

Review of compliance

Ms B A Clarke
Cartmel Old Grammar

Region:	North West
Location address:	Cartmel Old Grammar Cartmel Grange-over-Sands Cumbria LA11 7SG
Type of service:	Care home service without nursing Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care
Date the review was completed:	30 September 2011
Overview of the service:	<p>Cartmel Old Grammar provides accommodation and personal care for up to 23 older people. The home is owned by Ms Beverley Clarke, who is also the registered manager of the service.</p> <p>Cartmel Old Grammar is situated just outside the village of Cartmel, overlooking the</p>

	<p>racecourse and within walking distance of the Priory and the centre of the village. It is a large two-storey building that has been refurbished and extended. The home provides 23 bedrooms, all of which have an ensuite bathroom with a toilet, wash hand basin and bathing facilities. It is set in large well-kept gardens which have seating areas and there are car parking facilities at the front of the building. Accommodation is on two floors and the home has a passenger lift to access the accommodation on the first floor. There is a spacious entrance hall, sitting room and dining room which provide a choice of communal areas for the people living in the home to use.</p> <p>While we were carrying out this review we were told that Ms Clarke's bank had placed the service under the control of Law of Property Act receivers who were authorised to make all decisions about the home.</p> <p>We were told Ms Clarke had left the service in June 2011 and the Law of Property Act receivers had engaged Goldcare Future Management Limited to oversee the management of the home on a day-to-day basis.</p>
--	--

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

What we found overall

We found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety we reviewed.

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

Why we carried out this review

We started this review on 17 March 2011 as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews. While we were carrying out the review we were told about a number of concerns about how the service at Cartmel Old Grammar had been provided so we extended the review so we could be sure people living in the home were safe. We continued to work with other agencies to ensure the services provided at Cartmel Old Grammar met the Essentials standards of quality and safety, (the Essential standards), and people living in the home received appropriate and safe care.

How we carried out this review

When we started this review we looked at all the information we held about this service including information we had received from other agencies.

We asked Ms Beverley Clarke, the owner and registered manager of the service, to provide us with detailed information about how the service was meeting certain outcomes by completing self assessment forms. The self assessment forms were not returned to us by the date we had asked so we brought forward the date of our visit to the service.

While we were planning our visit to the home we were told about a number of allegations which raised concerns that people living at the home may not have been receiving safe care which protected their rights. We passed these concerns to the local safeguarding authority and worked with them to investigate the allegations.

We visited the service on 14 April 2011 and talked to people living there, to people visiting the home, to staff working in the home and to Ms Clarke.

After our visit we continued to gather further information by speaking to other agencies and services which had contact with the home and by taking part in safeguarding meetings which were held to look into the allegations we had been told about.

At our visit to Cartmel Old Grammar on 14 April 2011 and from information given during safeguarding meetings afterwards, we found that the service had not been meeting four of the Essential standards while Ms Clarke had been managing the home.

In May 2011 we issued a draft Review of Compliance Report to Ms Clarke. In the draft Review of Compliance Report we made four improvement actions and asked Ms Clarke to provide us with a report showing the improvements she would put in place to ensure the services provided at Cartmel Old Grammar met the Essential standards. We asked Ms Clarke to return her report to us within fourteen days of her receiving the draft Review of Compliance Report. Ms Clarke did not provide us with a report showing how she would ensure the Essential standards were being met at the service.

In June 2011 we were told that Ms Clarke's bank had appointed Law of Property Act receivers to take control of the bank's interest in Cartmel Old Grammar. The Law of Property Act receivers were given authority by Ms Clarke's bank to make all decisions about the future of the service and were responsible for ensuring the payment of bills and staff wages and for overseeing required improvements to the premises. The Law of Property Act receivers engaged Goldcare Future Management Limited to administer the management of the service on their behalf.

Ms Clarke left Cartmel Old Grammar in June 2011 and Goldcare Future Management Limited placed a manager in the home to oversee the day-to-day provision of the service.

The manager placed in the home by Goldcare Future Management Limited found further evidence that the Essential standards of quality and safety had not been complied with while Ms Clarke was managing the home. A large amount of medication had been stored in an unlocked cupboard in an unlocked room which could be accessed by people living in the home.

Due to the additional evidence that Cartmel Old Grammar had not been managed in a manner which protected people living in the home we extended our review of the service.

