

Review of compliance

<p>St John's Winchester Charity St. John's Almshouses</p>	
<p>Region:</p>	<p>South East</p>
<p>Location address:</p>	<p>32 St Johns South High Street Winchester Hampshire SO23 9LN</p>
<p>Type of service:</p>	<p>Extra Care housing services</p>
<p>Date of Publication:</p>	<p>June 2012</p>
<p>Overview of the service:</p>	<p>St John's Winchester Charity provides accommodation at the St John's Almshouses for 90-100 people who can live independently. Accommodation comprises 76 apartments or houses, located in the centre of Winchester in buildings on three sites. The service was registered with the Care Quality Commission in February 2012, to provide personal care only. About 10%</p>

	of people living at the service require support with their personal care.
--	---

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

Our current overall judgement

St. John's Almshouses was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety inspected.

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, carried out a visit on 25 May 2012, looked at records of people who use services, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

When we visited we talked with five people using the service. They all told us they were very satisfied with the service provided. People said, "I wouldn't want to live anywhere else" and they told us that care workers and nurses were "always nice, and knocked on the door or rang the bell before entering". People also said that if they were needed anything, staff were very quick to respond to calls, and always very helpful. We were told by everyone we spoke with that they felt very safe and that they were treated with dignity and respect. People understood the care they received and appreciated the support provided by the staff and by the organisation. They told us that there were a range of social activities offered, such as a weekly lunch club.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well St. John's Almshouses 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's privacy, dignity and independence were respected.

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

People experienced care and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse, because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening.

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

There were effective recruitment and selection processes in place and people were cared for and supported by suitably qualified staff.

The provider was meeting this 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

The provider had an effective system in place to identify, assess and manage risks to the health, safety and welfare of people using the service and others.

The provider was meeting this 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.

Where we judge that a provider is non-compliant with a standard, we make a judgement about whether the impact on people who use the service (or others) is minor, moderate or major:

A minor impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had an impact on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The impact was not significant and the matter could be managed or resolved quickly.

A moderate impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had a significant effect on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The matter may need to be resolved quickly.

A major impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had a serious current or long term impact on their health, safety and welfare, or there was a risk of this happening. The matter needs to be resolved quickly.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary changes are made.

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

When we visited we spoke with five people using the service.

People said that care workers and nurses were "always nice, and knocked on the door or rang the bell before entering". People also said that if they were needed anything, staff were very quick to respond to calls, and always very helpful. We were told by everyone we spoke with that they were treated with dignity and respect. We were told that the service enabled people to maintain their independence and have access to social and religious events.

Other evidence

We spoke with staff and looked at documentation relating to people's care. People living at the almshouses were living independently, but the service provided assistance if people needed prompting to take their medication or assistance with their personal care. Some people received additional support with their personal care from contracted domiciliary care agents. We looked at care plans for two people who needed support with their personal care. The care plans demonstrated that people's choices were taken into account because they included people's preferences regarding their care and their activities. Where people had care plans, they were kept in people's accommodation, so they could review them whenever they wished. People's skills at living independently were recorded.

The staff we spoke with understood how to treat people with respect and we observed that staff always rang people's door bells before entering their accommodation. We were also told that they would close doors and curtains before providing personal care.

The registered manager of the service outlined how the service supported people as their health deteriorated, and respected their decisions about how to end their lives. People expressed their views and were involved in making decisions about their care.

When we visited we found that St John's Winchester Charity had its own chapel. The services were taken regularly by the charity's own chaplain, who also provided pastoral support to the residents. Although there was a strong Christian focus, there was no required religious affiliation for people using the service. People had access to a range of community activities provided or facilitated by the service. Peoples' diversity, values and human rights were respected.

Our judgement

People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected.

The provider was meeting this 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

When we visited we spoke with five people who used the service. People told us that the staff were always kind and helped them with any care they needed. One person commented that assistance with personal care was provided regularly, and at agreed times. People valued the fact that care staff were available at any time day or night. They said staff attended promptly if there was an emergency, and assisted people in obtaining medical advice. People said, "I wouldn't want to live anywhere else" and "we are all very well looked after".

Other evidence

When we visited we talked with staff and looked at the care plans for two people who had assistance with their personal care. We also looked at other documentation relating to people's day to day care, and talked to staff.

We found that care plans summarised people's needs and how to minimise any risks to their health. The plans included guidance for staff about how to deliver care that met people's needs. The care plans were kept in people's accommodation and included their signed consent for personal care as well as details about their preferences regarding their care. There was also information about each person's health and any care or treatment they required. We saw that records were kept of the care provided by staff, both personal care and assistance with medication. We found that care was delivered in a way that met the assessed needs of people using the service.

The registered manager of the service told us that everyone who lived on their own had agreed to receive a telephone call each morning, so they could advise staff if they had concerns or needed any assistance. Those who lived as couples were called once a week. Staff also made social calls to everyone each week. As well as providing social support, these visits enabled staff to explore any health issues that may have arisen. Staff said they identified any changes in people's health quickly, and liaised with health services if further support was required. We saw from care plans that these were reviewed and updated to reflect changes in people's needs.

