

## SPSO decision report

**Case:** 201601367, University of Glasgow  
**Sector:** further and higher education  
**Subject:** complaints handling  
**Decision:** some upheld, recommendations

### Summary

Mr C made a number of complaints to us about the way the university had handled complaints he had made to them. He complained about the way in which the university had handled his complaint about two members of staff, but we found that the investigation into this matter had been reasonable and did not uphold this aspect of his complaint. He also said that the university had failed to investigate this complaint in the scheduled time. We found that many of the delays had been outwith the university's control and that, where extensions for the investigation to be completed had been sought, this had been done in line with the university's complaints procedure. On balance, we did not uphold this aspect of Mr C's complaint.

Mr C complained that the university had unreasonably stated that he was unwilling to accept a proposed solution. He also complained that they had unreasonably consulted with a member of staff about whom he had complained. We found that it had been reasonable for the university to state that he was not willing to accept a proposed solution and that there was nothing to prevent the member of staff from being involved in his complaint. We did not uphold these aspects of Mr C's complaint. Mr C complained that the university had erroneously blocked him from registering for classes because there was a marker on his record that he was going through conduct proceedings. We upheld this aspect of Mr C's complaint and found that the university had already apologised to him for this.

Mr C complained to us that the university had failed to investigate complaints about both the student conduct committee and the university senate. We found that the responses issued to Mr C about these issues had been reasonable and we did not uphold these aspects of his complaint. Mr C also complained about the actions of a member of staff at the university. Although the member of staff had referred to the wrong sections of the university's complaints procedure in responses to Mr C, we found that this had been due to human error and found no evidence that the member of staff had intentionally mislead him. There was no evidence that the member of staff had bullied or harassed Mr C or had forced him to withdraw his complaints. We did not uphold this aspect of Mr C's complaint. Mr C complained that the university did not have a clear procedure for appointing a complaints investigator. We found that the action that they had taken in Mr C's case had been reasonable and we did not uphold this aspect of his complaint.

### Recommendations

What we said should change to put things right in future:

- The university should ensure that students are not erroneously blocked from registering for classes because of service indicators against their name.

We have asked the organisation to provide us with evidence that they have implemented the recommendations we have made on this case by the deadline we set.