

2009-10 Statistics Tables – Explanatory Notes and Commentary

Tables:

Attached are summary details of the complaints that the SPSO received and determined about your Council in 2009-10. Table 1 details the number of complaints (by our subject categories) received for your Council for 2008-09 and 2009-10, alongside the total of local authority complaints for these years. In previous years we have used this table to show the total of all contacts (enquiry calls and complaints) that we received about your council. This year we have not included enquiry calls, as feedback has shown that it is more meaningful for you if we concentrate on the actual complaints received. We recorded 136 complaints about the Council, compared to 115 in the previous year.

Table 2 shows the outcomes of complaints determined about your Council by the SPSO in 2009-10. Received and determined numbers do not normally tally exactly, as figures tend to include cases carried forward from the previous year.

Graph of prematurity rates: The anonymised graph shows, for each Council, the percentage of complaints that we received and determined as premature, against the national average in 2009-10 (55%). This represents a decrease on the 2008-9 average of 60%, which is to be welcomed. Figures have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole percentage.

We consider a complaint to be premature when it reaches us before the complainant has been through the full complaints process of your organisation. The graph does not reflect the number of premature complaints that we received about your Council, but shows how your Council, proportionately, compares against the average for Scottish local authorities. Your Council is number 11 on the graph, above the average. You will see from Table 2 that the actual number of premature complaints for your Council was 84 out of a total of 141 complaints determined (60% of the total for your Council). The previous year's figure was 79 out of 107 (74% of the total for your Council). The proportion of premature complaints has therefore reduced against an increased number of complaints determined, although it still represents a fairly high level of premature complaints received about your Council.

NB We do not adjust our figures to mitigate the impact of housing stock transfer. It is evident, however, that there is a tendency for authorities that retain housing stock to receive more complaints and to fall higher within the prematurity graph than those that have undertaken stock transfer. This is to be expected, given that housing complaints are usually the largest category of complaint and that there is a disproportionately high incidence of prematurity in housing complaints.

Reported Complaints and Recommendations

We investigated and reported on one complaint about your Council in 2009-10, which we partially upheld. Attached is a summary sheet showing this complaint, and summarising the recommendations made. You will be aware that SPSO complaints reviewers follow up to find out what changes have been made as a result of recommendations.

.....

We hope that you find this summary information useful. If you have any enquiries about the statistics provided, please contact Annie White, SPSO Casework Knowledge Manager, on 0131 240 8843 or by emailing awhite@sps.org.uk. Statistical reports are available on the SPSO website at: <http://www.sps.org.uk/statistics/index.php>.

Table 1

Complaints Received by Subject		Glasgow City Council	Complaints as % of total	Sector Total	Complaints as % of total
2008-09	Building Control	2	2%	27	2%
	Consumer protection	3	3%	5	0%
	Economic development	0	0%	4	0%
	Education	3	3%	89	6%
	Environmental Health & Cleansing	13	11%	69	4%
	Finance	18	16%	148	9%
	Fire & Police Boards	0	0%	1	0%
	Housing	16	14%	459	29%
	Land & Property	4	3%	32	2%
	Legal & admin	6	5%	79	5%
	National Park Authorities	0	0%	5	0%
	Other	0	0%	9	1%
	Personnel	1	1%	22	1%
	Planning	11	10%	269	17%
	Recreation & Leisure	3	3%	44	3%
	Roads & Transport	15	13%	87	5%
	Social Work	15	13%	188	12%
	Valuation Joint Boards	0	0%	24	1%
	Out of Jurisdiction or Subject Unknown	5	4%	43	3%
	Total	115		1,604	
2009-10	Building Control	0	0%	36	2%
	Consumer protection	4	3%	10	1%
	Economic development	0	0%	2	0%
	Education	11	8%	94	5%
	Environmental Health & Cleansing	12	9%	71	4%
	Finance	16	12%	143	8%
	Fire & Police Boards	0	0%	3	0%
	Housing	15	11%	432	25%
	Land & Property	3	2%	33	2%
	Legal & admin	6	4%	90	5%
	National Park Authorities	0	0%	8	0%
	Other	2	1%	11	1%
	Personnel	0	0%	24	1%
	Planning	5	4%	264	15%
	Recreation & Leisure	3	2%	73	4%
	Roads & Transport	20	15%	94	5%
	Social Work	25	18%	199	11%
	Valuation Joint Boards	1	1%	19	1%
	Subject Unknown or Out Of Jurisdiction	13	10%	128	7%
	Total	136		1,734	

Table 2

Complaints Determined By Outcome			Glasgow City Council	
			Sector Total	
2008/09	Assessment	Premature	79	923
		Out of Jurisdiction	5	102
		Discontinued before Investigation	9	170
	Examination	Determined after detailed consideration	12	279
	Investigation	Report issued: complaint not upheld	1	25
		Report issued: complaint partially upheld	0	22
		Report issued: complaint fully upheld	1	15
		Discontinued during Investigation	0	10
		Total	107	1,549
	2009/10	Assessment	Premature	84
Out of Jurisdiction			11	118
Discontinued before Investigation			22	194
Other			1	17
Examination		Determined after detailed consideration	22	409
Investigation		Report issued: complaint not upheld	0	13
		Report issued: complaint partially upheld	1	25
		Report issued: complaint fully upheld	0	12
		Discontinued during Investigation	0	6
		Total	141	1,837

Glasgow City Council

Published	Case Ref.	Summary	Overall Report Decision	Recommendation(s)
22/07/2009	200800255	<p>(a) the Council's Social Work Service failed to record and respond appropriately to complaints about the behaviour of children in the Children's Unit (partially upheld);</p> <p>(b) the Council's Development and Regeneration Service arbitrarily extinguished conditions attached by the former authority to a previous consent for change of use relating to car parking and the maximum number of children to be accommodated (not upheld); and</p> <p>(c) the Council's Development and Regeneration Service failed in considering the application for the extension of the Children's Unit accurately to apply a relevant City Plan policy with reference to retained landscaped area within the curtilage of the property (not upheld).</p>	partially upheld	<p>review whether, in the case of complaints about the Social Work Service management response to problems emanating from children in the Council's care, which are not appropriate for being dealt with in terms of the statutory procedure, these should be considered under their corporate complaints procedure.</p>