

**The Local Government Ombudsman's
Annual Review**

**Gloucestershire County
Council**

**for the year ended
31 March 2009**

The Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) provides a free, independent and impartial service. We consider complaints about the administrative actions of councils and some other authorities. We cannot question what a council has done simply because someone does not agree with it. If we find something has gone wrong, such as poor service, service failure, delay or bad advice, and that a person has suffered as a result, the Ombudsmen aim to get it put right by recommending a suitable remedy. The LGO also uses the findings from investigation work to help authorities provide better public services through initiatives such as special reports, training and annual reviews.

Contents of Annual Review

Section 1: Complaints about Gloucestershire County Council 2008/09..	3
Introduction.....	3
Enquiries and complaints received.....	3
Complaint outcomes.....	4
Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman.....	5
Training in complaint handling.....	5
Conclusions.....	6
Section 2: LGO developments.....	7
Introduction.....	7
Council First.....	7
Statement of reasons: consultation.....	7
Making Experiences Count (MEC).....	7
Training in complaint handling.....	7
Adult Social Care Self-funding.....	8
Internal schools management.....	8
Further developments.....	8
Appendix 1: Notes to assist interpretation of the statistics 2008/09.....	9
Appendix 2: Local authority report 2008/09	

Section 1: Complaints about Gloucestershire County Council 2008/09

Introduction

This annual review provides a summary of the complaints we have dealt with about Gloucestershire County Council. We have included comments on the authority's performance and complaint-handling arrangements, where possible, so they can assist with your service improvement.

I hope that the review will be a useful addition to other information your authority holds on how people experience or perceive your services.

Two appendices form an integral part of this review: statistical data for 2008/09 and a note to help the interpretation of the statistics.

Changes to our way of working and statistics

A change in the way we operate means that the statistics about complaints received in 2008/09 are not directly comparable with those from 2007/08. Since 1 April 2008 the new LGO Advice Team has been the single point of contact for all enquiries and new complaints. The number of calls to our service has increased significantly since then. It handles more than 3,000 calls a month, together with written and emailed complaints. Our advisers now provide comprehensive information and advice to callers at the outset with a full explanation of the process and possible outcomes. It enables callers to make a more informed decision about whether putting their complaint to us is an appropriate course of action. Some decide to pursue their complaint direct with the council first.

It means that direct comparisons with some of the previous year's statistics are difficult and could be misleading. So this annual review focuses mainly on the 2008/09 statistics without drawing those comparisons.

Enquiries and complaints received

The Ombudsman's Advice Team received a total of 45 complaints and enquiries about the Council. Of these, five were treated as premature and referred back to the Council for consideration under its complaint process, while 27 were referred to an Investigative Team for a decision. In the remaining 13 cases we gave advice short of a decision, usually to pursue the matter through the Council's complaints process.

The majority of complaints and enquiries we received were about the Council's Education and Social Services functions, with 14 complaints about education, 10 about children and family services and five concerned with adult care services. The remaining complaints and enquiries were concerned with a range of Council services including planning and highway management.

Complaint outcomes

I decided 25 complaints during the year. In two cases I decided that the matter complained about was not within my jurisdiction to investigate. In 14 of those cases I found no evidence of maladministration or service failure and in another two cases, I used my discretion not to investigate further as I considered there was insufficient injustice caused to the complainant to justify doing so, even if the Council had been at fault as claimed. The remaining seven cases I discuss in more detail below.

Reports

I issued one report against the Council this year, where I found maladministration causing injustice. This was a joint report with the Health Services Ombudsman called "Six Lives", which addressed serious and disturbing failures in nationwide public service provision for six adults with learning difficulties. One of these cases was that of Tom Wakefield, a young man with profound and multiple learning difficulties who lived within the County and who died in April 2004, aged 20. The report investigated the services provided to Tom in the time leading up to his death by various agencies, including the Council's Social Services.

