



Complaints Handling Report

Quarter 2 (November – January)

Academic Year 2020-21

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Quarterly Trends	2
3. Impact on Service Delivery	3
COVID-19 measures within the college.....	3
Improving key communication	3
4. Further Education Complaints Performance Indicators – Definitions	4
5. Complaints Handling Key Performance Indicators – Quarter 2	5
6. Escalation and Extension Rationale	6
7. Complaints Handling Feedback Questionnaire	6

1. Introduction

North East Scotland College (NESCol) is committed to ensuring all clients and customers receive the best possible service. The College monitors stakeholder complaint feedback and ensures any lessons learned are actioned to improve its services. Reports measuring the College’s complaints handling performance will be published online quarterly and issued to the Senior Executive Team.

NESCol complaints handling procedures are subject to regular review and alteration as required. This could be as a result of stakeholder experiences, internal changes or external initiatives. The College is a member of the sector Complaints Handling Advisory Group, operating with the College Development Network (CDN) and in association with the Scottish Public Sector Ombudsman (SPSO).



NESCol is an equal opportunities College therefore all complaints are administered in compliance with the Data Protection Act 2018, The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002.

2. Quarterly Trends

For this quarter, NESCol received 9 complaints. The majority of complaints made relate to Customer Care (C1) or were Course Related (C3). Common themes regarding the cause of complaints are:

- Dissatisfaction with communication
- Timetabling changes
- Staff conduct

The pie chart to the left shows the percentage of complaints received for each complaint category. The pie chart to the right shows a breakdown of the percentage of complaints received this quarter for each campus. The Aberdeen City (4), Fraserburgh (1) and Altens (3) campuses received complaints this quarter. One complaint did not specify the campus involved. As the location was not relevant to the investigation, the complaint it has been logged as “unknown”.



3. Impact on Service Delivery

Upon closing a complaint, the quality team request details of any lessons learned or actions for completion (where applicable) from the relevant departments. The feedback received from stakeholders through the complaints process can alter our service delivery and highlight areas for improvement in order to better our practices. The below example/s from this quarter highlights the value of stakeholder feedback.

COVID-19 measures within the college.

Two separate complaints were received this quarter in regards to the COVID-19 measures in place and promoted by college staff. The Head of Health, Safety and Security met with the college onsite security management team to discuss diplomacy when interacting with people on campus. All relevant staff have been reminded to convey COVID-19 compliance messages in a respectful way.

Improving key communication

A complaint was received following an incident at one of the NESCol campuses. The parties involved were not clear on the follow-up actions taken by the college. The Director clarified the process and the role of the college. Staff have since worked on clarifying the related policy to allow for clearer communication of college responsibilities in the future.

4. Further Education Complaints Performance Indicators – Definitions

The following definitions for stage 1, stage 2, and escalated should be consistently applied throughout all indicators.

Stage 1

This means those responded to at stage 1 (frontline resolution). This does not include those escalated from stage 1 to stage 2. These will be counted in the escalated complaints. This includes those where the extended timeline (i.e. + additional 5 working days) was used.

Stage 2

This means those responded to at stage 2 (investigation). This includes those where the extended timeline (i.e. + additional 20 working days) was used.

This refers to those complaints considered directly at stage 2 for the following reasons:

- * straight away by complainant (this refers to customers who did not wish to be dealt with at stage 1 and wished to go straight to stage 2)
- * straight away by the College, or within a day or so after due consideration (i.e. College recognised complex, serious, high risk nature of the complaint and felt it was not suitable to be considered at stage 1)

Escalated

This means those escalated from stage 1 to stage 2.

This refers to those complaints where the complainant remains dissatisfied with the outcome of the frontline resolution and have requested that their case be escalated to stage 2 for investigation.

This includes those complaints where escalation was required because frontline resolution timescales were not met (i.e. 11 working days or more). Therefore automatic escalation rules apply.

Population

This figure will represent the total student population. For example the number of matriculated students at an agreed date.

The College, when reporting on the complaints handling KPIs for each quarter adheres to the above definitions to ensure consistency and accuracy.

5. Complaints Handling Key Performance Indicators – Quarter 2

COMPLAINTS HANDLING PROCEDURE INDICATORS		Q1	
Total no. of complaints received & complaints received per 100 population	No.	%	
Number of complaints Received	9	100.0%	
College Population and Number of Complaints received per 100 population	13507	0.1%	
Number of complaints closed at each stage and as a % of all complaints closed	No.	%	
Number of complaints closed at Stage 1 and % of total closed	9	100.0%	
Number of complaints closed at Stage 2 and % of total closed	0	0%	
Number of complaints closed after Escalation and % of total closed	0	0%	
Open	0	0%	
Number of complaints upheld, partially upheld and not upheld at each stage and as a % of complaints closed at that stage			
Stage 1	No.	%	
Number and % of complaints upheld at Stage 1	3	33.3%	
Number and % of complaints partially upheld at Stage 1	4	44.4%	
Number and % of complaints not upheld at Stage 1	2	22.2%	
Number and % of complaints resolved at Stage 1	0	0%	
Stage 2	No.	%	
Number and % of complaints upheld at Stage 2	0	0.0%	
Number and % of complaints partially upheld at Stage 2	0	0.0%	
Number and % of complaints not upheld at Stage 2	0	0.0%	
Number and % of complaints resolved at Stage 2	0	0.0%	
Escalated	No.	%	
Number and % of complaints upheld after Escalation	0	0.0%	
Number and % of complaints partially upheld after Escalation	0	0.0%	
Number and % of complaints not upheld after Escalation	0	0.0%	
Number and % of complaints resolved at Stage Escalation	0	0.0%	
Total working days and average time in working days to close complaints at each stage	No.	%	
Total working days and average time in working days to close complaints at Stage 1	36	4.0	
Total working days and average time in working days to close complaints at Stage 2	0	0.0	
Total working days and average time in working days to close complaints after Escalation	0	0.0	
Number and % of complaints closed within set timescales (S1=5 workings days; S2=20 working days ; Escalated = 20 working days)	No.	%	
No. and % of Stage 1 complaints closed within 5 working days	9	100.0%	
No. and % of Stage 1 complaints not closed with 5 working days	0	0.0%	
No. and % of Stage 2 complaints closed within 20 working days	N/A	N/A	
No. and % of Stage 2 complaints not closed within 20 working days	N/A	N/A	
No. and % of Escalated complaints closed within 20 working days	N/A	N/A	
No. and % of Escalated complaints not closed within 20 working days	N/A	N/A	

6. Escalation and Extension Rationale

In this quarter, there were no occasions where an extension or escalation was required.

7. Complaints Handling Feedback Questionnaire

Following the receipt of a response to their complaint, complainants are sent a complaints handling questionnaire so they can indicate their satisfaction with the different components of the complaints process.

This is monitored on a regular basis and the quality team reviews feedback received in relation to the handling process. This can influence future practice and alterations to the procedure followed.