

Review of compliance

R Cadman King Edward House	
Region:	South East
Location address:	77-79 New Street Ash Canterbury Kent CT3 2BW
Type of service:	Care home service without nursing
Date of Publication:	February 2012
Overview of the service:	King Edward House can provide accommodation and personal care for six people who have a learning disability. The accommodation was on two floors. One bedroom was shared and the remainder were single occupancy. There were two lounges, a dining room, bathrooms and toilets. At the back of the property there was a patio area and an enclosed garden. The

	service is near to the centre of Ash which is six miles from Sandwich.
--	--

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

Our current overall judgement

King Edward House was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety but, to maintain this, we have suggested that some improvements are made.

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

Why we carried out this review

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

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, carried out a visit on 19 January 2012, 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 who use services had special communication needs. They used a combination of short phrases, individual words, gestures and signs to express themselves. They said or showed us that the staff treated them with respect and supported them to raise any concerns they had. They said or showed us that they received the health and personal care they needed and that they were comfortable in their home. One person said, 'I get all my food and I go out. I go in my bedroom, I like it okay'.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well King Edward 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

People who use services were involved in decisions about their care and support, their privacy and dignity was respected and their independence was supported.

Overall, we found that King Edward House 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 services experienced effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

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

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

People who use services were being kept safe from abuse or the risk of abuse and their human rights were being respected.

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

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

People who use services generally were provided with accommodation that promoted their wellbeing. However, they did not have their own ornaments on display in one lounge and they could not be confident that one glazed door was safe.

Overall, we found that King Edward House was meeting this essential standard but, to maintain this, we have suggested that some improvements are made.

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

People who use services were safe and their health and welfare needs were met by sufficient numbers of appropriate staff.

Overall, we found that King Edward House 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 who use services benefited from safe quality care and support due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

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

Actions we have asked the service to take

We have asked the provider to send us a report within 14 days of them receiving this report, setting out the action they will take to improve. We will check to make sure that the improvements have been made.

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. When we propose to take enforcement action, our decision 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.

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 who use services said or showed us that decisions that affected them had been based upon their wishes.

They said, 'I go out a lot and do things I like' and 'I do things when I want things I like'. A third person smiled and gave a thumbs-up sign when asked about his involvement in decision making.

Other evidence

All of the people use services had lived there for some time and were settled in their home. The service was full and there were no plans for anyone to leave. There were arrangements to ensure that any new people in the future would have their needs for support assessed so that they could be confident they would get the help they needed. This would include the help they needed to express themselves, to wash and dress and to access the community.

The atmosphere in the service was relaxed, staff were polite and people were given time to do things in their own way. Staff recognised that people had special communication needs. They spoke with people in an understandable way that supported them to make choices.

There was written information about what people could expect when they moved in. This included what the fees covered and how people would be involved in decision making.

People had been supported to wear clean clothes and they had their own possessions. They had been supported to personalise their bedrooms by choosing things such as wallpaper and furniture.

Staff had kept in touch with carers (relatives) so that they knew about any important developments. People had been assisted to use the telephone to contact family and friends and they had been helped to deal with their mail.

There were occupational and social activities. These included going out to local day opportunities services where they could do arts and crafts, gardening and meeting with friends. At home people did things such as drawing, playing music and helping with domestic tasks.

People were free to receive guests whenever they wished.

Our judgement

People who use services were involved in decisions about their care and support, their privacy and dignity was respected and their independence was supported.

Overall, we found that King Edward House 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

People who use services said or showed us that they were satisfied with the health and personal care they received and that their independence was encouraged.

They said, 'I get on good with things I like. I get helped' and 'I like it'. Another person said 'good' and gave a thumbs-up sign when asked about the support he received.

Other evidence

Each person had an individual plan of support that said what assistance they needed and wanted to receive. The information included things such as helping people to do everyday tasks, managing medical conditions and accessing the local community. Staff said that these plans helped them to reliably provide support for people in ways that were right for them.

The plans took into account advice received from health and social care professionals and they had been reviewed to help make sure they were up to date and accurate.

There were written risk assessments that helped people to stay safe by avoiding unnecessary hazards such as falls or other accidents. In relation to falls, there was information about how to avoid incidents by making sure that one person was always supported by staff when using the stairs.

People received the support they needed. This included assistance with getting up and going to bed, washing and dressing, using the bathroom, eating meals and going out.

People had received the healthcare services they needed including seeing professionals such as doctors, dentists, opticians and dieticians. There was a reliable system to pass on important information when people were admitted to hospital. This included details of the person's known medical conditions, medication and mobility.

Things to maintain good health had been provided such as 'flu vaccinations and assistance to eat healthily in order to manage weight.

Our judgement

People who use services experienced effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

Overall, we found that King Edward House 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 who use services said or showed us they felt free to raise concerns and that they felt safe.

They said, 'I like people here and they're nice to me' and 'Good, I'm good here'. Another person smiled and held a support worker's hand more tightly when he was asked about how he felt about living in the service.

Other evidence

There was a user friendly complaints procedure that explained how people could raise concerns. This used pictures and signs to help people to understand their rights. There was a system to investigate and resolve complaints that was directly supervised by the provider. No complaints were being looked into at the time of our visit.

There was a policy and procedure that described the action staff should take in order to keep people safe from abuse. Staff had received relevant training and they knew what to do to keep people safe. This included being able to recognise abuse if it occurred and how to 'whistleblow' if there were concerns.

