

Review of compliance

Care Futures Kendall House	
Region:	South West
Location address:	15 Wesley Lane Warmley Bristol BS30 8BU
Type of service:	Care home service without nursing
Date of Publication:	April 2012
Overview of the service:	Kendall House is registered to care for eight younger adults.

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

Our current overall judgement

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

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

Why we carried out this review

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

How we carried out this review

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

What people told us

People were busy on the day of our visit and were in and out of the home all day. There was a happy, relaxed atmosphere in the home. We spent some time in the company of people living in the home and spoke with them individually. We saw staff interacted in a caring way and people responded to this.

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

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

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person makes suitable arrangements to ensure that people are enabled to make, or participate in decisions relating to their care. People are provided with opportunities, encouragement and support in relation to promoting autonomy and independence.

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

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person takes proper steps to help ensure that people experience effective,

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

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

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person makes suitable arrangements to ensure that people are safeguarded against the risk of abuse.

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

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person has suitable arrangements in place to ensure that staff are receiving appropriate training that is relevant to the needs of people in their care and to the roles they perform.

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

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person has systems in place to regularly assess and monitor the quality of services provided so that people can be further assured that they will be protected against the risks of inappropriate or unsafe care and treatment.

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

People were busy on the day of our visit and were in and out of the home all day. People told us that they 'do everything they like' and choices and decisions made were supported by staff.

Staff understood the importance of respecting people's choices and personal preferences. Comments included, "People have choice over everything they do on a daily basis", "There has been a great change and emphasis over the last year about empowering people to make decisions for themselves with minimum support from us" and "There have been some positive changes and people really are doing what they want to do, its very rewarding to see this".

We looked at messages of thanks received from relatives of people currently living in the home. Comments included, "My relative has been encouraged to be more independent which has further enabled them to 'blossom'. They are carrying out tasks now that they have never had the opportunity to do before and they are encouraged to make choices" and "My relative's dignity is always respected".

Other evidence

Daily routines were flexible; however most people had weekly routines that they

planned themselves and liked to follow. People studied at college, attended day centres, visited family and friends and took part in hobbies and activities that they were interested in. People were positive about these experiences and said 'they were often tired at the end of the day'.

People were encouraged and supported by staff and families to be as independent as possible. Everyone had progressed in confidence and assertiveness so that life was meaningful to them. Staff shared some good examples of what plans had been put in place with people so that their aims could be achieved.

One person who had attended an IT course at college was now using the internet with minimum support. Recently they chose to go on a trip to visit family and used the internet to arrange travel times on the train and booked and paid for their tickets with minimum support.

Several people had successfully completed college courses in IT which had increased their awareness and the advantages and uses of using the internet and the facilities available to them, for example SKYPE. The home did not have a computer or internet facilities for people which would have supported them to continue developing their computer skills and knowledge.

Staff spoke with us about how they supported people when booking appointments including GPs and dentists. People's level of confidence and ability varied but everyone had developed in some way and several people were doing this independently.

One support worker believed that by increasing independence people had grown in confidence, this in turn had increased people's socialising skills and had enabled people to make new friends.

Our judgement

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person makes suitable arrangements to ensure that people are enabled to make, or participate in decisions relating to their care. People are provided with opportunities, encouragement and support in relation to promoting autonomy and independence.

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 observed that people were relaxed, happy and comfortable in each others company. Staff told us that people in the home had built strong relationships and were good friends. We saw positive engagement at tea time when people and staff sat together to enjoy their meal and talk about their day, sharing any news.

Messages of thanks received from relatives included, "My relative has lived at Kendall House for three years and they are much healthier, happier and outgoing as a result of the care they receive" and "My relative clearly loves the people they live with and all the staff. It is evident that these feelings are reciprocated".

Other evidence

The quality of information recorded did not accurately reflect people's personal preferences about how they wished to receive care. The support plan format did not have an adequate amount of space to describe what care was required and this may have compromised the level of detail.

This did not mean that people were not receiving some good person centred care but the support plans did not describe this. In some aspects the home had captured individual needs that were reflected in the support plans but they required further development to ensure all staff were fully informed.

The care files were disorganised and staff said they were, 'cumbersome to work with', 'confusing', 'complicated, muddled and not user friendly'. The manager and staff talked

with us about streamlining the paperwork so that it was 'smarter' and gave a true reflection the care and support that was being given.

Staff agreed that short term support plans should be also be developed for people with short term needs for example, chest infections. The manager spoke with us after the inspection and told us that work to improve this had commenced.