We discussed the concerns which we had identified at our visit to the home in April 2011 and the improvement actions we had made in our draft Review of Compliance Report with the manager engaged by Goldcare Future Management Limited. We were assured improvements had been made in the service to ensure people were receiving a safe service which met their needs and protected their rights.

We carried out another visit to the home on 8 July 2011 to check the improvements which we had been assured were in place. At this visit we found the service was meeting the Essential standards of quality and safety and people living in the home were receiving safe care.

The overall judgements in this report on how the service was meeting the Essential standards are based on the evidence we gathered during our second visit to the home.

Where we found evidence that the Essential standards had not been met while Ms Beverley Clarke was carrying on and managing the home we have discussed this under the appropriate outcomes.

What people told us

At both of our visits to the service people living in the home and their families told us they were happy with the services provided at Cartmel Old Grammar. People living in the home said they enjoyed the food provided and had no complaints about the service.

People we spoke to in the home said,

“I am looked after very well”

“I like it here”

“It’s very nice”

“It’s good value for money”

We observed that people living in the home who had limited verbal communication were comfortable with the staff who supported them. Care staff were able to communicate with all the people living in the home.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting them

Outcome 1: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run

People living at Cartmel Old Grammar were treated with respect and they and their families were included in decisions about the care they received.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 2: Before people are given any examination, care, treatment or support, they should be asked if they agree to it

People agreed to the support they received and the decisions they made were respected.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 4: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights

People received the care they needed in a manner which protected their privacy and promoted their independence.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 5: Food and drink should meet people's individual dietary needs

People received food and drink which met their needs and which they enjoyed.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 6: People should get safe and coordinated care when they move between different services

People received the care they needed because the staff at Cartmel Old Grammar worked well with other services which supported them.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 7: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights

People living at Cartmel Old Grammar were protected from the risk of abuse and their rights were respected.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 8: People should be cared for in a clean environment and protected from the risk of infection

People were provided with a comfortable and clean environment to live in and were protected from the risk of infection.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 9: People should be given the medicines they need when they need them, and in a safe way

People living in Cartmel Old Grammar received the medication they needed in a safe way.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 10: People should be cared for in safe and accessible surroundings that support their health and welfare

People lived in a safe and comfortable home which was suitable to meet their needs.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

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

People received the support they needed and were protected when using equipment in the home.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

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

People living in the home were protected by the service using robust procedures when recruiting new staff.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 13: There should be enough members of staff to keep people safe and meet their health and welfare needs

People received the care they needed because there were enough staff employed in the home with the right skills and experience.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential 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 knew the assistance they needed and who were trained and competent to provide the support they required.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar 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

Effective management helped ensure that people received safe care which met their needs.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 17: People should have their complaints listened to and acted on properly

People living in the home and their families knew they could raise concerns about the service and that their complaints would be listened to and acted on.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 21: People's personal records, including medical records, should be accurate and kept safe and confidential

Personal information about people living in the home was kept securely to ensure their confidentiality was protected.

- Overall, we found that Cartmel Old Grammar was meeting this essential standard.

Action we have asked the service to take

At our visit to the service on 8 July 2011 we found all the Essential standards of quality and safety which we looked at were being met.

Other information

Where we have concerns we have a range of enforcement powers we can use to protect the safety and welfare of people who use this service. Any regulatory decision that CQC takes is open to challenge by a registered person through a variety of internal and external appeal processes. We will publish a further report on any action we have taken.

We will continue to monitor this service to ensure people continue to receive safe and effective care which meets their needs and protects their rights.

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 1: 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 1: Respecting and involving people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People living in the home told us they were well cared for and happy living there. We observed that people who had limited verbal communication were given choices about the support they received and the decisions they made were respected by staff in the home.

Other evidence
We reviewed the information we hold about this service, including information we had received from other agencies.

While we were carrying out this review we received information which suggested that people had not always received care in a dignified way and choice was not always offered.

During our visits to the home we spent time observing the care practices of staff and how they interacted with people. We saw that care staff were knowledgeable about the needs of the people living in the home and how they liked their care to be

provided.

We observed that people were given choices about their lives, including where they spent their time and the meals and drinks they took.

The staff in the home treated people with respect and gave them support in a manner which respected their privacy and independence. People were discreetly asked if they needed to use the toilet and were given the assistance they needed to do so. Care staff knocked on the doors to toilets before opening them and ensured the doors were closed when people were using the bathrooms.

