

Service Model Policy and Guidance: Review and Feedback Guidance 7.0

Contents

Our review and feedback process	5
Positive feedback	6
Complaints about our service	6
Handling a service complaint before it is referred to the Review and Feedback Team	7
Complaints about our decision	8
Timescales for receiving review requests	9
The Review and Feedback Team consideration of the case	11
Completing a review of a decision.....	12
Remedy	12
Compensation for our poor service	13
Opening a new assessment/investigation.....	13
Issuing an amended version of a decision or report.....	13
Quashing of reports or decisions	14
Communicating the decision	15
Approving review decisions	15
Completing the complaints process	15
Follow up contact regarding decision or service complaint	15
Insight.....	16
Joint Working with the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman	17
Complaints about our service and the role of the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee (PACAC)	17
Feedback from MPs	18
General Feedback on PHSO	18
Risk Assessment	18
Feedback not for Review and Feedback Team.....	18
Casework assurance spreadsheet	19

Our review and feedback process

1. When someone is unhappy with the decision we have made on their case, or the service they have experienced, we expect them to initially raise their concerns with the original case owner, or if a service complaint, their manager. This is because the person who handled the case is normally best placed to resolve any concerns and answer questions about it.
2. We would usually expect the complainant to have raised any concerns with the original case owner or their manager within one month of the decision complained about.
3. If the original case owner is unable to resolve a complaint about our decision, the person or organisation complaining will be asked to complete a form or provide information that explains what they think was wrong in our decision-making. This will then be passed to the case owner's manager for consideration. Their manager will then decide what action needs to be taken on a case, including whether it can be resolved short of further consideration, whether a peer review is needed or whether it should be passed to the Review and Feedback Team.
4. The Review and Feedback Team handles complaints about our decisions and service when we consider this appropriate. They also handle positive feedback and gather insight and learning.
5. A review is not the same as looking at an assessment or investigation again. The caseworker (on the Review and Feedback Team¹) will instead be looking at whether anything went wrong, and if so, what impact it had on our decision. If we find we did something wrong, we will either look to put things right, or offer another form of remedy if we cannot do this. We will only review a case once, except in exceptional circumstances.
6. Our decisions are final and can only be challenged by Judicial Review. We recognise though that this is a technical and expensive process, so in rare circumstances the Review and Feedback Team can review a decision we have made on a case. There is no automatic right to a review, and a case needs to meet specific criteria in order for the Review and Feedback Team to be involved. We will not review a case just because someone is unhappy or disagrees with what we have done.

Cases that should be passed straight to the Legal Team

7. If a complaint about our decision includes a plausible threat of legal action, for example, a letter from a solicitor mentioning the issuing of proceedings, the feedback should first be passed to the Legal Team to consider. **(Policy**

¹ Please note that through-out this guidance the term caseworker is used to describe the person handling the case on the Review and Feedback Team, and not the original case owner.

requirement) We should not wait until a pre-action protocol has been received to seek their involvement.

8. The Legal Team will consider the contents of the feedback and will decide if it should be more appropriately addressed by them or the Review and Feedback Team. The Legal Team will let the Review and Feedback Team know whether they are keeping the feedback, and share the outcome if appropriate.

Positive feedback

9. All positive emails or notes of telephone calls should be forwarded to feedbackaboutus@ombudsman.org.uk. The Review and Feedback Team should arrange for the workflow team to create a feedback record on Dynamics. Similarly hard copy positive feedback should be scanned and sent to the same e-mail address. The Review and Feedback Team will also receive and record positive feedback received directly to the Team from those who have used our service.
10. The Review and Feedback Team may contact the person giving the feedback for more specific information about why using our service was a positive experience, to thank them for providing the feedback and to explain how we will use it.
11. The Review and Feedback Team should pass on feedback within PHSO as appropriate. This is to ensure that learning can be obtained from these positive experiences.

Complaints about our service

12. A service complaint can cover any dissatisfaction with the level of customer service we provide. For example, treating someone without courtesy or respect, causing unnecessary delays or not explaining our processes or decision clearly. These complaints can relate to any aspect of our service and anyone involved in the case, not just the original case owner.
13. Service complaints should usually be resolved by the case owner's manager. A complaint can be escalated straight to the Review and Feedback Team though if the circumstances of the case require it, for example the case is a priority or particularly high risk. A service complaint will not be subject to a review.
14. In exceptional cases, complaints will refer to our service but the feedback is essentially about our decision. The caseworker should identify whether that type of feedback should be treated as a complaint about our decision or about our service. **(Policy requirement)** If the outcome sought is ultimately a review or change to the decision, then the feedback is best suited to being looked at as a complaint about our decision.

