

OSFC

Statistical Report

1 July 2015 to 30 September 2015



Contents

Chapter	Page
Purpose of Statistical Report and How to Use It	3
District and Regional comparisons:	
Falls	5
Lisburn	8
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	11
Antrim	14
Armagh	17
foyle	20
Appendix 1:	
Quality of decisions	23
Issues handled correctly	24
CCG Substitutions	25
CL Substitutions	26
CCG – Breakdown of Issues	27-33
CL – Breakdown of Issues	34-40
Appendix 2 - Time to process:	
CCG & BL – Time to process	41
Appendix 3 – OSFC Contacts	42

Purpose of Statistical Report and How to Use It

Why are the reports produced?

This Report is intended to help Social Fund Managers identify trends and issues in their District. The information in the report can therefore be used to help improve decision making and customer service. The report contains information relating to performance based on data collected by the Office of the Social Fund Commissioner (“OSFC”) through our casework.

Who produces the reports?

The report is prepared by the OSFC. If you would like to raise an issue or if you want more information please contact OSFC on 0808 127 0417 or by e-mail at sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk.

How often are reports issued?

A Statistical Report is produced every 3 months. This report covers the period 1 July 2015 to 30 September 2015.

How to interpret the information about the quality of decision making

An Inspector’s review has one of three outcomes, to:

- **confirm** the Reviewing Officer’s decision. The confirmation rate is the percentage of decisions where the outcome remained the same;
- **substitute** a new decision with a different outcome; or
- **refer back** the matter to the Reviewing Officer.

The Inspector also records whether the Reviewing Officer handled the decision correctly in law. This is irrespective of the outcome, so that a:

- confirmed decision could have been handled wrongly in law
- correctly made decision could be substituted (e.g. on new information)

The “correct rate” is the percentage of decisions in which all the crucial issues are handled correctly. A low “correct rate” therefore suggests a need for technical training.

It is also important to examine the relationship between “confirmations” and “correct rates”. If the confirmation rate is lower than the correct rate this indicates new information frequently came out at the Inspector stage. Could this information have been obtained earlier?

Alternatively, if the confirmation rate is higher than the correct rate, training may be required.

How to focus training in the right areas

This Report provides a further breakdown of the decisions so that it is possible to focus training and development in the right areas.

- Firstly, by showing the reasons for substituting a community care grant or crisis loan. It is possible for there to be more than one reason. This includes the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.
- Secondly, by detailing why Inspectors concluded Reviewing Officer’s decisions were not handled correctly.

The top section of the breakdown of issues table shows the number of decisions where the Inspector concluded that the Reviewing Officer’s decision was incorrect (i.e. Direction 1 error). If there was an error, the reason could have been a rationality error, a natural justice error, a law error, or a combination of the above. If the error was a law error, further details are provided. The table therefore shows the frequency of an error, which can be compared to the frequency across the region.

How to use the tables on time to process

The time to process tables provide information on performance against:

- Reviewing Officer process time – 10 days (CCGs & BLs). This is the time from receipt of the request for review, to the date of the Reviewing Officer's decision; and
- Cases received within 4 days. This is the time from when an applicant asked for an independent review and papers were requested from the SSA, to the day the case papers arrived at the OSFC.

Comments on Statistical Report

OSFC welcomes comments from District Managers on any aspect of the statistical information provided, including suggestions as to how you feel this Statistical Report may be improved. Your comments should be sent to the office manager at sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk

Falls District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Falls
% decisions confirmed	53.1%	57.9%
% decisions handled correctly	62.4%	57.9%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Falls. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 42.1% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 42.4%.

	Region	Falls
Incorrect	49.0%	62.5%

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Falls
New Information	51.0%	37.5%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Falls
SFI invoked Direction 49	4.8%	12.5%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in an above average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Falls
Direction 4 - Qualification	26 (12.9%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	4 (22.2%)
Inquisitorial role	19 (90.5%)	Inquisitorial role	2 (100%)
Priority	16 (42.1%)	Direction 7	1 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Direction 7 – the law was incorrectly applied by, for example, failing to consider a previous application for the same item within the relevant time period, or for refusing an item which had not been requested on a previous application within the relevant time period.