During our first visit to the home we saw that one person was very anxious and confused at lunchtime. The staff in the home quietly gave reassurance in an area away from other people and helped this person to become more settled and comfortable before they were assisted to go into the dining room for lunch.

Care staff were patient when supporting people and gave them the time they needed to remain as independent as possible.

We looked at the records held about some of the people living in the home. These showed that people living in the home and their families had been included in discussing and agreeing the care to be provided to them.

At both of our visits we found that the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People living at Cartmel Old Grammar were treated with respect and they and their families were included in decisions about the care they received.

Outcome 2: Consent to care and treatment

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- Where they are able, give valid consent to the examination, care, treatment and support they receive.
- Understand and know how to change any decisions about examination, care, treatment and support that has been previously agreed.
- Can be confident that their human rights are respected and taken into account.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 2: Consent to care and treatment

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People living in the home told us they were well looked after and liked living at Cartmel Old Grammar.

Other evidence
We saw that care staff asked for people’s agreement before they provided care to them and only gave the support individuals had agreed to. Where people refused care this was respected by the care staff in the home.

People were given time to make decisions about their care and the options available to them were discussed in a manner which they could understand.

A number of people living in the home had dementia and may have required additional support to give consent to or to refuse care. The care records we looked at showed some families had been included in making decisions about the care individuals received.

After our first visit to the home on 14 April 2011 we were told that two people had received care in a manner which did not respect their rights but which had been

agreed by their families. Stair gates had been placed in the doorways to their bedrooms to prevent them leaving their rooms during the night.

While the stair gates were not in the doorways during our first visit to the service, we were told by social workers who had visited the home the day before our inspection that they had been in place when they had first arrived in the home.

The use of the stair gates was discussed with Ms Clarke after our first visit to the home. Ms Clarke confirmed the stair gates had been used but told us they had been removed before our visit and had not been in place since then.

Ms Clarke told us the stair gates had been put in place to protect the individuals involved and this had been discussed and agreed with their families. There was no evidence the use of the stair gates had been assessed using a decision-making process that included a Best Interests Assessment or met the Mental Capacity Act code of practice guidelines, as required.

In the draft Review of Compliance Report we sent to Ms Clarke in May 2011 we made an Improvement Action under Outcome 7 of the Essential Standards about the failure to ensure the Mental Capacity Act code of practice guidelines had been followed. Ms Clarke was asked to provide us with a report describing the improvements she would make to ensure the code of practice was followed in the future and to ensure the services provided at Cartmel Old Grammar met the Essential standards.

When we returned to the home on 8 July 2011 we saw there were no restrictions in place to prevent people leaving their rooms as they wished.

Our judgement

People agreed to the support they received and the decisions they made were respected.

Outcome 4: 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 4: Care and welfare of people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People living in the home told us they were "very well cared for". People said they were happy living in Cartmel Old Grammar.

Other evidence
We saw that care staff were knowledgeable about the needs of people living in the home and provided the support they required in the way they preferred.

A number of people living in the home needed assistance to maintain their mobility and this was provided in a patient manner which gave people the time they needed to remain as independent as possible.

Care staff in the home were able to communicate with the people living there and gave people choices about the care they received.

The records held about people showed an assessment of their needs had been carried out to make sure the home was able to provide the support they required. The needs assessments had been used to develop a care plan for each individual, giving staff information about the care they required. People who were able to had signed their care plans and others had been signed by their families on their behalf.

While this review was being carried out social workers completed assessments of the needs of five people living at Cartmel Old Grammar.

The social workers identified that two individuals would benefit from having further specialist assessments carried out by an Occupational Therapist. The Occupational Therapist assessed that additional specialist equipment was required to ensure the needs of the individuals could continue to be met in the home and arranged for this to be provided.

Where people living in the home were reaching the end of their life they were supported to remain at Cartmel Old Grammar as long as the home was able to continue to meet their needs.

A local health care professional told us Cartmel Old Grammar was very good at caring for people who were reaching the end of their life.

The service had arrangements in place to plan for foreseeable emergencies to make sure people continued to receive the support they needed.

After we carried out our visit to the service we were told social workers visiting the home had observed a care practice which did not respect the rights of two people living there. The home had used an inappropriate method to ensure two people were not able to leave their bedrooms at night. Although we did not see any evidence of this at our visit, Ms Clarke told us this had taken place but had stopped before we visited the home. We have included this concern in this report under Outcomes 2 and 7.