Handling a service complaint before it is referred to the Review and Feedback Team

15. Complaints about the service being provided by an individual member of staff or team should be considered by or passed to the relevant case owner's manager. **(Policy requirement)**
16. The manager should attempt to resolve these concerns. **(Policy requirement)** This could involve apologising for a delay, arranging contact or showing how improvements will be made.
17. If the manager involved in the case is unable to resolve the complaint to the complainant's satisfaction, they should decide if this should be escalated or referred to Review and Feedback Team. **(Policy requirement)**
18. This could be because the case owner or manager considers the steps they have taken to resolve the complaint are reasonable, but the complainant is seeking further resolution or outcomes.
19. Any formal complaint received about the amount of time it is taking for a case to be allocated at any stage of the process should be passed to the Review and Feedback Team and not to the workflow or shared services teams.
20. The Review and Feedback Team will usually also consider service complaints that involve a number of members of staff or different stages of the process or when the complaint is closed.

How RaFT consider service complaints

21. Some service complaints can be resolved promptly and effectively at the initial point of contact. For example, where the individual complains about a delay in the allocation of the case and this is addressed by explanations or priority allocation. Or where a complaint is raised that the person has not had contact, the Review and Feedback Team should arrange that contact.
22. The caseworker should always look for the most effective and customer-focused way to resolve an issue. If the person complaining is satisfied with the resolution proposed at that early point of contact, then they should record the service complaint as resolved at the initial point of contact. **(Policy requirement)**
23. If the complaint cannot be satisfactorily resolved at the initial point of contact, the caseworker should consider what information is likely to be needed to carry out an analysis of the complaint, how this information will be obtained, and by when. The caseworker should ensure they have identified all the information needed to understand the complaint. If more evidence is needed later on, this should be requested. **(Policy requirements)**

24. The caseworker should complete an appropriate consideration of the complaint on Dynamics. **(Policy requirement)** This analysis should:
- explain why the person is unhappy with the service we have provided, how they have been affected and what they want as a remedy;
 - explain what evidence we have taken into account (we should usually speak to the staff member and to the person if necessary) and how we have considered their complaint;
 - consider whether the Service Model and Service Charter have been adhered to and if not, what impact this had on the person bringing the complaint to us.
 - explain what our proposed decision is (and whether we uphold/don't uphold), if we are recommending redress and how we are to explain this to the individual.
 - Suggest any possible learning from the feedback either on an individual or organisational basis, where appropriate.
25. If a service complaint is upheld, the caseworker should suggest an appropriate remedy to resolve the complaint. **(Policy requirement)** This could include further explanations, apologies, service improvements or a financial remedy.
26. The decision on a service complaint should be reviewed and agreed in line with the Review and Feedback Team Supervision Model. **(Policy requirement)**
27. The Review and Feedback Team should ensure appropriate learning points are passed on to the relevant person/area in line with the insight model set out later in this guidance. **(Policy requirement)**

Complaints about our decision

28. These are complaints about a decision we have reached usually following an assessment or investigation. This is usually the final decision that is given when the case is closed. However, it could sometimes be on an open case where we have decided not to investigate certain parts of the complaint, for example, because they are out of remit or out of time.

Case owner consideration of a complaint about our decision

29. The case owner should consider if they can resolve the complaint themselves. This will usually be by providing more information about how and why the decision was reached, or providing further clarity about our processes.
30. If following their intervention the complainant considers it resolved, the case owner should note this on the relevant case record. The complaint can then be considered closed.
31. If the case owner cannot resolve the case and considers there is not enough information for a review to take place, they should issue a review form to the

person complaining and ask for it to be returned to them. They should let the individual or organisation complaining know about the review process and our one month time limit for providing the information required. If appropriate, they should explain the information they would like the person complaining to provide.

32. When the case owner receives the form or if the case owner considers there is enough information for a review request consideration to take place, they should discuss the case with their manager who will set up a new feedback case on Dynamics 365.

33. The complaint should always be referred directly to the Review and Feedback Team for consideration when the case;

- Is medium or high risk
- Was opened following previous Review and Feedback Team review/involvement
- Is from a special interest MP or the MP is supporting the request or raising their own concerns about the decision
- Has been marked for assurance by the Ombudsman or their deputies

If the complaint meets any of these criteria, the caseworker should refer it to Review and Feedback Team by creating a task on Dynamics 365.

