

Review of compliance

Kent County Council Wayfarers	
Region:	South East
Location address:	St Barts Road Sandwich Kent CT13 0AW
Type of service:	Care home service without nursing
Date of Publication:	February 2012
Overview of the service:	Wayfarers is a Kent County Council run home offering up to 33 beds for people requiring residential care. The home is separated into two distinct wings (Hollyside and Cherry Way) with their own dining areas and communal spaces. People are able and encouraged to participate in joint activities and social events. The home is set in a residential area of Sandwich, close to the town centre with good

	access to the local amenities. There are gardens to the rear of the home.
--	---

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

Our current overall judgement

Wayfarers was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety.

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

Why we carried out this review

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

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider and carried out a visit on 30 January 2012.

What people told us

People told us that they were happy with the care and support they were receiving and that their needs were being met in all areas. They said that the staff treated them with respect, listened to them and supported them to raise any concerns they had about their care. People told us that the service responded to their health needs quickly and that the manager talked to them regularly about their plan of care and any changes that may be needed.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Wayfarers 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 were involved in decisions about their care and support. Their privacy and dignity was respected and their independence encouraged.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential standard.

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

People who use the service experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meet their needs and protects their rights.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential standard.

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

People's safety is supported by staff who have received training to meet their needs and know how to recognise abuse.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential standard.

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

Staff spoken with demonstrated through discussion and observation skills to carry out their role. This was supported by structured and completed training which protected people who use the service from risk and supported them with their needs.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers 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

People benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support with systems to monitor the quality of care that informs management of any concerns.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential standard.

Other information

Please see previous reports for more information about previous reviews.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

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

What we found

Our judgement

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

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

Some people told us how they had talked about their care to the manager when they first arrived in the home. They said that they had been asked what they liked and disliked. They said there were given lots of choice, around what they would like to do. They talked about the activities in the home and going out into the community.

They said that there were residents meetings and regular surveys to get peoples opinions of the service.

People said that staff knock on their door before they entered their rooms. They said that at all times they were treated with respect. One person said "The staff are marvellous; they make sure I have my privacy".

People said the staff were always polite and when asked if staff upheld their privacy and dignity. Comments were as follows: "Oh yes always". Another said "Yes, and I have no concerns or worries".

Other evidence

Most people living in the home had family members involved in their care and supported them when necessary to make decisions. People spoken with confirmed

they were able to make decisions about their day to day care.

We saw that people were treated with dignity and their privacy was respected. Staff were seen during the day offering people choices and being given time to make decisions. People who use services had the opportunity to be asked about and take part in all aspects of life within the service as they wished or their capacity allowed.

Discussions with staff showed their commitment to making sure that people were always treated as individuals and were encouraged to express their views about their care. Staff demonstrated through conversation that the people who use the service were treated with respect and dignity.

Our judgement

People were involved in decisions about their care and support. Their privacy and dignity was respected and their independence encouraged.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

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

What we found

Our judgement

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

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We saw that the people who use the service were making choices about their lives and were part of the decision process. People had their own individual routines which were respected. One person who uses the service said they were very satisfied with the care offered and given. They felt that the home offered good quality care and that the manager was receptive to their comments and suggestions. People, who lived in the home, told us that staff helped them with their personal care and ensured their privacy.

A visiting District Nurse from the local surgery expressed her opinions of the service and was happy to tell us that the surgery had close working relations with the home. She said staff were receptive to her direction and advice and that she had no concerns with regard to the quality of care offered within the service.

People were seen to be relaxed around the staff and happy to ask for help. Staff immediately responded to requests for assistance and also kept an eye on people who were not asking but who needed it. If someone had to wait staff told them for how long and why.

Other evidence

We reviewed and discussed with the manager the care records of three residents at the home. These had detail and guidelines about the support needed to meet people's needs. They had an assessment of need, details on how to support the person or what assistance was to be provided. Detailed guidance for staff was available so that they supported people consistently with actions that achieve the desired goal. The care

plans were regularly updated.

There was guidance to staff about how a person needs or wishes to be supported in things like personal hygiene and eating. Comments included what someone could and could not do for themselves. The care plans had some common themes for each person but also particular things about people, making them individual and person centred.

Moving and Handling risk assessments were in place which identified the equipment to be used and number of carers needed to support the person to use the equipment safely. Throughout the site visit we observed staff moving people who use the service safely. All of the staff had received moving and handling training and told us they were confident that they were moving people safely.

Risk assessments were in place in all the care plans seen and evidence was available that they had been reviewed.