At our visit to the service on 8 July 2011 we found no concerns with how the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People received the care they needed in a manner which protected their privacy and promoted their independence.

Outcome 5: Meeting nutritional needs

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- Are supported to have adequate nutrition and hydration.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 5: Meeting nutritional needs

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People told us they enjoyed the meals provided in the home. One person told us, "We get a glass of red wine with our lunch".

Other evidence
We observed the lunchtime meal being served during our visit to the service on 14 April 2011. The meal was served in the dining room in the home, although people were offered the choice of taking their meal in the sitting room if they preferred.

Before lunch people were offered a glass of sherry and we saw that most people enjoyed this.

People were offered a choice of cold drink to have with their meal and a hot drink was provided to people after they had eaten.

A board outside the dining room gave people details of the names of staff on duty in the home and the meal to be provided at lunch time. The board did not include details of the alternative meals which could be chosen if people did not want the main course which was planned for that day. We saw that people who did not want the main course provided during the visit were given a choice of alternative meals.

The dining room provided a comfortable and pleasant area for people to eat in.

Personal choice and independence were promoted including by giving people the opportunity to season their meals with salt and pepper as they liked and by adding their own milk and sugar to their drinks according to their own preferences.

Care staff were knowledgeable about the support individuals required with eating and drinking and provided this in a discreet and patient manner.

At our visit to the home on 8 July 2011 we saw that people were offered a choice of meals which they enjoyed and which took account of their identified nutritional needs.

At both of our visits we found that the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People received food and drink which met their needs and which they enjoyed.

Outcome 6: Cooperating with other providers

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- Receive safe and coordinated care, treatment and support where more than one provider is involved, or they are moved between services.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 6: Cooperating with other providers

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
The people we spoke to in the home did not comment on how the service was meeting this outcome.

We observed that the service cooperated with other health care agencies which supported people in the home to make sure they received the care they needed.

Other evidence
The care records we looked at showed us that people were supported to see their doctor as they needed.

The home did not provide nursing care and the local district nursing team provided this care to people who needed it.

One health care professional we spoke to told us the home was very good at supporting people as they reached the end of their life, with nursing care being provided by the local district nursing team. This meant people were able to remain in the surroundings they knew, with care staff who knew the support they needed, as they reached the end of their life.

We saw that people who had more complex needs were supported by appropriate health care services.

Health care specialists who supported people living in the home told us care staff cooperated with them in caring for people, listened to the advice they gave and followed the guidance they provided.

At both of our visits we found that the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People received the care they needed because the staff at Cartmel Old Grammar worked well with other services which supported them.

Outcome 7: 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 7: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

The people we spoke to did not comment on how the service was meeting this outcome.

Other evidence

During our visits to the service we saw that people were treated with respect and their rights were protected by the staff employed in the home.

We asked two of the staff on duty at our visit to the home on 14 April 2011 about the training they had received and they both said they had received training in protecting people from abuse.

The staff we spoke at that visit said they would be confident speaking to Ms Clarke if they were concerned about the welfare of an individual living in the home.

After we carried out our first visit to the service we were told social workers visiting the home the previous day had observed a care practice which did not respect the rights of two people living in the home.

Stair gates had been placed in the entrances to two bedrooms to ensure two people were not able to leave their bedrooms at night.

Although we did not see any evidence of this at our visit, Ms Clarke told us this had taken place but said the stair gates had been removed the day before we visited the home in April 2011.

Ms Clarke told us the stair gates had been put in place to protect the individuals involved and this had been discussed and agreed with their families.

There was no evidence the use of the stair gates had been assessed using a decision-making process that included a Best Interests Assessment or met the Mental Capacity Act code of practice guidelines, as required.

In the draft Review of Compliance Report we sent to Ms Clarke in May 2011 we made an Improvement Action under this Outcome about the failure to ensure the Mental Capacity Act code of practice guidelines had been followed. Ms Clarke was asked to provide us with a report describing the improvements she would make to ensure the code of practice was followed in the future and to ensure the services provided at Cartmel Old Grammar met the Essential standards.

At our visit to the home on 8 July 2011 we saw there were no restrictions in place to prevent people leaving their rooms as they wished.

After we issued our draft Review of Compliance Report to Ms Clarke in May 2011 we were told that two incidents of alleged abuse had taken place in the home which Ms Clarke was aware of but which she hadn't reported to the local safeguarding authority as required.