We saw newsletters and posters about social and religious events provided by the service. For instance, the charity had its own chapel and chaplain, and on the day of our visit, the chapel was holding a memorial service. On the notice board, we saw that social clubs had been established for a wide range of interests, including cards, scrabble and knitting. There was also an internet café. The monthly newsletter contained information about events such as the weekly lunch club, singing club and day trips. It also contained puzzles, news and reminiscence articles. In this way, the service, provided opportunities to support people's social and psychological welfare.

One member of staff we spoke with outlined how they had responded to a recent emergency in the night, having been called by a person using the service using their call system. Arrangements were in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies.

Our judgement

People experienced care and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

The provider was meeting this 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

When we visited we talked with five people at the service. Everyone said they felt very safe and were treated with respect. One person said, "I don't think you could find a better place".

Other evidence

During our visit, we observed that people were relaxed and comfortable with staff and that staff were always respectful with people living at the service.

We looked at documents and talked with two members of staff and found that safeguarding was taken seriously. There had not been any safeguarding referrals in the past two years, but staff had an understanding of how to protect vulnerable adults from abuse. Training records confirmed that all staff had attended safeguarding of vulnerable adult training in the 2011, apart from one new staff member who was booked onto a course. The registered manager of the service had attended Hampshire County Council's course for managers, and other staff had been trained by the charity's own trainer. This training had included training in the Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. We found that people who used the service were protected from the risk of abuse, because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening.

Our judgement

People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse, because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent

abuse from happening.

The provider was meeting this 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

When we spoke with people living at the service, they all said that staff were caring. One person said, "Everyone is so caring, you couldn't improve it here. Everyone is so nice". People told us that staff were skilled and well trained. They also said that people in the office were very helpful.

Other evidence

When we visited we spoke with staff and looked at staff files and the service's recruitment policy.

From the three staff files we reviewed we saw that appropriate information was sought when recruiting new staff and appropriate checks were undertaken before staff began work. The applicant's identity was checked, and an enhanced criminal record certificate was obtained for all new staff before they started work. We saw that applicants completed detailed application forms, which summarised their experience and employment history. In each case we saw that at least two references had been sought. The service had retained evidence of interviews on file, and we saw that effective recruitment and selection processes in place. We found that evidence of a medical assessment was missing from one file. When asked, this person could recall having completed a medical health assessment.

Our judgement

There were effective recruitment and selection processes in place and people were cared for and supported by suitably qualified staff.

The provider was meeting this 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

When we visited, we spoke with five people living at the service. They said that they would feel confident to make a comment or complaint, but that they had no cause to complain about the care provided by the service. One person commented about the service, saying there was, "No need for any improvement".

Other evidence

When we visited we looked at how the service monitored the quality of service provision.

We saw that the service had developed a template questionnaire to issue to people receiving personal care. This had been designed to gain feedback from people about staff skills, the quality of care and their views about whether their care plan was a true reflection of their needs. This questionnaire had not been issued and was still being refined at the time of our visit.

We saw that there had been no complaints about the service, but that they had received many complimentary cards. We saw that care plan folders included the service's complaints procedure, should people wish to make a complaint.

Staff were familiar with recording accidents and incidents, and we saw that details of such events were noted so that action could be taken to reduce the risks of these recurring. None of these incidents or accidents however related to people living at the home. There was a separate log of people's falls, however, and a falls risk assessment

for each person. We saw that the service logged trends and the registered manager outlined how they facilitated referrals to the falls clinic when people needed this additional support. Other incidents, relating to people living at the service, were recorded in their daily logs and highlighted in the handover diary. We were shown an example of where action was taken to seek a review of someone's medication, following an incident. This showed that appropriate actions or changes in care were implemented as a result of incidents or accidents.

Minutes of the April 2012 staff meeting summarised the results of monthly medication audits, following the implementation of new medication administration records. The minutes stated that there were very few errors on these records. This showed that audits were carried out to ensure that procedural changes were implemented effectively.

We were also told that the service had recently experienced some short-term failures of the call system, and this was being monitored to determine the cause and frequency of the fault. We were told that the trustees would consider replacing the system, if it were found to be unstable. This showed that learning from incidents took place and appropriate changes were implemented.

During the visit, we spoke with the registered manager and nominated individual about their plans to set up systems for internally monitoring and reporting on, the overall quality of service provision. The nominated individual was already carrying out monitoring visits to two other services provided by St John's Winchester Charity, and was setting up a new system of visits, appropriate to this service.

Our judgement

The provider had an effective system in place to identify, assess and manage risks to the health, safety and welfare of people using the service and others.

The provider was meeting this 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.

Where we judge that providers are not meeting essential standards, we may set compliance actions or take enforcement action:

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. 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