In particular, I investigated the service provided to Tom from July 2003, when he should have left a residential school within the County as he had turned 19. I found that the Council's arrangements for Tom's transition to adult care fell significantly below reasonable standards. I found there was no strategy in place to provide for commissioning new services for Tom when he turned 19 and that Social Services worked in an unplanned and unstructured way, failing to tell the family about a potentially suitable placement when this became available. I also found that the Council did not respond appropriately to complaints from Tom's parents about its practices.

I concluded that it would never be known, if appropriate arrangements had been in place, whether Tom would have lived longer or could have had more enjoyment from life in his last year. But the Council's actions had caused Tom's parents a significant injustice. I recommended therefore that the Council should apologise to Tom's parents and contribute £5000 towards a total of £30,000 paid by various public bodies in recognition of the failings in Tom's care.

Local settlements

A 'local settlement' is a complaint where, during the course of our investigation, a council takes or agrees to take some action that we consider to be a satisfactory response to the complaint. In 2008/09, [27.3%] of all complaints the Ombudsmen decided and which were within our jurisdiction were local settlements. *The remaining six complaints against your Council were decided as local settlements.*

The most significant of these was a complaint about the Council's Highways and Transportation Department. When it was initially consulted on a planning application the Department gave advice to the District Council (the planning authority) that the plans, from a Highway perspective, were acceptable. But the planning application was subsequently refused because of concerns about road safety. The complainants appealed the refusal to the Planning Inspectorate, at which point the County changed its advice and agreed with the District Council that on highway grounds the planning application was unacceptable.

I considered that the County's initial assessment of the plans had been flawed. As a result the complainants should have received advice far sooner that the plans were unacceptable. By not receiving that advice the complainants continued to incur expense on plans that they were never going to be able to put into practice. The Council accepted this and agreed to compensate the complainants by paying £6500 of those costs.

A further £250 compensation was paid to a complainant who had been the subject of enquiries following a Child Protection Conference. The Council was obliged under the Children Act to investigate concerns about the complainant that were raised at the Conference. But investigation had found those concerns to be groundless. The Council therefore agreed to put a statement on the child's file to this effect, which would then be circulated to all attendees of the Conference. A complaint was made to me as the Council failed to do this, instead copying those attendees a different letter that was private and confidential to the complainant. The Council remedied the complaint by recalling the wrong letter and sending the right one, while accepting the need to pay some compensation for the distress caused.

Settlement was reached in four cases where the Council accepted fault in the administration of school admission appeals. In one case the settlement was in the form of an apology for an inappropriate question asked by a Panel Member during an appeal hearing. The other three cases involved appeals for a selective school within the County. I considered the Appeal Panel had adopted a flawed approach in focusing unduly on the scores achieved by the appellants' children during the selective process and had not adequately considered other extenuating circumstances that may have justified upholding an appeal. The Council agreed that an appropriate remedy for these complaints was to convene a fresh appeal for each of the complainants. I am also pleased to note that the Council agreed to issue some supplementary guidance to appeal panels considering appeals for selective schools, to try to avoid a repeat of these mistakes.

In total therefore the Council paid £11,750 towards settlement of complaints last year.

Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman

Formal enquiries were made on 22 cases during the course of the year. The average time taken by the Council to respond was just over 31 days; a small improvement on last year when the average response time was just over 32 days. I am grateful to the Council for its continuing efforts here, but would welcome further improvement next year so that it can meet the 28 days target I set for such responses.

Training in complaint handling

Part of our role is to provide advice and guidance about good administrative practice. We offer training courses for all levels of local authority staff in complaints handling and investigation. All courses are presented by experienced investigators. They give participants the opportunity to practise the skills needed to deal with complaints positively and efficiently. We can also provide customised courses to help authorities to deal with particular issues and occasional open courses for individuals from different authorities.

I have enclosed some information on the full range of courses available together with contact details for enquiries and bookings.

