**COMPLAINTS HANDLING PROCESS**

**PERFORMANCE STATISTICS 2018/19**

This report details Scottish Enterprise activities and performance in order to comply with the internal Complaints Handling Process (CHP) between 1 April 2018 and 31 March 2019.

The procedure provides **two** opportunities to resolve complaints internally:

1. **Frontline Resolution**

For issues that are straightforward and easily resolved, requiring little or no investigation:

* ‘On-the-spot’ apology, explanation, or other action to resolve the complaint quickly, in five working days or less, unless there are exceptional circumstances.
1. **Investigation**

For issues that have not been resolved at the frontline or that are complex, serious or ‘high risk’:

* A definitive response provided within 20 working days following a thorough investigation of the points raised.

**COMPLAINTS ACTIVITY IN 2018/19**

In this year 12 complaints were received. Five complaints were dealt with at frontline resolution. Seven complaints went to investigation.

**Table 1 – Frontline Resolution**

|  |
| --- |
| Frontline Complaints (Stage 1) |
| Complaints considered at Stage 1 | 5 |
| Completed within 5 working days | 5 |

**Table 2 – Complaint Investigations**

|  |
| --- |
| Investigation (Stage 2) |
| Complaints considered at Stage 2 | 7 |
| Completed within 20 working days | 7 |

**Table 3 – External Review**

|  |
| --- |
| External Review (SPSO) |
| Complaints considered by the SPSO | 0 |
| Complaints upheld by SPSO | 0 |

**Learning from complaints/process improvement**

Complaints are analysed for trend information and to ensure we identify any recurring issues or potential service failures and take appropriate action.

In each case the complaints were resolved efficiently and satisfactorily in line with our Complaints Handling Process and therefore there are no procedural changes required. We will continue to monitor our complaints and processes to ensure best practice.

**COMPLAINTS APRIL 2018 – MARCH 2019**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Complaint** | **Action Taken** | **Outcome** |
| A company complained they had not received grant money for a trip to a trade Show in the United States and had to submit claims forms on numerous occasions. | An investigation of the situation showed that the financial process was delayed due to the company finance forms being returned incomplete leaving Scottish Enterprise (SE) unable to process the form and make payment. A member of the Trade Services team spoke to the company and payment was made. | Complaint resolved at Investigation Stage. |
| A company raised a complaint in relation to the rental increase which SE failed to implement under the existing lease of an organisation they were acquiring.  | A member of the Business Infrastructure team spoke to the complainant and followed up with an email apologising for the error which had taken place when inputting the original lease details to the system. A payment process was agreed. | Complaint resolved at Frontline Resolution. |
| An MSP wrote to the Chief Executive in relation to a company’s application for RSA support and the time which elapsed between submitting their application and receiving a decision. | The case was reviewed and an apology issued by the Chief Executive with the assurance that we will take the necessary steps to avoid this situation in the future. | Complaint resolved at Investigation Stage. |
| A company complained about the delay to the processing and payment of their grant claim. | The claim was reviewed and an apology was issued, advising that the claim had been assessed and a team member had already been in touch to assist with collating the outstanding evidence required to ensure prompt payment of the claim. | Complaint resolved at Investigation Stage. |
| A company was disappointed with the lack of response from a member of SE staff and the behaviours of another in two SE overseas offices.  | SE Director EMEA, appointed a colleague to contact the complainant at the earliest opportunity to discuss their concerns. The complainant was provided with useful information and signposted to a number of Scottish organisations. The complainant expressed their appreciation of the time spent and the advice given. | Complaint resolved at Firstline Resolution. |
| An MSP wrote to the Chief Executive concerning the length of time it had taken to complete the proposed sale of SE owned land. | The claim was reviewed and internal approval granted to progress the sale. The MSP acknowledged that SE addressed the issue and conveyed thanks. | Complaint resolved at Investigation Stage. |
| A company contacted SE regarding an outstanding payment of an Innovation Grant, explaining the delay in payment had caused significant difficulties for the business. | SE contacted the complainant and assured them that if they sent in the appropriate supporting evidence the claim would be processed as high priority. A SE Innovation Specialist also called the complainant to discuss. | Complaint resolved at Firstline Resolution. |
| An MSP contacted SE on behalf of one of their constituents regarding a delay in payment of a development grant. | The case was investigated and payment of the grant was made and an apology issued. Colleagues in the Contract Management team and Business Gateway tried to contact the individual direct to apologise however they were unable to speak to the complainant. | Complaint resolved at Investigation Stage. |
| An individual received correspondence from SE regarding GlobalScots. They contacted SE to confirm they were not a GlobalScot and did not wish to receive any further information. Unfortunately, before the mailing list was updated another email was issued. | On investigation it transpired there were two candidates with the same name and there was an error with the email address. A very apologetic response was sent to the individual ensuring that all details had been changed and SE would not contact them again. Colleagues in the GlobalScot team were advised of the error and asked to ensure double checking of all future mailing lists.  | Complaint resolved at Investigation Stage. |
| A company contacted SE complaining about the quality of advice they were given about their RSA application and subsequent cost and time delays they feel the company incurred because of this advice.  | On investigation it transpired that following the company’s application and appraisal of application SE contacted the company four times seeking clarification of the project and seeking answers to questions to which no answers were received. A telephone meeting was held with the company’s accountant and outstanding issues were addressed. SE proposed two options and the company are now working with the RSA team on a possible way forward. | Complaint resolved at Investigation Stage. |
| An individual wrote expressing their frustration and disappointment on receiving the notice of termination of their project. | SE’s Head of Innovation replied to the individual explaining the reasoning behind the decision to terminate the funding for the project. The issues were fully discussed and articulated to the individual and the team at the time. The Head of Innovation also offered to meet with the individual and the team, which was accepted. | Complaint resolved at Frontline Resolution. |
| An individual emailed SE event organisers on the use of a progressive web app which participants were asked to use to register their attendance. The individualquestioned whether governmentorganisations should be endorsing products or requesting businesses to install particular software or use particular hardware. They felt it was anti-competitive and potentially damaging to business IT security. | SE’s Director Technology met with the individual confirming that SE used a commercially available product for the purpose of managing data in line with SE data privacy policies and reinforced that attendees are not obligated to download an application. The individual was satisfied with the response. | Complaint resolved at Firstline Resolution. |