Time to process

	Region	Falls
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.3%	57.9%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Falls
% decisions confirmed	77.1%	68.8%
% decisions handled correctly	78.3%	56.3%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Falls. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 31.3% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 20.2%.

	Region	Falls
Incorrect	65.7%	80.0%

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Falls
New information	22.9%	0.0%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Falls
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Falls
Direction 3 - Qualification	20 (14.1%)	Natural justice	5 (100%)
Natural justice	13 (86.7%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	3 (30.0%)
Other issues	3 (75.0%)	Inquisitorial role	1 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Lisburn District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	53.1%	60.6%
% decisions handled correctly	62.4%	45.5%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Lisburn. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 33.3% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 42.4%.

	Region	Lisburn
Incorrect	49.0%	72.7%

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Lisburn
New Information	51.0%	27.3%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Lisburn
SFI invoked Direction 49	4.8%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Lisburn
Direction 4 - Qualification	26 (12.9%)	Inquisitorial role	6 (85.7%)
Inquisitorial role	19 (90.5%)	Natural justice	3 (100%)
Priority	16 (42.1%)	Priority	3 (50.0%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Time to process

	Region	Lisburn
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.3%	100%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	77.1%	84.6%
% decisions handled correctly	78.3%	73.1%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Lisburn. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 11.5% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 20.2%.

	Region	Lisburn
Incorrect	65.7%	100%

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Lisburn
New information	22.9%	33.3%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Lisburn
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Lisburn
Direction 3 - Qualification	20 (14.1%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	4 (21.1%)
Natural justice	13 (86.7%)	Natural justice	3 (100%)
Other issues	3 (75.0%)	Other issues	1 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Knockbreda & Downpatrick District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
% decisions confirmed	53.1%	40.6%
% decisions handled correctly	62.4%	53.1%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Knockbreda & Downpatrick. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 59.4% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 42.4%.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
Incorrect	49.0%	57.9%

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
New Information	51.0%	42.1%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
SFI invoked Direction 49	4.8%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
Direction 4 - Qualification	26 (12.9%)	Priority	4 (57.1%)

Inquisitorial role	19 (90.5%)	Inquisitorial role	3 (100%)
Priority	16 (42.1%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	3 (12.0%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.

Time to process

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.3%	80.6%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
% decisions confirmed	77.1%	83.3%
% decisions handled correctly	78.3%	75.0%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Knockbreda & Downpatrick. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 16.7% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 20.2%.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
Incorrect	65.7%	66.7%

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
New information	22.9%	33.3%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
Direction 3 - Qualification	20 (14.1%)	Natural justice	3 (100%)
Natural justice	13 (86.7%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	3 (10.7%)
Other issues	3 (75.0%)	Facts or evidence	1 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Facts or Evidence – in other words the Reviewing Officer did not use facts or evidence before them appropriately. For example the decision is not one supportable on the evidence before the Reviewing Officer, or a relevant fact was ignored
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Antrim District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Antrim
% decisions confirmed	53.1%	54.3%
% decisions handled correctly	62.4%	65.7%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Antrim. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 37.1% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 42.4%.

	Region	Antrim
Incorrect	49.0%	53.8%

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Antrim
New Information	51.0%	46.2%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Antrim
SFI invoked Direction 49	4.8%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Antrim
Direction 4 - Qualification	26 (12.9%)	Priority	3 (50.0%)
Inquisitorial role	19 (90.5%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	3 (10.3%)
Priority	16 (42.1%)	Inquisitorial role	1 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.

Time to process

	Region	Antrim
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.3%	95.1%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Antrim
% decisions confirmed	77.1%	68.0%
% decisions handled correctly	78.3%	84.0%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Antrim. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 21.7% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 20.2%.