Timescales for receiving review requests

34. The complainant should contact the case owner within a month of the decision. If the caseworker then sends a review form out for the complainant to complete, the person then has one month to send it to us.

35. If a case falls outside of these time limits, the manager can decide the request is out of time to consider. This decision will usually be taken prior to deciding what action is required.

36. If a request is received outside of this time frame the manager should give the complainant making the request the opportunity to explain why if they have not already provided explanations. They should then consider the reasons provided in order to decide if this time limit should be put aside and the request still considered. **(Policy requirements)**

37. Decisions to set the time limit aside will be made on a case by case basis. Some reasons we may still consider it appropriate to consider a request outside of the time frame though may include;

- an illness or bereavement;
- where additional support was needed to help make the review request from an advocate or MP, particularly if this was a reasonable adjustment;
- problems obtaining relevant evidence essential to the review request;
- not being made aware sooner of the option of making a review request.

38. Where there is no reasonable explanation for the review request being received outside the time limit, the manager should seek approval from a peer manager to decline the case for review. **(Policy requirement)**

39. The manager or original case owner should contact the complainant requesting the review to explain why they will not be proceeding further. They should handle any concerns raised about this as a result. **(Policy requirements)**

Manager consideration of a complaint about our decision

40. Upon considering the time limit, the manager should decide if the information the person complaining has provided indicates something went wrong which would change their decision. They should use our review criteria to assist them in reaching their view. **(Policy requirement)**

41. Our review criteria include;

- We got facts wrong or made mistakes in our work which will make a difference to the decision in their case.
- They have new information or evidence that could change our decision
- We did not gather the right information/evidence.
- We did not understand what a complainant wanted us to look at or achieve.
- We missed out parts of the complaint which might change our decision.
- We incorrectly told them we could not look at their complaint.
- We did not make a fair decision based on all the relevant evidence.
- We did not follow our policy or guidance for considering complaints when coming to a decision, and that had an impact on whether our decision is correct.
- Any other reason the decision might be wrong.

42. Once the manager decides whether they would be likely to change their decision based on these criteria, they should take action as listed below.

When the decision should be changed

43. If the manager considers their decision would or might change they can decide to either handle it themselves, or refer the case to Review and Feedback Team.

44. A manager will usually handle a complaint themselves if it can be resolved by either providing further information or clarification, or if the decision is clearly wrong, and a further assessment will put the complaint right. For example, a decision a case is out of remit, when it isn't. They must be sure though, that it will be resolved to the person complaining's satisfaction.

45. If a manager makes a decision to handle a complaint themselves, they should record their analysis of the complaint, including the decision they have reached and their proposed outcome. They should then ensure the person complaining is

updated with the decision made. The feedback case can then be closed, and if applicable, a request for a new case should be sent to the main mailbox.

46. If the manager considers the case should be passed to the Review and Feedback Team instead, they should set a task on Dynamics 365 for the case to be accepted for consideration by the Review and Feedback Team. These will usually be cases where;
 - a. The complainant is not satisfied with the outcomes suggested.
 - b. The most suitable outcome is not one the manager can achieve within their delegated authority, for example; making a financial payment, quashing a report or decision, or re-opening an investigation.
 - c. The case is complicated, and the manager is unable to reach a view in a relatively short timeframe.

When the decision should not be changed

47. When the manager considers the decision they made on the case is correct, they should summarise the reasons why, and set a task in Dynamics 365 for workflow to allocate the complaint for a peer review by another manager.
48. The peer review manager should then review the original managers reasoning and decide if they agree the decision does not need to be changed.
49. If the peer review manager agrees the decision does not need changing, the peer review manager should confirm this on the feedback record, and let the manager know so they can close the case.
50. If the peer review manager considers the decision needs further consideration, or does need changing, they should discuss this with the manager. As a result of this discussion it should be decided that;
 - a. The manager's decision needs further consideration or changing, and either the case should be referred to the Review and Feedback Team to consider whether a review needs to be completed, or the manager can handle the complaint themselves.
 - b. The manager's decision does not require further consideration or changes, and the feedback case can be closed.
51. Following the outcome of the peer review request the manager should either close the case, or arrange for a task to be set on Dynamics 365 either to themselves, or to Review and Feedback Team. The outcome should be shared with the complainant and the decision should be recorded on Dynamics 365.