Together people and staff were always looking for new initiatives to live a healthy lifestyle. Last year one person received an invite to a wedding and wanted to buy a new outfit for the occasion. They decided that they wanted to lose some weight for the event and asked staff to support them with this.

As a result of this other people living in the home asked if they could join in and lose weight too. People decided to create their very own 'weight watchers' club, which included planning menus and creating their own fitness club. Staff told us about the positive impact the club had brought to people including, weight loss and improved mobility.

Our judgement

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person takes proper steps to help ensure that people experience effective, safe appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

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 were asked to complete a survey which asked them, 'How safe do you feel?' The survey explained that it is important to feel safe both at home and outside and provided examples of what feeling unsafe could be. Eight people had ticked the answer; "I feel very safe".

One person had ticked, "I feel quite safe but not as safe as I would like". The manager spoke with this person to see why they did not feel very safe. The person explained that it was because of their poor eyesight and that this could make them feel vulnerable at times. Staff were knowledgeable about this person's needs and the support and reassurance required.

Other evidence

Staff shared with us their experiences and feelings when there had previously been a safeguarding incident in the home. They told us about how it had raised their awareness and that they wanted to protect people in their care even more.

Staff were committed to supporting people's choice and control over their lives, protecting their human rights. All staff demonstrated a good understanding about what constituted abuse and what processes to follow in order to safeguard people in their care. We spoke with staff who confirmed they had received safeguarding training.

Comments included, "I believe that people are safe here without a doubt", "I would not hesitate to report any form of abuse if I had concerns" and "We have a whistle blowing

policy here so that we can report concerns confidentially".

Policies and procedures were available and staff had signed to say that they had read and understood them. Information was available for staff about who to contact should they suspect that abuse had occurred. The manager was knowledgeable about the relevant local multi agency procedures and processes.

We saw that people were supported to take risks balanced on their safety and their health care needs. People's capacity had been taken into account when such choices had been made and their right to take informed risks had been respected.

Our judgement

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person makes suitable arrangements to ensure that people are safeguarded against the risk of abuse.

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 did not speak with people about this outcome area on this occasion.

Other evidence

There was an induction programme which covered all mandatory training. The home had a mentor system where all new staff were linked with and shadowed by a senior staff member during shifts. This was to assist with continued training throughout the induction process.

The manager and senior staff conducted 'observation tests' of staff when working and supporting people they were caring for both in the home and outside. Staff were observed a minimum of three times before they were either assessed as competent or until the staff member felt confident in themselves.

The training matrix demonstrated the home provided staff with training and development opportunities tailored to individual needs. The manager and staff were conscientious in attending training relevant to the care needs of the people they were caring for and relevant to the roles they performed.

Staff explained to us that as a small care home they worked very closely with each other and this meant there was a continuous theme of supporting and supervising each other. Staff felt they were supported on a daily basis by the manager and other colleagues.

Records showed us that supervisions were both one to one sessions and group

meetings. The home also encouraged and supported practical supervisions in addition to the formal ones they received. This had enabled staff to develop their practical skills.

There was an annual appraisal process which tied in with the supervision arrangements. The manager had established a formal recording of supervision for all staff. A plan was devised for discussion which included people living in the home, work issues, staff issues, personal development and training.

Our judgement

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person has suitable arrangements in place to ensure that staff are receiving appropriate training that is relevant to the needs of people in their care and to the roles they perform.

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 did not speak with people about this outcome area on this occasion.

Other evidence

People influenced what happened in the home by attending monthly residents meetings. The meetings were informal and welcomed by people as a social event. We saw that agendas were flexible and gave opportunities for staff to provide people with up to date information about the home and any news. The meetings were predominantly a time for people to share information and ideas about, 'things we would like to do', 'things we are not happy about' and 'things about staff'.

Staff meetings were considered as 'group supervisions' where staff could share their experiences and knowledge of the people they cared for, discuss topics of interest and share information from any training received. We saw the agendas were flexible and staff contributed to these. Staff said they were supported to 'influence positive change'. Requests were also made for short notice meetings if there was something that they particularly wanted to discuss.

We saw regular audits were carried out in the home including health and safety, care documentation and medication. Specialists also visited the home to conduct audits on behalf of the registered provider. The manager told us that they requested an occupational therapist to audit the environment recently and subsequently further adaptations and equipment were put in place following their recommendations.

Our judgement

Overall, we found that Kendall House was meeting this essential standard.

The registered person has systems in place to regularly assess and monitor the quality of services provided so that people can be further assured that they will be protected against the risks of inappropriate or unsafe care and treatment.

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