

Review of compliance

Elizabeth Finn Homes Limited Hampden House	
Region:	Yorkshire & Humberside
Location address:	120 Duchy Road Harrogate North Yorkshire HG1 2HE
Type of service:	Care home service with nursing
Date of Publication:	March 2012
Overview of the service:	Hampden House is owned by Elizabeth Finn Care, and run by Elizabeth Finn Homes. It is a purpose built care home registered to accommodate a maximum of 66 service users. It has recently been extensively refurbished providing en-suite facilities for all bedrooms and refurbished communal areas. It is situated in a quiet residential area on the outskirts of Harrogate, has well kept, attractive garden grounds, and is a short

	walk from open green spaces.
--	------------------------------

Summary of our findings for the essential standards of quality and safety

Our current overall judgement

Hampden House was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety.

The summary below describes why we carried out this review, what we found and any action required.

Why we carried out this review

We carried out this review as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews.

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, observed how people were being cared for, looked at records of people who use services, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

People we spoke with told us they were very happy at Hampden House. Some told us they first entered the service as respite clients and then decided to stay. They told us they were impressed with the care and support they received from the staff and that they felt very safe and comfortable at the home

One person commented 'I'm fairly independent, but the staff know what help I need. They sit and talk with me about the care I need, I find them very courteous and polite'. Another said, 'I'm highly satisfied. The staff have made me feel so welcome and comfortable'.

Others told us "the staff are very caring and remember how you like to be cared for, they listen to what you want." "Staff genuinely care if you are unhappy with everything and want to put it right"

People also told us how pleased they were about the refurbishment and how good the home now looked.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Hampden House was meeting them

Outcome 01: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run

People give their consent to treatment and their rights and dignity were respected. Overall, we found that Hampden house was meeting the essential standard.

Outcome 04: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights

People living at the home receive safe and good quality care that meets their needs and protects their rights. Overall, we found that Hampden House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights

People living in the home were protected and kept safe from abuse. Overall, we found that Hampden House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 12: People should be cared for by staff who are properly qualified and able to do their job

Recruitment systems at the home ensured that people living at the home were supported by safely appointed staff. Overall, we found that Hampden House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care

There were good systems in place to monitor the quality of service that people receive. Overall, we found that Hampden House was meeting this essential standard.

Other information

Please see previous reports for more information about previous reviews.

**What we found
for each essential standard of quality
and safety we reviewed**

The following pages detail our findings and our regulatory judgement for each essential standard and outcome that we reviewed, linked to specific regulated activities where appropriate.

We will have reached one of the following judgements for each essential standard.

Compliant means that people who use services are experiencing the outcomes relating to the essential standard.

A **minor concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard.

A **moderate concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and there is an impact on their health and wellbeing because of this.

A **major concern** means that people who use services are not experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and are not protected from unsafe or inappropriate care, treatment and support.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary improvements are made. Where there are a number of concerns, we may look at them together to decide the level of action to take.

More information about each of the outcomes can be found in the *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*

Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- * Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
- * Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
- * Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
- * Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We talked to people about their experiences moving into the home. They told us that they had visited the service before they had moved in to make sure the home was right for them. They also said that the manager had met with them and asked them about the care they needed and how they would prefer to be supported with their care needs.

People confirmed that they decided their daily routines, when they got up, went to bed and what they wanted to do for the day; they told us that the home was a very relaxed and friendly place to live in.

People were very positive about the recent changes to the home and how much the environment had improved, one person said, "The staff have all worked so hard changing rooms around, making sure we were comfortable and safe". We talked with people about their bedrooms and they told us that they decided what they wanted to have in their rooms such as their own furniture, ornaments, pictures and other favourite possessions, this helped people feel it was their own space and home.

Everyone we spoke to felt that they were encouraged to have a say in how they home was run and that their opinions were respected.

Other evidence

The staff told us that they knew people well; they knew about people's likes and dislikes and told us how they supported an individual to follow their preferred daily routine. Staff told us that they all have training in specialist areas such as dementia; this helps them support people with their individual needs and enable them to live their daily lives as independently as possible.