Conclusions

I welcome this opportunity to give you my reflections about the complaints my office has dealt with over the past year. I hope that you find the information and assessment provided useful when seeking improvements to your Council's services.

**J R White
Local Government Ombudsman
The Oaks No 2
Westwood Way
Westwood Business Park
Coventry
CV4 8JB**

June 2009

Section 2: LGO developments

Introduction

This annual review also provides an opportunity to bring councils up to date on developments – current and proposed – in the LGO and to seek feedback. It includes our proposal to introduce a ‘statement of reasons’ for Ombudsmen decisions.

Council First

From 1 April 2009, the LGO has considered complaints only where the council’s own complaints procedure has been completed. Local authorities have been informed of these new arrangements, including some notable exceptions. We will carefully monitor the impact of this change during the course of the year.

Statement of reasons: consultation

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 made provision for the LGO to publish statements of reasons relating to the individual decisions of an Ombudsman following the investigation of a complaint. The Ombudsmen are now consulting local government on their proposal to use statements of reasons. The proposal is that these will comprise a short summary (about one page of A4) of the complaint, the investigation, the findings and the recommended remedy. The statement, naming the council but not the complainant, would usually be published on our website.

We plan to consult local authorities on the detail of these statements with a view to implementing them from October 2009.

Making Experiences Count (MEC)

The new formal, one stage complaint handling arrangement for adult social care was also introduced from 1 April 2009. The LGO is looking to ensure that this formal stage is observed by complainants before the Ombudsmen will consider any such complaint, although some may be treated as exceptions under the Council First approach. The LGO also recognises that during the transition from the existing scheme to the new scheme there is going to be a mixed approach to considering complaints as some may have originated before 1 April 2009. The LGO will endeavour to provide support, as necessary, through dedicated events for complaints-handling staff in adult social care departments.

Training in complaint handling

Effective Complaint Handling in Adult Social Care is the latest addition to our range of training courses for local authority staff. This adds to the generic Good Complaint Handling (identifying and processing complaints) and Effective Complaint Handling (investigation and resolution), and courses for social care staff at both of these levels. Demand for our training in complaint handling remains high. A total of 129 courses were delivered in 2008/09. Feedback from participants shows that they find it stimulating, challenging and beneficial in their work in dealing with complaints.

Adult Social Care Self-funding

The Health Bill 2009 proposes for the LGO to extend its jurisdiction to cover an independent complaints-handling role in respect of self-funded adult social care. The new service will commence in 2010.

Internal schools management

The Apprenticeship, Skills, Children and Learning Bill (ASCL) 2009 proposes making the LGO the host for a new independent complaints-handling function for schools. In essence, we would consider the complaint after the governing body of the school had considered it. Subject to legislation, the new service would be introduced, in pilot form, probably in September 2010.

Further developments

I hope this information gives you an insight into the major changes happening within the LGO, many of which will have a direct impact on your local authority. We will keep you up to date through LGO Link as each development progresses but if there is anything you wish to discuss in the meantime please let me know.

**J R White
Local Government Ombudsman
The Oaks No 2
Westwood Way
Westwood Business Park
Coventry
CV4 8JB**

June 2009

Appendix 1: Notes to assist interpretation of the statistics 2008/09

Introduction

This year, the annual review only shows 2008/09 figures for enquiries and complaints received, and for decisions taken. This is because the change in the way we operate (explained in the introduction to the review) means that these statistics are not directly comparable with statistics from previous years.

Table 1. LGO Advice Team: Enquiries and complaints received

This information shows the number of enquiries and complaints received by the LGO, broken down by service area and in total. It also shows how these were dealt with, as follows.

Formal/informal prematures: The LGO does not normally consider a complaint unless a council has first had an opportunity to deal with that complaint itself. So if someone complains to the LGO without having taken the matter up with a council, the LGO will usually refer it back to the council as a 'premature complaint' to see if the council can itself resolve the matter. These are 'formal premature complaints'. We now also include 'informal' premature complaints here, where advice is given to the complainant making an enquiry that their complaint is premature. The total of premature complaints shown in this line *does not include* the number of resubmitted premature complaints (see below).