The Review and Feedback Team consideration of the case

52. All complaints about our decision(s) should be triaged, before allocation, to decide if the case is suitable for consideration by the Review and Feedback Team, or if further work needs to be completed by the manager.

53. If the decision is the complaint is suitable for the Review and Feedback Team they should accept it for further consideration, decide whether the case is suitable for a caseworker, or senior caseworker on the team, and add to their allocation queue.
54. If the decision is to send the case back to the manager for consideration, they should set a task on Dynamics 365 for the manager to complete further work. They should explain the reasons for this decision with the manager.

Completing a review of a decision

55. The caseworker reviewing the case must contact the complainant to introduce themselves and explain the review process. **(Policy requirement)**
56. The caseworker should record their review analysis on the Review and Feedback Team Decision Form and any relevant parts of the feedback case record. The caseworker should assure all relevant parts of the form are signed and agreed at the appropriate parts of the Review and Feedback Team Supervision Model. **(Policy requirements)**
57. An alternative approach can be taken if the circumstances of the case requires it, for example, the case is particularly complex. In these circumstances the caseworker should discuss how to approach the case with the Head of the Review and Feedback Team² and record the approach to be taken on Dynamics 365. **(Policy requirement)**

Remedy

58. If a caseworker considers a case should be upheld, their review analysis should include relevant consideration to an appropriate remedy and clearly explain what remedy, if any, is being proposed. **(Policy requirement)**
59. The caseworker should use our Principles for Remedy in determining what types of redress may be appropriate. **(Policy requirement)** The caseworker should also consider;
- the specific impact on the complainant;
 - if the remedy proposed is proportionate to the injustice sustained; and
 - Whether the payment will put the complainant back into the position they would have been in if not for the poor service.
60. The type of remedy will depend on the circumstances of the case, but may include an apology, the opening of a new case, or a financial remedy.

² All decisions listed in this document as requiring approval by the Head of the Review and Feedback Team can also be made by the Assistant Director, or above.

Compensation for our poor service

61. In cases where an injustice cannot be put right, we may consider making a financial payment. Any proposal that includes a payment for our poor service should be considered in line with our Principles for Remedy and checked for consistency using our [Typology of Injustice](#) and severity of injustice scale.
62. If a financial remedy is agreed then a referral should be made to the Assistant Director - Intake and Resolution and the Executive Director of Finance and Governance (if over £500) for authorisation in line with the Finance Code⁶. Once given, that authorisation should be attached to the case record. **(Policy requirements)**
63. The number and amount of such payments should be kept under review as part of the regular internal insight reporting.

Opening a new investigation

64. If, having carried out the review, the Review and Feedback Team considers that we got the investigation decision wrong, we can decide to open a new case and have the complaint looked at again, either fully or in part.
65. This should only happen in exceptional circumstances and will usually be because the evidence we have used was flawed, we were unfair in the way we undertook the investigation, or we have received new information which would have had a significant impact on the decision we would have made.
66. If a new investigation is proposed, the caseworker should write to the complainant and the organisation complained about to inform them of the proposal to open a new case. The caseworker should set out a summary of the complaint we propose to investigate. **(Policy requirement)** This will give them the opportunity to comment on the proposal. This must be agreed in line with the Delegation Scheme. **(Legal requirement)**
67. The caseworker should consider any comments in line with the Review and Feedback Team Supervision Model to decide if we should proceed with the proposal. If we do, a new case can be opened on Dynamics and send details of the case (and the case file if appropriate) to the Workflow Team explaining that it should be allocated as a priority. **(Policy requirements)**
68. All cases where a new investigation is recommended to be opened should be treated as a priority and the risk level should be reconsidered. **(Policy requirements)**

Issuing an amended version of a decision or report

69. If we have been told about minor issues in a report which would not have any impact on our decision, we may decide to send out amended versions. This will

only be for inconsequential mistakes, for example, a misspelt name or unimportant date.

Quashing of reports or decisions

70. In considering a suitable way to remedy a complaint about a decision, we can consider quashing our own report or decision. This means that we would treat the report as invalid (and we would make that clear to all affected parties).

71. We will only quash a report or decision we have made in exceptional circumstances given the strong public interest in certainty around our decisions. These circumstances are;

- We have missed significant material evidence which we should have considered, or significant new evidence has come to light, and/or;
- Our decision is incontrovertibly and significantly wrong for some other reason, and;
- There is no other way to resolve the matter, and;
- It is in the public interest for the report to be quashed, for example because the existence of the report and its findings are having a demonstrable adverse impact.