We saw that the care records included a pre-admission assessment. This was before any decision was made about people moving in. This was to make sure that individual needs could be fully met by this service.

Care plans were kept both electronically and in people's rooms. We reviewed some care plans. The care plans contained detailed information about peoples care and support needs and addressed equality and diversity. We saw that where people were able they were involved in the decision making within their care plans.

Our judgement

People give their consent to treatment and their rights and dignity were respected. Overall, we found that Hampden house was meeting the essential standard.

Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People, who were able, confirmed that the staff treat them with respect and felt confident in the support they received.

People also told us that they felt that their individuality was respected and their spiritual and cultural needs were met.

We were shown the variety of activities on offer and that there were opportunities to pursue individual hobbies and interests. We saw a large book of forthcoming activities displayed in the home. People told us that there were regular activities organised in the home such as; poetry reading, daily crosswords, quizzes, art group, music and cinema nights with their new television projector. They also had a variety of visiting entertainers and regular church services were held in the home. There was an activities organiser employed by the home, but the people who live at the home were proactive in organising activities and coming up with new ideas. One individual explained that during the resident meetings they flag up new ideas and activities for the next season to be added to the list.

Other evidence

We looked at the care documents; these confirmed that individuals had their own assessments and care plans relating to their needs. The care plans were individualised, detailed and contained all the information staff would need to make sure that people were supported to meet their needs in the way they preferred.

We saw that individual risk assessments were in place. These risk assessments demonstrated that the home takes into account risks to people's safety and welfare whilst providing care and support. However we did find that some risk assessments were not being updated regularly, the home's own audit had acknowledged this and the management were taking action to remedy this omission.

Care plans also showed that other health care professionals, such as speech therapists, and GP's were involved in meeting the health care needs of people living at the home and that their recommendations were put into practice.

Throughout the day we observed good interaction between people living at the home and the staff. People were observed being relaxed and comfortable both in their own rooms and in the communal areas throughout the home.

We joined people for lunch and observed how people were supported through the meal time. Staff were acting in a respectful manner, addressing people by their chosen names and offering help as required. Lunch was a positive and social event, with people discussing items of interest amongst their tables. Wine was served with lunch as well as water and fruit juice. This was a 'restaurant', experience with people choosing from the menus on the table and staff taking their orders at the meal time.

Our judgement

People living at the home receive safe and good quality care that meets their needs and protects their rights. Overall, we found that Hampden House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are respected and upheld.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People said that staff would listen to them if they were unhappy with anything and help sort out their problems. People also told us they felt comfortable in talking to the staff and felt if they had any concerns they were confident they would be responded to quickly.

Other evidence

We spoke to staff about the procedures in place for making sure that people who live at the home were safeguarded from abuse. The staff told us that they had completed safeguarding training whilst working at the home. The training records also confirmed that all staff had completed training in safeguarding.

Staff told us the action they would take if they had concerns, staff were clear about the action they should take in line with their own organisational guidance. This was important to ensure that everyone was aware of their roles and responsibilities regarding the protection of vulnerable adults and the need to report potential incidents of abuse.

The clinical manager told us the service had clear procedures which staff followed in practice to ensure people who used the service were protected. Also each person was given a copy of the service users' guide which contained information on safeguarding people living at the service.

The management had recently made a safeguarding alert to the local authority and fully

cooperated with the investigation to ensure that people are kept safe from harm.

We saw that people seemed comfortable and relaxed with staff and their surroundings and staff treated people with consideration and respect.

Our judgement

People living in the home were protected and kept safe from abuse. Overall, we found that Hampden House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 12: Requirements relating to workers

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by staff who are fit, appropriately qualified and are physically and mentally able to do their job.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 12: Requirements relating to workers

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People did not comment on this outcome.

Other evidence

We talked to staff who told us that they had been interviewed for their present job at the home and that references and checks had been completed before they began work at the home.