	Region	Antrim
Incorrect	65.7%	60.0%

A below average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Antrim
New information	22.9%	40.0%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Antrim
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Antrim
Direction 3 - Qualification	20 (14.1%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	2 (9.5%)
Natural justice	13 (86.7%)	Exclusions	1 (100%)
Other issues	3 (75.0%)	Natural justice	1 (33.3%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Exclusions – in other words an award has been made for an item which is excluded by the directions, or where an item has been incorrectly excluded (e.g. where too wide an interpretation of an exclusion has been applied).
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Armagh District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Armagh
% decisions confirmed	53.1%	54.4%
% decisions handled correctly	62.4%	77.2%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Armagh. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 40.5% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 42.4%.

	Region	Armagh
Incorrect	49.0%	25.0%

A below average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Armagh
New Information	51.0%	75.0%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Armagh
SFI invoked Direction 49	4.8%	12.5%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in an above average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Armagh
Direction 4 - Qualification	26 (12.9%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	6 (8.5%)
Inquisitorial role	19 (90.5%)	Inquisitorial role	3 (75.0%)
Priority	16 (42.1%)	Priority	2 (22.2%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.

Time to process

	Region	Armagh
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.3%	78.8%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Armagh
% decisions confirmed	77.1%	73.9%
% decisions handled correctly	78.3%	84.8%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Armagh. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 23.9% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 20.2%.

	Region	Armagh
Incorrect	65.7%	54.5%

A below average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Armagh
New information	22.9%	9.1%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Armagh
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Armagh
Direction 3 - Qualification	20 (14.1%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	5 (12.2%)
Natural justice	13 (86.7%)	Other issues	1 (100%)
Other issues	3 (75.0%)		

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

foyle District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	foyle
% decisions confirmed	53.1%	51.1%
% decisions handled correctly	62.4%	55.3%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from foyle. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 44.7% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 42.4%.

	Region	foyle
Incorrect	49.0%	57.1%

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	foyle
New Information	51.0%	42.9%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	foyle
SFI invoked Direction 49	4.8%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	foyle
Direction 4 - Qualification	26 (12.9%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	8 (20.5%)
Inquisitorial role	19 (90.5%)	Inquisitorial role	4 (100%)
Priority	16 (42.1%)	Priority	4 (40.0%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.

Time to process

	Region	foyle
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.3%	95.9%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	foyle
% decisions confirmed	77.1%	80.8%
% decisions handled correctly	78.3%	84.6%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from foyle. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 19.2% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 20.2%.

	Region	foyle
Incorrect	65.7%	60.0%

A below average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	foyle
New information	22.9%	40.0%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	foyle
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	foyle
Direction 3 - Qualification	20 (14.1%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	3 (13.0%)
Natural justice	13 (86.7%)	Inquisitorial role	1 (100%)
Other issues	3 (75.0%)	Natural justice	1 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Appendix 1

Quality of Decisions

DISTRICT	Total Decisions			CCG Confirmed			CL Confirmed			BL Confirmed		
	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%
Antrim	61	37	60.7%	35	19	54.3%	25	17	68.0%	1	1	100.0%
Armagh	125	77	61.6%	79	43	54.4%	46	34	73.9%	0	0	0.0%
Falls Road	36	22	61.1%	19	11	57.9%	16	11	68.8%	1	0	0.0%
Foyle	77	46	59.7%	47	24	51.1%	26	21	80.8%	4	1	25.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	69	44	63.8%	32	13	40.6%	36	30	83.3%	1	1	100.0%
Lisburn	62	42	67.7%	33	20	60.6%	26	22	84.6%	3	0	0.0%
Total	430	268	62.3%	245	130	53.1%	175	135	77.1%	10	3	30.0%