72. If the Review and Feedback Team consider a report or decision should be quashed, they must raise this request with the Legal Team. They should provide details to the Legal Team of the case and the reasons they believe it means the circumstances listed above. **(Policy requirements)**

73. The final decision to whether a report should be quashed can only be made by the Ombudsman, or their deputies. **(Policy requirement)**

74. Executive Office will have arrangements for monitoring the number of occasions where reports are quashed.

Timescales for completing review requests and applications for Judicial Review

75. On rare occasions an individual or organisation may make a request for the Review and Feedback Team to undertake a review, while also considering issuing Judicial Review proceedings against us.

76. If Review and Feedback Team accept a case they will aim to give a decision within 40 working days, however there may be occasions when a review takes longer than this, for example when a case is particularly complex.

77. We understand Judicial Review applications need to be submitted promptly and usually no later than three months of a decision being made. We therefore will not usually challenge an application made to the courts on the basis of delay² if we received an application for a review within our one month timescale, and we took more than three months to reach a decision³.

Communicating the decision

78. Caseworkers must prepare a letter to explain the review outcome.

This will be tailored to take account of the particular circumstances of the case. The review outcome letters must contain the following information: **(Policy requirements)**

- A clear statement of what the outcome of the review is and the reasons for the decision;
- If a complaint had been upheld, an apology and, where appropriate, an explanation of the specific action that PHSO will take (and by when) to provide a remedy;
- A clear statement of the learning we have gained from the complaint and how we will take that learning forward
- An explanation that once the review is completed this is the end of the complaints process and the only way to challenge the decision is by pursuing a Judicial Review.

79. The caseworker reviewing the case should inform the case owner (and their manager if the case was supervised) of the decision made on the review. **(Policy requirements)**

80. If it is identified that we could have done something better, either in the decision we have made or the service we have provided, the caseworker should provide feedback detailing the learning points from the review. If the caseworker identifies good practice in the review, this should also be highlighted and shared. **(Policy requirements)**

81. Once the learning and insight has been identified, this should be recorded on the feedback case and fed back to the relevant case owner's manager. **(Policy requirements)**

Approving review decisions

82. All review proposals and Review and Feedback Team responses should be made and agreed in line with the Review and Feedback Team Supervision Model and the Delegation Scheme. All decisions to open a new investigation following an upheld review must be shared and approved by the Ombudsman or Deputy Ombudsman. **(Policy requirements)**

Completing the complaints process

83. After we have completed a review or decided a review is not needed, the caseworker should inform the complainant in their review or review request decision letter that they have reached the end of our internal complaints process. **(Policy requirement)**

Follow up contact regarding decision or service complaint

84. After we have given the outcome of a complaint about our decision or service, the manager or the Review and Feedback Team may receive follow

up contact about this decision. We will usually only complete a consideration or a review of a case once.

85. The manager or RaFT caseworker should consider whether new evidence has come to light since the outcome; whether there is any indication we got something wrong in our consideration of the service or decision complaint or whether this is a repeat of the earlier complaint. **(Policy requirement)**
86. The manager or RaFT caseworker should be customer-focused and decide whether we can give any further explanation about our decision or there is anything further of value that can be added. If the correspondence suggests any flaws in work considered by the team then the manager or Head of the Review and Feedback Team should consider how best to address this. **(Policy requirement)**
87. If the correspondence adds nothing new to the case and there is nothing more that can be reasonably added, then a brief response should be sent or telephone call made explaining that we have reached the end of our internal complaints process and stating that we won't be taking any further action. A clear record on Dynamics 365 should be added showing what consideration has been given to any follow-up correspondence. **(Policy requirements)**

Insight

Good practice

88. When the Review and Feedback Team identifies good practice, at any stage of the process or for any type of feedback, they should share it in line with the [Feedback and learning Model](#). This should also be recorded as a learning point on the feedback case. **(Policy requirement)**
89. There is no definition of what we consider to be good practice, and this can incorporate any technique, method or process the case owner uses which produces good results, and therefore could be shared or applied more widely in our casework.
90. When sharing instances of good practice the Review and Feedback Team should provide details of the case and complaint and include the reasons why it was being shared.
91. The caseworker should capture any good practice on the decision form and in the Dynamics record. **(Policy requirement)**

Learning points

92. When the Review and Feedback Team identifies learning points on a case, either for the individual or wider organisation, they should share them in line with the [Feedback and Learning Model](#). The caseworker should record this in the decision form and in the Dynamics record. **(Policy requirement)**
93. Some examples of when sharing a learning point may be appropriate would be;
- A casework process has not been followed that already exists and we want to ensure the case owner is made aware of it.
 - When we don't have existing requirements in place in relation to an area of casework, but it may be beneficial.
 - The case owner has followed the Service Model, but a deviation would have been appropriate given the circumstances of the case. For example, a request for a reasonable adjustment.