Advice given: These are enquiries where the LGO Advice Team has given advice on why the Ombudsman would not be able to consider the complaint, other than the complaint being premature. For example, the complaint may clearly be outside the Ombudsman's jurisdiction. It also includes cases where the complainant has not given enough information for clear advice to be given, but they have, in any case, decided not to pursue the complaint.

Forwarded to the investigative team (resubmitted prematures): These are cases where there was either a formal premature decision, or the complainant was given informal advice that their case was premature, and the complainant has resubmitted their complaint to the Ombudsman after it has been put to the council. *These figures need to be added to the numbers for formal/informal premature complaints (see above) to get the full total number of premature complaints. They also needed to be added to the 'forwarded to the investigative team (new)' to get the total number of forwarded complaints.*

Forwarded to the investigative team (new): These are the complaints that have been forwarded from the LGO Advice Team to the Investigative Team for further consideration. The figures may include some complaints that the Investigative Team has received but where we have not yet contacted the council.

Table 2. Investigative Team: Decisions

This information records the number of decisions made by the LGO Investigative Team, broken down by outcome, within the period given. **This number will not be the same as the number of complaints forwarded from the LGO Advice Team** because some complaints decided in 2008/09 will already have been in hand at the beginning of the year, and some forwarded to the Investigative Team during 2008/09 will still be in hand at the end of the year. Below we set out a key explaining the outcome categories.

MI reps: where the LGO has concluded an investigation and issued a formal report finding maladministration causing injustice.

LS (local settlements): decisions by letter discontinuing our investigation because action has been agreed by the authority and accepted by the Ombudsman as a satisfactory outcome for the complainant.

M reps: where the LGO has concluded an investigation and issued a formal report finding maladministration but causing no injustice to the complainant.

NM reps: where the LGO has concluded an investigation and issued a formal report finding no maladministration by the council.

No mal: decisions by letter discontinuing an investigation because we have found no, or insufficient, evidence of maladministration.

Omb disc: decisions by letter discontinuing an investigation in which we have exercised the Ombudsman's general discretion not to pursue the complaint. This can be for a variety of reasons, but the most common is that we have found no or insufficient injustice to warrant pursuing the matter further.

Outside jurisdiction: these are cases which were outside the Ombudsman's jurisdiction.

Table 3. Response times

These figures record the average time the council takes to respond to our first enquiries on a complaint. We measure this in calendar days from the date we send our letter/fax/email to the date that we receive a substantive response from the council. The council's figures may differ somewhat, since they are likely to be recorded from the date the council receives our letter until the despatch of its response.-

Table 4. Average local authority response times 2008/09

This table gives comparative figures for average response times by authorities in England, by type of authority, within three time bands.

LGO Advice Team

Enquiries and complaints received	Adult care services	Children and family services	Education	Public Finance inc. Local Taxation	Planning and building control	Transport and highways	Other	Total
Formal/informal premature complaints	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	5
Advice given	1	4	2	0	1	1	4	13
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	3	6	12	0	0	0	2	23
Total	5	10	14	1	2	6	7	45

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
01/04/2008 / 31/03/2009	1	6	0	0	14	2	2	25

Response times	FIRST ENQUIRIES	
	No. of First Enquiries	Avg no. of days to respond
1/04/2008 / 31/03/2009	22	31.2
2007 / 2008	11	32.4
2006 / 2007	14	37.9

Average local authority response times 01/04/2008 to 31/03/2009

Types of authority	<= 28 days %	29 - 35 days %	> = 36 days %
District councils	60	20	20
Unitary authorities	56	35	9
Metropolitan authorities	67	19	14
County councils	62	32	6
London boroughs	58	27	15
National park authorities	100	0	0