Care records and specific health care records seen showed that residents had access to a range of health care professionals including dentists and opticians when needed and they had regular health checks.

Planned activities were arranged for the differing needs of people living in the service. The service promoted a range of activities which take into account people's individual interests. People were encouraged and assisted to participate as they chose. Different activities included music and sing-a-long, music therapy, dedicated game times, parties and celebrations and reminiscence.

Whilst it was accepted following discussions with people and a relative that social needs are taken into account the care planning process did not fully document this in plans of care viewed. They did not always show likes and dislikes and activities preferred.

Our judgement

People who use the service experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meet their needs and protects their rights.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

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

What we found

Our judgement

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

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People told us that they felt safe in the home. They said they could talk to the staff or manager if they had any concerns. One person said "I feel very safe, feel supported to raise any problems or concerns"

Observations during the visit showed there was a relaxed atmosphere in the home and people chatted freely and openly with each other, the staff and management.

Other evidence

Staff told us that they had not seen any poor practice. They were very aware of their legal and moral responsibilities in relation to safeguarding the people who they care for. Staff told us that they were very confident that the organisation would always listen and take action if they reported anything that they were concerned about. Staff described the action they would take if they saw any abusive or disrespectful behaviour by colleagues.

Staff spoken with showed knowledge of safeguarding people from abuse and how and where to report any suspicions or concerns. All staff had received safeguarding training.

Evidence was seen at the time of the site visit that all staff had a Police check. The purpose of the check is to show that someone has not done anything in the past that might make them not suitable to work with vulnerable people.

Staff, we spoke to, showed an understanding of peoples' needs. They were able to

describe how they knew if someone was distressed or concerned by observing and responding to their behaviour.

Staff had received training on how to keep people safe. This gave them the knowledge and the skills to do their jobs well and protect people from abuse. Training has been delivered in relation to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding (safeguards to protect loss of freedom and rights).

Care plans viewed had examples of the service using a non complex decision making tool. This protects people's freedoms and rights. It assesses people to ensure that decisions are not taken away from them where they have capacity and if they are the service is compliant with the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

The service had a copy of the local safeguarding protocols (procedures to follow to protect vulnerable people from abuse) issued by Kent and Medway Councils available for staff.

Our judgement

People's safety is supported by staff who have received training to meet their needs and know how to recognise abuse.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential 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

People that use the service told us there was a consistent staff team that created a pleasant atmosphere within the home and that the staff were competent and knew how to care for them safely. One person said "The manager is very approachable, staff work hard to provide good care and I have no concerns".

Other evidence

Staff spoken with demonstrated through discussion skills to carry out their role. Records viewed showed that staff had received training in core courses namely, safeguarding adults, manual handling, First Aid and fire. Many of the staff had a NVQ (National Vocational Qualification) in care at various levels. Training updates had been carried out in line with current guidance as recommended by Skills for Care a government training agency. Staff said they felt supported by the training to carry out their role and received regular one to one supervision.

Members of staff had a full in house induction when they started working at the home. A foundation induction programme that follows the element of national guidance for care homes issued by Skills for Care (a national government training agency) was also in place.

Our judgement

Staff spoken with demonstrated through discussion and observation skills to carry out their role. This was supported by structured and completed training which protected people who use the service from risk and supported them with their needs.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

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

What we found

Our judgement

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

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People who use the service and staff told us they had regular meetings to give them an opportunity to have their voices heard.

All of the people spoken with in the home told us that the Registered Manager spoke with them on a regular basis and checked to see if they were happy with the service. One person said when referring to the manager "I have no concerns or worries I am well looked after here"

Other evidence

The management team in the home had developed close working partnerships with other professionals evidence of this was gained reviewing the care planning documentation and talking to staff. Staff said they are supported and had regular one to one supervision.

Complaints, incidents and accidents were monitored and reviewed so that the service monitored any patterns and took appropriate action. Additional quality assurance processes included surveys that were given to people who use the service. The last surveys contained many compliments about the quality of care and how well the people who use the service were cared for. The manager is in the process of developing quality assurance questionnaire for all stakeholders, such as health and social care professionals and relatives.

Many auditing tools are used to monitor the quality of the service provided. These

include care plans, medication, health and safety, the environment and staffing. Monitoring takes place by a representative of the Kent County Council who carries out an inspection against the outcomes as outlined within the Essential Standards of Quality issued by the Care Quality Commission.

Our judgement

People benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support with systems to monitor the quality of care that informs management of any concerns.

Overall, we found that Wayfarers was meeting this essential standard.

What is a review of compliance?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Information for the reader

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

Care Quality Commission

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