

## SPSO decision report

**Case:** 201403259, Care Inspectorate  
**Sector:** Scottish Government and devolved administration  
**Subject:** complaints handling  
**Outcome:** some upheld, no recommendations

### Summary

Mrs C complained about two inspections at the residential care home her mother (Mrs A) lived in. Mrs C felt it was unreasonable for the Care Inspectorate to say in their inspection report that the privacy and dignity of residents could be compromised when bedroom doors were left open. Mrs C said Mrs A preferred to have her door open so she could see what was going on and chat to visitors and passers-by. She said inspectors could have discovered this by speaking to her mother.

Mrs C said the Care Inspectorate's response to her complaint failed to take into account one of the inspection reports she complained about. We found the Care Inspectorate had agreed a list of six complaints for investigation with Mrs C. It was for the investigator to decide what weight to give different pieces of evidence. We found the Care Inspectorate made their position in respect of Mrs A's bedroom door very clear. They recognised that Mrs A's preference was to have her door open. However, this should have been discussed and recorded in Mrs A's care records, which it was not. They accepted that the report could have been better worded.

Mrs C said it had taken the Care Inspectorate too long to log and respond to her complaint. We found Mrs C's complaint was appropriately logged and acknowledged. The Care Inspectorate acted in accordance with their complaints procedure in meeting with Mrs C, in an attempt to resolve her concerns. At the end of the meeting, they quite reasonably checked whether Mrs C wanted to progress to the investigation stage. However, it took too long to respond to Mrs C's complaint at each stage of the process and we upheld Mrs C's complaint on the basis of delay.