When the allegations were reported to the local safeguarding authority and investigated under their procedures, no evidence was found that people had been abused. As part of the investigation the allegations were discussed with Ms Clarke and she confirmed that she had been told about the incidents but had not reported them as she did not believe they had occurred.

Although the local safeguarding authority investigations found no evidence that people living in the home had been abused, by failing to report the allegations Ms Clarke had failed to follow the correct procedure and she had not ensured people living at Cartmel Old Grammar were protected from the risk of abuse.

At our visit to the home on 8 July 2011 we discussed the procedures for identifying and reporting abuse with the staff on duty and acting manager. The staff we spoke to said they had received additional training in safeguarding people and showed they had a good understanding of the procedure to follow if they witnessed an incident which could mean an individual was being abused. The acting manager had a very good understanding of the procedure to follow to report allegations of abuse to the local safeguarding authority and of her responsibility to ensure the correct procedure was followed to protect people living in the home.

At our visit to the home on 8 July 2011 we found additional safeguards had been put in place to make sure people living there were protected from abuse and the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People living at Cartmel Old Grammar were protected from the risk of abuse and their rights were respected.

Outcome 8: Cleanliness and infection control

What the outcome says

Providers of services comply with the requirements of regulation 12, with regard to the *Code of Practice for health and adult social care on the prevention and control of infections and related guidance*.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 8: Cleanliness and infection control

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People living in the home and visitors we spoke to told us the home was “always clean”.

People we spoke to told us staff ensured individual’s clothes were “nicely laundered” and said there were “never any unpleasant smells” in the home.

Other evidence
Care staff told us they had received training in infection control to ensure they were knowledgeable about how to protect people from the risk of infection.

At both of our visits to the service we looked around the home and observed all areas were clean and provided a pleasant and comfortable environment for people to live in.

The home employed a cleaner to work six hours each day to ensure people were provided with safe and hygienic accommodation.

As there were no concerns about how the service was protecting people from the risk of infection we did not look in depth at how it was meeting the guidance in the *Code of Practice for health and adult social care on the prevention and control of infections and related guidance*.

At both of our visits to the home we found that the service was meeting this

outcome.

Our judgement

People were provided with a comfortable and clean environment to live in and were protected from the risk of infection.

Outcome 9: Management of medicines

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- Will have their medicines at the times they need them, and in a safe way.
- Wherever possible will have information about the medicine being prescribed made available to them or others acting on their behalf.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 9: Management of medicines

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People we spoke to did not comment on how the service was meeting this outcome.

Other evidence
At our visit to the home on 14 April 2011 we observed how medication was handled in the home and saw safe procedures were followed to ensure people received the medicines they needed, when they needed them.

The care records we looked at showed that people who wished to had been supported to handle their own medication and that this had been agreed with their doctor. This helped people to maintain their independence and control over their lives.

At our first visit to the home on 14 April 2011 a senior member of the care staff told us one person had been given medication in a manner which was not as their doctor had prescribed it to be given.

The staff member told us this had been done because the staff in the home had observed a change in the person’s needs which they believed showed the medication should be given to them in a different way.

We looked at the records for how medication had been administered to this person. The records did not show that the medicine had been given in a different way to how it had been prescribed and were therefore inaccurate.

The senior staff member told us the change in the person's needs had been discussed with their doctor who had then changed the prescription for the medication.

We spoke to the doctor after our visit to the home and he confirmed he had changed the prescription for the medication after the home had made him aware of the change in the person's needs.

In the draft Review of Compliance Report we sent to Ms Clarke in May 2011 we made an Improvement Action under this Outcome about the failure to ensure the home's procedures for handling medication were followed consistently. Ms Clarke was asked to provide us with a report describing the improvements she would make to ensure people only received prescribed medication as agreed by their doctor and to ensure accurate records were kept of the medicines given to people.

In June 2011, after Ms Clarke had left Cartmel Old Grammar, the acting manager placed in the home by Goldcare Future Management Limited found a large amount of medication had been stored in an unlocked cupboard in an unlocked room which could be accessed by people living in the home. All medication held in care homes must be stored securely to protect people living there who may be at risk if they take the wrong medicines by accident. By failing to ensure the medication had been stored securely Ms Clarke had not ensured people living in the home had been protected.

On finding the store of medication the acting manager immediately took action to protect people living in the home and the medication was removed from the premises and taken to be stored securely.

At our visit to the home on 8 July 2011 we found all medication in the home was stored securely and we found no concerns about how the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People living in Cartmel Old Grammar received the medication they needed in a safe way.