Joint Working with the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman

94. Any joint decisions made by PHSO and the LGSCO are for the LGSCO not Review and Feedback Team to consider. If these are received, they should be directed to the Joint working Team to be considered in line with the LGSCO process. **(Policy requirement)**
95. There may be occasions when there is a complaint about what happened at PHSO before the joint working was agreed. These could be considered by Review and Feedback Team but only for actions or service before the joint working was agreed. It is advised to check with the joint working Team in those cases before Review and Feedback Team proceeds. **(Policy requirements)**

Complaints about our service and the role of the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee (PACAC)

96. It is sometimes the case that, after they have been through our review and feedback process, some of our complainants are still dissatisfied and want to complain further. Complainants can challenge our decisions through a Judicial Review. However, there is no organisation that can specifically look into an individual complaint about the service we provide.
97. PACAC monitors complaints about the Ombudsman as a way of scrutinising the work of the office and identifying systemic problems, but they will not consider individual cases. Complainants may submit details of their dissatisfaction to PACAC to inform their general scrutiny, but should not expect them to look into their complaint. Furthermore, it is not PACAC's role to act as a further appeal process for the cases that we consider. If a complainant still wants to contact PACAC after you have clarified their role, they should contact PACAC directly.

Feedback from MPs

98. If the office receive a course of business request from an MP or a member of their casework staff (a request for an update on the case for example), this should be dealt with by whoever receives the correspondence (Business Support Officer, caseworker etc.)
99. If an MP makes a complaint to us, then the original case owner or their manager should try to answer the complaint in the first instance. If that is not possible, then the complaint should be passed to the Review and Feedback Team. **(Policy requirements)**
100. If an MP makes a complaint to us, this should be taken into account when carrying out a risk assessment and documenting a mitigation plan. The case should also be added onto the casework assurance spreadsheet. **(Policy requirements)**

General Feedback on PHSO

101. Examples of this may include general feedback about our website or about one of our published reports. These may not always be from someone who has used our service. The caseworker should discuss these with the Head of Review and Feedback Team to decide who is best placed to respond.

Risk Assessment

102. Staff should be mindful of casework risk throughout their contact with a person providing feedback.
103. The [Service Model general guidance](#) says that a risk assessment should be carried out '*When we decide to do further work following a complaint about our service or decision*'. For more detail on the risk categories and how to carry out a formal risk assessment please refer to the [Service Model general guidance](#).

Feedback not for Review and Feedback Team

104. We sometimes receive feedback from individuals that is not for the Review and Feedback Team's consideration. Examples would include; complaints about the type of software we use; commercial contracts we may have; our office accommodation or issues relating to a public appearance the Ombudsman has made.
105. When received, these pieces of feedback should be forwarded to the relevant internal department, such as our Corporate Services or External Affairs and Insight directorates. **(Policy requirement)**

Casework assurance spreadsheet

106. Our [casework assurance process](#) sets out when a case needs to be passed to the Review and Feedback Team to share with the Chief Executive and/or Ombudsman for their oversight or approval.

107. The following case types should be considered under this process; **(Policy requirement)**

- Complaint about service or decision from, or supported by, an MP
- Correspondence from MP/organisation linked to wider stakeholder engagement in PHSO
- Correspondence from PACAC Chair or Health Select Committee Chair
- Post review or the Review and Feedback Team decision where the MP asks for the Ombudsman to respond.
- Concerns raised about personal conduct of a senior member of staff during handling of complaint.
- Correspondence that raises potentially significant systemic issues
- Correspondence that indicates potential legal challenge
- Potentially high profile case or possible media/social media interest
- Any new investigation that has arisen from an upheld review
- Correspondence from very vulnerable complainants.

108. If the Review and Feedback Team consider the case meets any of the criteria listed above, as well as the criteria for review, the case should be recorded onto the casework assurance spreadsheet. **(Policy requirement)** This will then be discussed with the Ombudsman, or their deputies, as appropriate.