We looked at the staff files to see how they had been recruited to work at the home. We looked at the staff who had recently started work at the home. The records were complete and included application form, interview report, CRB (Criminal Records Bureau) check, identification, terms and conditions and training certificates.

Staff also confirmed that they had completed induction training. We saw the induction records and these were completed. The manager told us that each member of the staff team initially works alongside an experienced member of staff. This was important to make sure that people were consistently well cared for.

Our judgement

Recruitment systems at the home ensured that people living at the home were supported by safely appointed staff. Overall, we found that Hampden House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support, due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People told us that they were happy with the home and would speak to the staff or the management if they had any concerns.

Other evidence

People told us that their key worker and other staff had spoken to them individually about their choices and preferences in the home. They also told us that they had resident's meeting every few months at the home and that they had the opportunity to express their opinions and confirmed that follow up action was taken.

People explained that they were consulted about their care and that they were asked if they were happy with the service.

We saw that the home sends out questionnaires to people who use the service, relatives, staff and other stakeholders in order to gain information about how people view the service and what improvements they would like to see.

Staff told us they felt comfortable in raising any issues with the management of the home and were also clear about their own responsibilities. Staff also told us that they have regular meetings to discuss any issues within the home.

We looked at care, staff and health & safety records and found that they were completed and up to date.

We also saw completed safety audits and observed that the fire systems had been regularly tested. We also looked at the gas safety certificate and found that this was up to date. The food standards agency had also visited the home and awarded five stars which is the maximum the home could achieve.

We looked at the quality monitoring systems that the home had in place during our visit. The manager told us that they regularly audited all areas of the home, including care records, falls and accidents, medication and the health and safety of the home. A representative of the provider also visited the home regularly and conducted and reviewed the care at the home. In addition to this other audits were undertaken by financial and health & safety services. The pharmacist also conducted their own inspection of the home.

Our judgement

There were good systems in place to monitor the quality of service that people receive. Overall, we found that Hampden House was meeting this essential standard.

What is a review of compliance?

By law, providers of certain adult social care and health care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has written guidance about what people who use services should experience when providers are meeting essential standards, called *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*.

CQC licenses services if they meet essential standards and will constantly monitor whether they continue to do so. We formally review services when we receive information that is of concern and as a result decide we need to check whether a service is still meeting one or more of the essential standards. We also formally review them at least every two years to check whether a service is meeting all of the essential standards in each of their locations. Our reviews include checking all available information and intelligence we hold about a provider. We may seek further information by contacting people who use services, public representative groups and organisations such as other regulators. We may also ask for further information from the provider and carry out a visit with direct observations of care.

When making our judgements about whether services are meeting essential standards, we decide whether we need to take further regulatory action. This might include discussions with the provider about how they could improve. We only use this approach where issues can be resolved quickly, easily and where there is no immediate risk of serious harm to people.

Where we have concerns that providers are not meeting essential standards, or where we judge that they are not going to keep meeting them, we may also set improvement actions or compliance actions, or take enforcement action:

Improvement actions: These are actions a provider should take so that they **maintain** continuous compliance with essential standards. Where a provider is complying with essential standards, but we are concerned that they will not be able to maintain this, we ask them to send us a report describing the improvements they will make to enable them to do so.

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. Where a provider is not meeting the essential standards but people are not at immediate risk of serious harm, we ask them to send us a report that says what they will do to make sure they comply. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action to make sure that essential standards are met.

Enforcement action: These are actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers are set out in the law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

Information for the reader

Document purpose	Review of compliance report
Author	Care Quality Commission
Audience	The general public
Further copies from	03000 616161 / www.cqc.org.uk
Copyright	Copyright © (2010) Care Quality Commission (CQC). This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part, free of charge, in any format or medium provided that it is not used for commercial gain. This consent is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and on proviso that it is not used in a derogatory manner or misleading context. The material should be acknowledged as CQC copyright, with the title and date of publication of the document specified.

Care Quality Commission

Website	www.cqc.org.uk
Telephone	03000 616161
Email address	enquiries@cqc.org.uk
Postal address	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA