

Review of compliance

Mrs Audrey Zeane Redmore Redstacks	
Region:	Yorkshire & Humberside
Location address:	36 Heads Lane Hessle East Riding of Yorkshire HU13 0JH
Type of service:	Care home service without nursing
Date of Publication:	May 2012
Overview of the service:	Redstacks is a privately owned care home registered to an individual. The home is a large house set in its own grounds in a residential area of Hessle and has been extended to provide accommodation for 14 older people who may have memory impairment. Communal accommodation consists of two lounges and one dining room. Private accommodation consists of 12 single bedrooms and one shared

	<p>bedroom. The garden provides a safe environment and is easily accessible. There is parking for five cars.</p>
--	--

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

Our current overall judgement

Redstacks was not meeting one or more essential standards. Action is needed.

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 26 April 2012, observed how people were being cared for, looked at records of people who use services, talked to staff, reviewed information from stakeholders and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

We carried out this inspection as part of our routine reviews of the service and also to check on some outstanding compliance actions from the last inspection, the improvement plan for which had not yet expired.

We spoke with three people that used the service and with two relatives visiting on the day of our visit.

People that used the service told us they were satisfied with the care they received, that they had good relationships with the staff and that their needs were well met.

The visitors told us they thought their relatives were settled and safe. They praised the staff and commented that the activities being carried out were a welcome distraction and a pleasure to be involved in.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Redstacks 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

Peoples' 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 11: People should be safe from harm from unsafe or unsuitable equipment

People were protected from unsafe or unsuitable equipment. 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

People were cared for or supported by suitably qualified, skilled and experienced staff. The provider was meeting this standard.

Outcome 14: Staff should be properly trained and supervised, and have the chance to develop and improve their skills

People were cared for by staff who were supported to deliver care and treatment safely and to an appropriate standard. 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 a system in place to identify, assess and manage risks to the health, safety and welfare of people using the service and others.

Outcome 24: Services must be managed by people who are honest, reliable and trustworthy. They must also have the right skills, experience and qualifications to do the job

People had their needs met because the home had been managed by an appropriate person. 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

We spoke with people that used the service and they told us they were given choices in their daily lives. These included when to rise, what to wear, eat and do, and when to go to bed or rest.

One person said that due to their circumstances there was little they could do in respect of activity, but that they were supported in their care and health care by the staff.

People said their privacy and dignity was respected when staff supported them with personal care and they understood that confidentiality was maintained with respect to their personal information.

Other evidence

We spoke with the staff about the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and respecting peoples' rights. We also looked at staff training records.

Staff told us they had completed some MCA e-learning training supplied by East Riding of Yorkshire Council. They told us how they offered people choices and encouraged them to make decisions.

Staff said they would talk to members of the management team about MCA issues and would expect the team to manage any referrals for capacity assessments and decisions, as they did not deal with these concerns.

We were told there had been no Deprivation of Liberty Safeguard referrals as these had not been needed so far.

Staff had improved their practice for offering choices since the last inspection and we saw and heard people being asked before support was provided, so people in the home were making choices and were being respected.

People expressed their views and were involved in making decisions about their care.

Our judgement

Peoples' 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

People we spoke with and two relatives told us they were well cared for and their health care needs were assessed and monitored.

One person told us they and a few of the ladies in the home did not like what was on the television and discussion followed until a consensus was agreed. People expressed their views freely and made requests of the staff regarding their personal care needs.

Other evidence

We spoke with the staff about supporting people with their care and health needs and we looked at two case files to track how needs were met.

Staff told us how they supported people with their care needs and they demonstrated good understanding individuals' needs and presented a caring nature. They also showed us they knew peoples' personalities and preferences.

Case files contained documentation in the form of assessments of need, care plans and risk assessments, which showed peoples' needs had been assessed and planned for.

There was also evidence of the support that had been given to people in the form of diary notes and monitoring charts, as well as records of health care professional visits and reviews of care plans.

This told us that people could be assured staff had the information to ensure their needs would be met.

Peoples' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered in line with their individual care plans.

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

We spoke with people who used the service, but their feedback did not relate to this outcome.

Other evidence

We spoke with the staff about safeguarding people from abuse and we looked at the staff training records and the policy on safeguarding.

Staff demonstrated an understanding of the safeguarding adults' procedures and referral system. They also knew about signs and types of abuse, so people were protected from the risks of being harmed.

They told us they had completed some e-learning training on abuse and had been given copies of leaflets explaining about the East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Safeguarding Adults' Team, including how to contact them. We saw these leaflets. We also saw that the training record evidenced when the e-learning training had been completed.

The provider was asked during our visit to arrange some safeguarding training for staff to attend. They had been unable to confirm this before we left but had arranged for two senior staff to attend the ERYC's safeguarding awareness course in June 2012 a few days later.

There had been one referral to ERYC Safeguarding Adults' Team in the last few

weeks, which had been investigated, but not upheld.

People that 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 11: Safety, availability and suitability of equipment

What the outcome says

This is what people should expect.

People who use services and people who work in or visit the premises:

- * Are not at risk of harm from unsafe or unsuitable equipment (medical and non-medical equipment, furnishings or fittings).
- * Benefit from equipment that is comfortable and meets their needs.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 11: Safety, availability and suitability of equipment

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We spoke with people who used the service, but their feedback did not relate to this outcome.

Other evidence

We spoke with the staff about using mobility equipment in the home and we looked at some equipment maintenance records.

Equipment in the home included a passenger lift, a lifting hoist, a bath hoist and a stair lift. Most people used the passenger lift to access the upper floor.

Staff told us that only one person used the lifting hoist and only occasionally. Since the last inspection this person had been re-assessed for using the hoist and it had been determined that it was appropriate for them, as they had found it uncomfortable and they had said so at the last inspection.

We were told that no one ever used the lifting equipment without a risk assessment being in place and an assessment carried out to determine it was the right equipment for them.

The passenger lift, lifting hoist, bath hoist and stair lift had all been serviced on a contract in March 2012. We were told the stair lift was never used because people preferred and used the passenger lift.

Improvements had been made for the person using the lifting hoist so that they experienced safe and appropriate support with their mobility.

We saw that a Health and Safety inspection had been carried out in December 2011. A risk assessment had been required for an unguarded radiator in one of the bedrooms and for a rug with a curled corner in the entrance hall. These had been attended to.

We were informed that staff had completed training in the use of lifting equipment.

People were protected from unsafe or unsuitable equipment because the provider had ensured people had been assessed for its use and staff had been trained in operating it.

Our judgement

People were protected from unsafe or unsuitable equipment. 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

We spoke with people who used the service, but their feedback did not relate to this outcome.

Other evidence

We spoke with the staff about recruitment and we looked at recruitment files for the two most recently employed staff to determine if they had been security checked before they started working in the home.

We were told there had been no new staff since February 2012 and that the most recent recruits had been employed following the recruitment procedure. Their files contained evidence of Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks having been received before they started working in the home.

Other aspects of their recruitment were not looked at, because these had been satisfactory at the last inspection and only CRB checks had been a problem then.

There were recruitment and selection processes in place that had been followed, so that people were protected from being cared for by staff that were unfit to do the job.

Our judgement

People were cared for or supported by suitably qualified, skilled and experienced staff. The provider was meeting this standard.

Outcome 14: Supporting staff

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 competent staff.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 14: Supporting staff

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We spoke with people who used the service, but their feedback did not relate to this outcome.

Other evidence

We spoke with the provider and the staff about staff training opportunities and we looked at training records.

Staff told us they had completed some training by watching a DVD and answering a questionnaire or by working through computerised courses, in areas that covered safeguarding adults from harm, infection control, the Mental Capacity Act and Health and Safety. Staff had also been trained in moving and handling, use of the lifting hoist, fire safety and administration of medication by attending training courses.

The management team had arranged for two staff to attend the next East Riding of Yorkshire Council safeguarding awareness course in June 2012.

We saw that an Environmental Health Officer (EHO) visit had been carried out in January 2012 and systems in respect of food safety had been assessed as satisfactory. The only recommendation that had been made was for the provider to consider completing the 'Safer Food Better Business' diary as supplied by the EHO.

Staff received appropriate professional development so that people were confident they were being looked after by competent staff.

Our judgement

People were cared for by staff who were supported to deliver care and treatment safely and to an appropriate standard. 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

We spoke with people who used the service, but their feedback did not relate to this outcome.

Other evidence

We spoke with the provider and the staff about quality assuring the service and we looked at documents relating to the quality monitoring system.

The provider and staff told us that the quality assurance system had been brought up to date recently. It included a planned series of monthly audits on areas relating to care, staffing, entertainment and 'resident' meetings. It also involved sending out surveys to people that used the service, their relatives and the staff, as well as taking information from the complaint and accident records.

We saw that the monthly audit checks for 2010 and 2011 covered fire safety, personal care, laundry, infection control measures, care plans, home and equipment maintenance, key working and continence care.

The provider may find it useful to note that all of the information gathered throughout the year, or a quality assurance cycle, had not been collated to show where the service performance had been successful and where performance was identified as needing to improve.

People that used the service, their representatives and staff were asked for their views

about their care and they were acted on.

Our judgement

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

Outcome 24: Requirements relating to registered managers

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Have their needs met because it is managed by an appropriate person.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 24: Requirements relating to registered managers

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We spoke with people who used the service, but their feedback did not relate to this outcome.

Other evidence

We spoke with the provider about the service still having no registered manager in post.

We understood that a definite decision had been reached in respect of who was to be the registered manager of the service. An application for this person had already been sent the Care Quality Commission (CQC), but had been rejected as the forms used had been incorrect.

The person had checked with the CQC regarding the becoming the registered manager for two separate registered providers, but within the same family group of services. This had been approved and so the person concerned had arranged for a new Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) check to be carried out in order to submit the correct registered manager application.

Because the provider had shown willing to submit a registered manager application and had already tried to do so, but had been unsuccessful in this, the CQC deemed the provider to be compliant with this outcome. The new application must be submitted as soon as the CRB check has been received.

Our judgement

People had their needs met because the home had been managed by an appropriate

person. 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