There were arrangements to support people who needed special help when making certain important decisions such as receiving some kinds of medical attention. Also, there were safeguards if someone needed to have part of their freedom limited so that any restrictions used were the least necessary and were reviewed regularly.

Security checks including references and a police check had been completed for staff. These had been done to help make sure that they were trustworthy to work with people who were vulnerable.

People were being helped to manage their money so they had enough to buy things. There were records to show how money had been spent and how much was left.

Our judgement

People who use services were being kept safe from abuse or the risk of abuse and their human rights were being respected.

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

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

There are minor concerns with Outcome 10: Safety and suitability of premises

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People who use services said or showed us that their accommodation was generally comfortable, homely and clean.

They said, 'My home is good and I like my bedroom' and 'I like things here for me'.

In one of the lounges there was a large display cabinet that had various models and pieces of crockery that did not belong to the people who use services. One person pointed to the cabinet and said, 'No, no, not like it there, I like pictures'. Two other people frowned and gave a thumbs-down sign when asked if they liked what was on show.

Other evidence

Most parts of the accommodation were well decorated and comfortably furnished. There were some unnecessary health and safety signs. Work was being done to repair parts of the exterior of the property where render had cracked and paintwork had become discoloured. A part of the small garden was being used to park a caravan. Chairs that previously had been on the lawn had been moved to one side to create the parking space. The chairs had ended up directly facing the caravan the exterior of which was stained and dirty.

During our visit the heating was on and the accommodation was warm. There was a fresh atmosphere and there was an informal system to do the cleaning.

Steps had been taken to keep people safe. These included radiators being fitted with

guards and hot water temperature controls to reduce the likelihood of burns and scalds. There was a glazed door in public area that appeared to be fitted with ordinary glass that was not shatter-resistant.

A contractor had completed regular checks of the fire safety equipment and more regular checks had been done by staff. There had been a recent fire drill and staff knew what action to take if the fire alarms sounded so that people could be kept safe. This included knowing how to safely evacuate the building.

Contractors had checked gas appliances and the electrical wiring system and had said that they were safe to use.

The kitchen was old and worn but it was clean and good food handling practices were in place. These included regular checks being done to make sure that certain foods had been chilled and frozen correctly. Also, there were arrangements to check that hot food was properly cooked through.

The laundry was equipped with a washer and dryer. It was well organised so people did not have to wait too long before having their clothes returned to them.

Our judgement

People who use services generally were provided with accommodation that promoted their wellbeing. However, they did not have their own ornaments on display in one lounge and they could not be confident that one glazed door was safe.

Overall, we found that King Edward House was meeting this essential standard but, to maintain this, we have suggested that some improvements are made.

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 who use services said or showed us that there were sufficient staff on duty to enable their needs for support to be reliably and consistently met.

They said, 'People are okay here at home with me and 'I'm here with people. I like my things like writing and being out with people'.

Other evidence

There were usually two support workers on duty during the day and the evening and there was a staff presence in the service at night. The written roster showed that shifts were being filled reliably and there were effective cover arrangements for planned and unexpected absences.

During our visit, people were helped to go to the bathroom when they wanted, received assistance to undertake social activities and as necessary were given individual support to eat their meals.

A number of things contributed to people receiving consistent support. These included having informal handover sessions at the beginning and end of each shift. At these meetings each person's general wellbeing had been reviewed so that as necessary things such as doctor's appointments could be organised. There was an informal work plan for each shift so that staff knew what they were expected to do.

The manager had supervised the quality of the work that staff did by observing their

practice and by reviewing the adequacy of the training they had received.

Our judgement

People who use services were safe and their health and welfare needs were met by sufficient numbers of appropriate staff.

Overall, we found that King Edward House 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 services said or showed us that they were consulted about their home and could contribute suggestions for its improvement.

They said, 'I talk to people, they help me with things and do nice things' and 'We do things like go on holiday'.

Other evidence

Feedback had been received from people who use services. Suggested improvements had been made including providing high definition television in one lounge and arranging for most people to go to an overseas holiday park.

Accidents had been recorded and analysed so that action could be taken to reduce the likelihood of them happening again. This included identifying likely contributory factors such as trip hazards so that they could be addressed.

Informal quality audits had been completed of key things such as the management of medication. This involved the manager checking that medicines were being ordered, stored, administered, recorded and disposed of in the correct way.

National developments in good practice such as new guidance about the use of medicines and equipment had been received and as necessary acted upon. This was so that people had been protected from medicines or equipment that might no longer have been safe for them to use.

Our judgement

People who use services benefited from safe quality care and support due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

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

Action we have asked the provider to take

Improvement actions

The table below shows where improvements should be made so that the service provider **maintains** compliance with the essential standards of quality and safety.

Regulated activity	Regulation	Outcome
Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care	Regulation 15 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010	Outcome 10: Safety and suitability of premises
	<p>Why we have concerns: People who use services generally were provided with accommodation that promoted their wellbeing. However, they did not have their own ornaments on display in one lounge and they could not be confident that one glazed door was safe.</p>	

The provider must send CQC a report about how they are going to maintain compliance with these essential standards.

This report is requested under regulation 10(3) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

The provider's report should be sent to us within 14 days of the date that the final review of compliance report is sent to them.

CQC should be informed in writing when these improvement actions are complete.

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