10/15 letter issued
30/09/2014	10/02/2015	* I recommend that SPSO should acknowledge that [the complainant] was not informed prior to the SPSO's letter of 22 September 2014 of SPSO's approach to identifying the issues for investigation, and should apologise for this omission. * I recommend also that SPSO should consider, in the light of my discussion, whether there is any action it would be useful to take (for example by providing extra guidance for staff and/or updating its published information) to ensure that complainants understand the role of the complaints reviewer in drawing up the issues for investigation.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	No letter on case (not held)
28/08/2017	18/12/2015	Overall, I have partially upheld your complaints. As you know my role is limited in respect of some of the concerns you have referred for review. I appreciate too that your aims and concerns are less supportive than you would like. Nevertheless I hope that what I have said will feel that the issues you have been subjected to careful independent scrutiny within the limitations of my remit, and that my conclusions and the reasons for them have been clearly explained. I also hope that you will be reassured by the recommendations I have made (paragraphs 31, 35, 36) These are: ? I recommended that SPSO give an apology to you (paragraph 31) ? I recommended that SPSO give an acknowledgement to you of your concern and the reasons for it (paragraph 35) ? I recommended that SPSO review staff guidance (paragraph 36) ? I recommended that SPSO consider the registration of all service complaint forms (paragraph 36)	Some Upheld	Apology given and other action	09/02/16 letter issued
18/09/2015	28/01/2016	My conclusion is that the letter of 25 August could have done more to explain the reasons for the Ombudsman's findings, and that, in the absence of fuller explanation it was understandable that you should find the tone of the letter some what hostile and defensive. It would also, I suggest, have been appropriate for the Ombudsman to have acknowledged your feelings. Accordingly I uphold this aspect of your complaint. I will return later to make a recommendation based on this finding. In the circumstances I do not uphold this aspect of your complaint. Although I agree with you that SPSO failed to respond directly to the questions raised in your letter of 17 September, I have concluded that there was no obligation for it to do so in respect of your service complaint, since this was being addressed by ICRS, or your decision review request, since that matter was concluded. I recommend that SPSO should acknowledge that the letter of 25 August 2015 caused you to feel that SPSO was defensive and dismissive of your concerns and should apologise for causing you distress.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	22/04/16 letter issued
18/12/2015	10/03/2016	Final remarks 39. On balance, I partly uphold your complaint. Although I do not consider the overall time taken to investigate your complaint to be unreasonable, I have concluded that some of SPSO's communication to you about this could have been clearer (paragraphs 28 and 31 to 33). SPSO also took twice as long as its target response time to reply to your complaint at Stage 2 and failed to provide you with important information about how to take your complaint further. I consider that these failings would have affected your ability to feel trust and confidence in SPSO. 40. As SPSO has already apologised to you for the delay at Stage 2, I do not consider that it is necessary for it to take any further action with regard to your individual complaint. However, I recommend that it should consider whether it needs to take further steps to ensure that in cases where the 20 day target cannot be met, complainants are contacted before the response date, with a brief explanation of the reasons for the delay and a revised estimate of when a response will be sent. It should also review its standard letters to ensure that information about how and when to approach ICERS is included in the body of the text.	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	No further apology required (18/11/17)
20/06/2016	07/10/2016	have partially upheld the complaint about correspondence as he had not received an appropriate response I made the following recommendation: * I recommended that an appropriate letter now be issued to you with an apology for not issuing this letter earlier (paragraph 27)	Some Upheld	Apology given, no other action taken	12/10/16 letter issued
21/10/2015	25/02/2016	Overall, I have upheld your complaint and have made the following recommendations: ? SPSO should apologise for the fact that in spite of the auto reply to your email of 4 June 2015, you did not receive any further response. ? SPSO should consider whether it needs to take steps to ensure that in cases where the 20 day target cannot be met, complainants are contacted before the target date, with a brief explanation of the reasons for the delay and a revised estimate of when a response will be sent. In addition I have suggested that SPSO should keep under review the number of cases where it is unable to meet its 20 day target for responding to service complaints at Stage 2 and the reasons for this to see if there is any greater systemic problem that needs to be addressed.	Fully Upheld	Apology given and other action	03/06/16 letter issued
21/09/2015	16/12/2015	Final remarks I have upheld two of your complaints. I have made the following recommendations: * I recommended that an apology be made to you (paragraph 36). Kindly note that, if accepted, the Ombudsman will be contacting you direct. * I note that in a previous ICERS report, a recommendation was made that SPSO should consider whether there is any action it would be useful to take (for example by providing extra guidance for staff and/or updating its published information) to ensure that complainants understand the role of the Complaints Reviewer in drawing up the issues for investigation. In my draft report I recommended that action be taken to take this recommendation forward. (paragraph 40). I am pleased to report that in its response to the draft report, SPSO has confirmed that this recommendation was implemented and that changes were made to published information on how complainants are agreed with complainants, for example to its Information Leaflet. It is important that the complaint agreement reflects the complainant's wishes as closely as is possible and proportionate. This is an issue which SPSO will continue to take into account and accordingly I have recommended that action taken to take this recommendation forward be subject to future review with regard to its effectiveness.	Some Upheld	Apology given and other action	26/05/16 letter issued following further complaint re delay
03/06/2016	08/08/2016	To sum up, I have considered themselves you have raised and have upheld the following complaints: * SPSO did not timely implement the ICERS recommendation * SPSO has not provided explanations requested (report) * SPSO did not inform you of its intention to completely bypass the first stage of its complaints process * SPSO did not process your latest complaint within the required time periods I have recommended that SPSO considers whether it would be appropriate in these circumstances to consider making a conciliatory payment to you in recognition of its delay and the distress and inconvenience caused to you. Whilst I have no authority to order such a payment to be made, in my opinion this would be appropriate in acknowledging the aspects of your complaint I have upheld and for the distress and inconvenience caused. I have also recommended that SPSO conducts a review of its responses and reports its findings in a form that is accessible to public scrutiny. In response to the draft report, SPSO has confirmed acceptance of the review findings. SPSO has again apologised for the delays that occurred and accepted that the response provided in May 2016 did not set out precisely how the failure to issue a timely apology occurred or provide a full explanation about the reasons for the delays. SPSO has confirmed that it has identified learning from the complaint and amended its systems to ensure that such a failure should not happen again. SPSO has further confirmed that it has given careful consideration to making a conciliatory payment. However, it has explained that it is not its policy or practice to do so in cases where there has been no direct financial loss. SPSO stated: "This does not mean that we in any way do not underestimate the issues identified through this complaint and we have shown clearly that we have learned from the complaint and taken steps to amend our systems to prevent recurrence." This is a decision for SPSO to make and I regret that I can take this matter no further. Whilst you have expressed some disappointment with my conclusions, I can assure you that the issues you have raised have been subjected to careful independent scrutiny within the limitations of my remit. Kindly note that I have also sent a copy of this report to the SPSO today.	Some Upheld	Apology given and other action	01/04/16 Recs fields added to CSC case type