Issues Handled Correctly

District	Total Decisions			CCG Correct			CL Correct			BL Correct		
	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%
Antrim	61	46	75.4%	35	23	65.7%	25	21	84.0%	1	1	100.0%
Armagh	125	103	82.4%	79	61	77.2%	46	39	84.8%	0	0	#DIV/0!
Falls Road	36	20	55.6%	19	11	57.9%	16	9	56.3%	1	0	0.0%
Foyle	77	49	63.6%	47	26	55.3%	26	22	84.6%	4	0	0.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	69	45	65.2%	32	17	53.1%	36	27	75.0%	1	1	100.0%
Lisburn	62	36	58.1%	33	15	45.5%	26	19	73.1%	3	0	0.0%
Total	430	299	69.5%	245	153	62.4%	175	137	78.3%	10	2	20.0%

CCG Substitutions

District	Total Substituted			Substituted Incorrect		New Information (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)		SFI Invoked Dir 49 (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)	
	Total	Substituted	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Antrim	35	13	37.1%	7	53.8%	6	46.2%	0	0.0%
Armagh	79	32	40.5%	8	25.0%	24	75.0%	4	12.5%
Falls Road	19	8	42.1%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%
Foyle	47	21	44.7%	12	57.1%	9	42.9%	0	0.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	32	19	59.4%	11	57.9%	8	42.1%	0	0.0%
Lisburn	33	11	33.3%	8	72.7%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
Total	245	104	42.4%	51	49.0%	53	51.0%	5	4.8%

CL Substitutions

District	Total Substituted			Substituted Incorrect		New Information (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)		SFI Invoked Dir 49 (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)	
	Total	Substituted	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Antrim	23	5	21.7%	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
Armagh	46	11	23.9%	6	54.5%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%
Falls Road	16	5	31.3%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Foyle	26	5	19.2%	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	36	6	16.7%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%
Lisburn	26	3	11.5%	3	100.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
Total	173	35	20.2%	23	65.7%	8	22.9%	0	0.0%

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Northern Ireland

	Total					
Number of decisions	245					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	80	32.7%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	5	1.4%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	202	55.0%	176	87.1%	26	12.9%
Other Issues	7	1.9%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
Eligibility	11	3.0%	10	90.9%	1	9.1%
Inquisitorial Role	21	5.7%	2	9.5%	19	90.5%
Direction 7	5	1.4%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%
Exclusions	9	2.5%	3	33.3%	6	66.7%
Priority	38	10.4%	22	57.9%	16	42.1%
Amount of Award	2	0.5%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Natural Justice	8	2.2%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Direction 49	59	16.1%	55	93.2%	4	6.8%
	367		273	74.4%	94	25.6%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Falls

	Total					
Number of decisions	19					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	8	42.1%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	18	60.0%	14	77.8%	4	22.2%
Other Issues	1	3.3%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	2	6.7%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	5	16.7%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
	30		19	63.3%	11	36.7%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Lisburn

	Total					
Number of decisions	33					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	15	45.5%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	20	42.6%	18	90.0%	2	10.0%
Other Issues	2	4.3%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Eligibility	1	2.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	7	14.9%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	3	6.4%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Priority	6	12.8%	3	50.0%	3	50.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	6.4%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 49	3	6.4%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
	47		28	59.6%	19	40.4%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Knockbreda & Downpatrick

	Total					
Number of decisions	32					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	15	46.9%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	25	46.3%	22	88.0%	3	12.0%
Other Issues	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	3	5.6%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	3	5.6%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 7	2	3.7%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Exclusions	2	3.7%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Priority	7	13.0%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
Amount of Award	1	1.9%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	8	14.8%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%
	54		37	68.5%	17	31.5%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Antrim

	Total					
Number of decisions	35					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	9	25.7%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	29	61.7%	26	89.7%	3	10.3%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	2	4.3%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	2.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	6	12.8%	3	50.0%	3	50.0%
Amount of Award	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Natural Justice	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	6	12.8%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
	47		37	78.7%	10	21.3%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Armagh

	Total					
Number of decisions	79					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	14	17.7%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	71	61.7%	65	91.5%	6	8.5%
Other Issues	2	1.7%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Eligibility	2	1.7%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	4	3.5%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
Direction 7	2	1.7%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Exclusions	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	9	7.8%	7	77.8%	2	22.2%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	24	20.9%	23	95.8%	1	4.2%
	115		100	87.0%	15	13.0%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Foyle