Outcome 10: Safety and suitability of premises

What the outcome says

This is what people should expect.

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

- Are in safe, accessible surroundings that promote their wellbeing.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 10: Safety and suitability of premises

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People living in Cartmel Old Grammar told us the accommodation provided was “lovely” and said they liked their own rooms.

Other evidence.
Cartmel Old Grammar provided private accommodation for people in twenty-three single bedrooms, all of which had an ensuite bathroom.

Communal space was provided in the form of a large sitting room and spacious dining room, which was big enough to accommodate all the people living in the home.

The home had a range of adaptations to help people to maintain their independence including grab rails in the main corridors and a passenger lift.

The home was furnished and decorated to a high standard and provided people with comfortable accommodation which was suitable to meet their needs.

Risk assessments had been carried out to ensure the environment was safe for people to live and work in.

At both of our visits to the home we found that the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People lived in a safe and comfortable home which was suitable to meet their needs.

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
<p>What people who use the service experienced and told us People we spoke to did not comment on how the service was meeting this outcome.</p> <p>Other evidence People living in Cartmel Old Grammar used a range of equipment to help them to maintain their independence.</p> <p>We saw that staff knew the equipment people used and made sure it was available when they needed it.</p> <p>Care staff provided people with the support they required while using specialist equipment in a discreet and patient manner.</p> <p>At our visit to the home on 14 April 2011 we were informed appropriate Portable Appliance Tests had been carried out to ensure equipment in the home was safe for people to use.</p> <p>Following our visit we spoke to the local Fire Officer who confirmed he had carried out an inspection at the service in January 2011 during which he had checked that Portable Appliance Tests had been carried out.</p>

During the investigation of the concerns we were told about while planning our review, the local Fire Officer carried out another visit to Cartmel Old Grammar. At that visit Ms Clarke told the Fire Officer the person who had carried out the Portable Appliance Tests had not completed the training required to ensure these were completed properly.

When Goldcare Future Management Limited took over the responsibility for the day to day operation of the home we asked them to check that the Portable Appliance Tests had been carried out by an appropriately trained and qualified person. The manager placed in the home by Goldcare Future Management Limited could not find evidence the tests had been carried out so arranged for this to be done as a matter of urgency.

Our judgement

People received the support they needed and were protected when using equipment in the home.

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 told us they were “pleased with the care” provided in the home and said they were “looked after very well” by the staff employed there.

Other evidence
Care staff told us they had received a range of training to ensure they had the qualifications and skills to meet the needs of people living in the home.

We observed that staff provided the support people needed in a patient way which respected their rights and ensured their independence.

Care staff were knowledgeable about the needs of people living in the home and were able to communicate and understand the people they were supporting.

At our visit to the home on 14 April 2011 we checked some of the records held about the staff employed in the service. We saw that one person had been employed before the required checks on their suitability had been completed.

The senior staff member on duty at our visit told us she believed the person who had been employed was known to Ms Clarke, who was able to confirm they were safe to work in the home.

Care services must use a robust system for recruiting staff which includes a range of checks on their fitness. It is important that all the checks required are completed before any staff are employed in care services to make sure people and their property are safe. Ms Clarke told us no new staff would be employed in the home until all the required checks had been completed.

In the draft Review of Compliance Report we sent to Ms Clarke in May 2011 we made an Improvement Action under this Outcome about the failure to ensure the required checks were carried out before any new staff were employed in the home. Ms Clarke was asked to provide us with a report describing the improvements she would make to ensure people living in the home were protected by the service using thorough procedures to recruit new staff.

At our visit to the home on 8 July 2011 we were told no new staff had been employed in the home. The acting manager was aware of the checks which needed to be carried out before new staff were allowed to work at the service and assured us robust checks would be carried out before any new staff were employed to make sure people living at the home were protected.

Our judgement

People living in the home were protected by the service using robust procedures when recruiting new staff.

Outcome 13: Staffing

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 sufficient numbers of appropriate staff.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 13: Staffing

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People told us they were "pleased with the care" provided in the home and said, "I am looked after very well".

Other evidence
The care staff working in the home told us it was "a good home" and "a nice place to work".

We observed that there were enough staff on duty during both of our visits to provide the support individuals needed, when they needed it.

We saw that support was provided in a patient way which promoted peoples' rights and independence. No-one we spoke to in the home said they had needed to wait to receive the support they required.