	Total					
Number of decisions	47					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	19	40.4%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	39	52.7%	31	79.5%	8	20.5%
Other Issues	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	3	4.1%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Inquisitorial Role	4	5.4%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	1.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	10	13.5%	6	60.0%	4	40.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	2	2.7%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 49	13	17.6%	12	92.3%	1	7.7%
	74		52	70.3%	22	29.7%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Northern Ireland

	Total					
Number of decisions	175					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	37	21.1%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	3	1.5%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	142	72.8%	122	85.9%	20	14.1%
Other Issues	4	2.1%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
Eligibility	22	11.3%	21	95.5%	1	4.5%
Inquisitorial Role	2	1.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	3	1.5%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	2	1.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	1	0.5%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	15	7.7%	2	13.3%	13	86.7%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	195		152	77.9%	43	22.1%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Falls

	Total					
Number of decisions	16					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	7	43.8%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	10	50.0%	7	70.0%	3	30.0%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	3	15.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	1	5.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	5	25.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	20		11	55.0%	9	45.0%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Lisburn

	Total					
Number of decisions	26					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	7	26.9%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	2	6.9%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	19	65.5%	15	78.9%	4	21.1%
Other Issues	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	3	10.3%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	3.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	10.3%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	29		20	69.0%	9	31.0%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Knockbreda & Downpatrick

	Total					
Number of decisions	36					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	9	25.0%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	28	66.7%	25	89.3%	3	10.7%
Other Issues	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	7	16.7%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	1	2.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	7.1%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	42		32	76.2%	10	23.8%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Antrim

	Total					
Number of decisions	25					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	4	16.0%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	21	70.0%	19	90.5%	2	9.5%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	5	16.7%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	10.0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	30		26	86.7%	4	13.3%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Armagh

	Total					
Number of decisions	46					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	6	13.0%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	41	87.2%	36	87.8%	5	12.2%
Other Issues	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	3	6.4%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	1	2.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	1	2.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	47		41	87.2%	6	12.8%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Foyle

	Total					
Number of decisions	26					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	4	15.4%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	23	85.2%	20	87.0%	3	13.0%
Other Issues	1	4.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	1	3.7%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	27		22	81.5%	5	18.5%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Appendix 2 - Time to process

CCG & BL - Time to Process

District	CCG				BL				Combined CCG & BL						
	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		Avg time taken (days)	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		Avg time taken (days)	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		3rd Stage (request to papers rec'd)		Combined Time	
		Within 10 days	%			Within 10 days	%			Within 10 days	%	Within 4 days	%	Within 14 days	%
Antrim	41	39	95.1%	5.3	1	1	100.0%	4	42	40	95.2%	36	85.7%	39	92.9%
Armagh	80	63	78.8%	8	0	0	0.0%	0	80	63	78.8%	74	92.5%	68	85.0%
Falls Road	19	11	57.9%	8.9	1	1	100.0%	4	20	12	60.0%	18	90.0%	16	80.0%
Foyle	49	47	95.9%	7.7	4	4	100.0%	3	53	51	96.2%	50	94.3%	51	96.2%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	31	25	80.6%	7.6	1	1	100.0%	2	32	26	81.3%	32	100.0%	29	90.6%
Lisburn	35	35	100.0%	4.2	3	3	100.0%	2	38	38	100.0%	37	97.4%	38	100.0%
Total	255	220	86.3%	7	10	10	100.0%	2.5	265	230	86.8%	247	93.2%	241	90.9%

Appendix 3 – OSFC contacts

Social Fund Commissioner	Mr Walter Rader OBE <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
Statistical Reports	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
Casework (for progress, information before the Inspector’s decision)	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
(for queries, complaints after the Inspector’s decision)	08081270417 <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
Leaflets and Publications	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
OSFC website (contains a range of information and support including, quarterly and annual statistics reports, Corporate Plans and Annual Reports)	www.osfcni.org.uk