The home employed a cleaner and a cook to ensure people were provided with a clean environment to live in and meals which they enjoyed and which met their needs.

Staffing levels were assessed to take account of the number of people living in the home and the support they needed.

At both of our visits to the home we found that the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People received the care they needed because there were enough staff employed in the home with the right skills and experience.

Outcome 14: Supporting 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 competent staff.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 14: Supporting workers

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People we spoke to did not comment on how the service was meeting this outcome.

Other evidence
At both of our visits to the service care staff told us they felt well supported by the managers in the home.

When we visited the service we saw the managers worked alongside care staff providing informal supervision and support as they cared for people living in the home.

We observed that care staff were knowledgeable about the needs of people living in the home and were skilled and competent to provide the support they required.

Care staff told us they had completed a range of training and had been supported to complete qualifications relevant to their roles including NVQ level 2 and 3 in Care.

At both of our visits to the home we found that the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement
People were cared for by staff who knew the assistance they needed and who were trained and competent to provide the support they required.

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
The people we spoke to did not comment on how the service was meeting this outcome.

Other evidence
At both of our visits to the service we saw that appropriate risk assessments had been completed to ensure the safety of people living and working in the home.

People living in the home and their families told us they had been included in making decisions about the care and services provided in the home.

The care records we looked at showed individuals and their families had agreed to the care to be provided in the home.

When we started our review of the service we asked Ms Clarke to complete a self assessment giving us details of how the service was meeting this outcome.

The self assessment was not received by the time we had asked so we brought forward our visit to the service in April 2011.

At our visit to the home on 14 April 2011 the senior staff member in charge of the service told us the service had tried a number of ways to obtain the views of people living in the home and their families. She said informal feedback was obtained by people living in the home and their visitors speaking to a senior staff member or to Ms Clarke.

As there was no evidence from a formal quality assurance process, we were not able to determine how feedback from people living in the home and their families had been used to improve the services provided to people.

In the draft Review of Compliance Report we sent to Ms Clarke in May 2011 we made an Improvement Action under this Outcome. Ms Clarke was asked to provide us with a report describing the improvements she would make to ensure the views of people living in the home were used to develop the service.

When we visited the home on 8 July 2011 the acting manager placed in the home by Goldcare Future Management Limited had only been overseeing the management of the service for four weeks. At our visit we observed the acting manager had identified where further improvements needed to be made to the service and was taking appropriate action to address these areas, giving priority to issues which affected the health, welfare or safety of people living in the home. Goldcare Future Management Limited continued to provide us with information about important events and the improvements made in the home.

At our visit to the service on 8 July 2011 we found no concerns with how the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

Effective management helped ensure that people received safe care which met their needs.

Outcome 17: Complaints

What the outcome says

This is what people should expect.

People who use services or others acting on their behalf:

- Are sure that their comments and complaints are listened to and acted on effectively.
- Know that they will not be discriminated against for making a complaint.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 17: Complaints

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
At both of our visits to Cartmel Old Grammar people told us they would speak to a member of the care staff or the home manager if they were not happy with the services or support provided in the home.

People said, "I have no complaints" and "I am pleased with the care provided".

Other evidence
The home had a complaints procedure which was given to people living there and made available to their families.

The complaints procedure included details of how complaints could be made and the process for looking into concerns and reporting the outcome to the person who had made the complaint.

Ms Clarke told us the home had not received any formal complaints from people living in the home or their families in the twelve months before our visit in April 2011.

At both of our visits to the home we found that the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

People living in the home and their families knew they could raise concerns about the service and that their complaints would be listened to and acted on.

Outcome 21: Records

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services can be confident that:

- Their personal records including medical records are accurate, fit for purpose, held securely and remain confidential.
- Other records required to be kept to protect their safety and well being are maintained and held securely where required.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 21: Records

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People living in the home did not comment on how the service was meeting this outcome.

Other evidence
We looked at the records held about people living in the home.

The records were mainly up to date and accurate, with the exception of a medication record which we have included earlier in this report under outcome 9, Management of medicines.

We saw that people had been included in developing the information held about them and that this was stored securely to protect their confidentiality.

Care staff were knowledgeable about the needs of the people living in the home and had the information they required to provide the care people needed.

At both of our visits to the home we found that the service was meeting this outcome.

Our judgement

Personal information about people living in the home was kept securely to ensure their confidentiality was protected.

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 Adult 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