

Review of compliance

Mr & Mrs P Post and Mr K G Post Favorita House Residential Home

Region:	South East
Location address:	28 Canterbury Road Herne Bay Kent CT6 5DJ
Type of service:	Care home service without nursing
Date of Publication:	December 2011
Overview of the service:	<p>Favorita is a privately owned care home for people needing residential care. It provides care for up to 16 older people. The home is laid out over two floors and there are stair lifts available to access the two levels of the upper floor.</p> <p>Communal facilities include a main lounge, a dining room, a smaller lounge/dining room, and a small conservatory.</p>

	<p>The home is located on the main road into Herne Bay. Local shops and the sea front are all close by.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Our current overall judgement

Favorita House Residential Home 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 16 November 2011, 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 told us that they had the care and support they needed to remain well and healthy. Everyone we spoke to said good things about the staff like 'They are kind' and 'The staff are excellent'. People said that they thought that there were enough staff on duty.

People said they liked living at the home and they were involved in decisions about their care and support.

They told us that the food was good and that they were happy with their bedrooms.

People told us that they were satisfied and happy with the service. They said that the manager checked to make sure they were happy with the service.

One person told us that they had been unwell and staff made sure that they saw a doctor.

They told us that the staff treated them with respect, listened to them and supported them to raise any concerns they had.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Favorita House Residential Home 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 was supported.

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

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

Although most peoples' care and welfare needs were met one person could not be confident that they would be reliably and consistently supported to manage a medical condition.

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

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 and upheld.

Overall, we found that Favorita 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 received safe care and their health and welfare needs were met by competent staff.

Overall, we found that Favorita 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 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 Favorita 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 said they had received information about the home and staff had talked to them about the care and treatment they needed. They said that the manager of the home had visited them before they moved in to discuss their needs and that they had been involved in making decisions about their care.

We heard staff actively listening to people when offering them choices. People told us they had the opportunity to join in with activities. Activities included games, sing-a – longs and quizzes. One person told us they had played games on the computer which they enjoyed. There were visits from the local churches and staff supported people to live as independently as possible.

People said that privacy and dignity was respected. They said that staff knocked on their door before they entered their rooms and that they always explained what was going on and what they were going to do.

One person said 'The staff are very good here, they are kind and respectful'.

Other evidence

When people had been considering moving into the home their needs for care had

been assessed so that they could be confident they would get the help they needed.

Staff told us that people and relatives had been involved in the information that was in their care plans.

The atmosphere in the home was relaxed and staff spoke to people in an informal and polite manner.

We observed people being supported by the staff to do what they wanted to do. We saw staff explaining to people what support and care they were going to give.

People had been helped to wear neat and clean clothes which they had chosen.

People could attend church services. There were social activities such as games, arts and crafts. People were free to receive guests whenever they wished.

At the time of the visit some people were having their lunch in the dining area. Others had chosen to have their lunch in their rooms or in another part of the home. Staff were attentive and made sure people had everything that they wanted.

Our judgement

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

Overall, we found that Favorita 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 said that they were satisfied with the health and personal care they received and that their independence was encouraged.

They said that they were well supported with their personal and health care, mobility and diet. This included assistance with everyday tasks such as washing and dressing, using the bathroom, eating and drinking and taking care of themselves. People told us that the staff supported them to be as independent as possible.

They said, 'The staff here are very good they come and check I'm okay and everyday they help me with what I need' and 'I get a fair bit of help from staff to do things and if they're needed they come when you ask, they're friendly'.

Other evidence

Each person had an individual plan of care that said what assistance they needed and wanted to receive. The information included things such as responding to medical conditions, helping people with reduced mobility and helping people wash, dress and use the bathroom. The plans took into account advice received from health and social care professionals.

Staff said that these plans helped them to reliably provide care for people in ways that was right for them.

We saw staff caring and supporting people in the way that suited them best. We saw that staff followed the information in the care plans when doing this.

Assessments were in place to make sure that people's skin was kept as healthy as possible. Body maps were used to record any areas of concern and there was a plan of care to make sure people's skin was being looked after properly. People were seen using equipment such as special cushions and mattresses to help keep their skin healthy. There were falls risk assessments in place to make sure that people were kept as safe as possible from the risk of falling over.

There was information about people's mental capacity in some of the care plans. There were arrangements to support people who needed special help when making certain important decisions. There were also safeguards if someone needed to have part of their freedom limited so that any restrictions used were the least necessary and were reviewed regularly.

One person had a routine medical condition that needed to be carefully monitored so that help could quickly be provided when necessary. Although the person was being checked, staff had not been given sufficient guidance about what steps to take when they became unwell and some staff had not received suitable training about the condition. This meant that the person concerned might not consistently and reliably receive the care they needed. Also, it had been recommended that staff refer the person to a special nurse and this had not been done.

Our judgement

Although most peoples' care and welfare needs were met one person could not be confident that they would be reliably and consistently supported to manage a medical condition.

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

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 discuss any concerns they had with the staff. Observations during the visit showed there was a relaxed atmosphere and people chatted freely and openly with each other, the staff and management.

Other evidence

There was a policy and procedure that described the action staff should take in order to keep people safe from abuse. Staff knew about what to do to keep people safe.

The staff we spoke to and the registered manager were able to tell us how and where to report any suspicions or concerns about the safety and wellbeing of the people. Most of the staff had received training on how to keep people safe. This meant that all the staff had the knowledge and the skills to protect people from all forms of abuse. Training was on going.

Some staff had received training regarding the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. Further training had been booked, therefore, people could be sure that any decisions were made in their best interests and were reviewed in line with appropriate guidelines.

Our judgement

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

Overall, we found that Favorita 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 told us the staff were kind and caring. We saw positive interactions between people and staff.

The staff that provided the care were able to tell us about the care and support they gave to the people who lived at the home.

People said the staff team worked well together.

Other evidence

Most of the staff who worked at the home had been there for a number of years. Staff spoken with confirmed they had received induction training and said they were supported well when they first started working at the home.

Records were seen of staff training. They included attending courses in mandatory subjects like fire awareness, infection control, food safety, safe moving and handling and safeguarding people from abuse.

The service provided specialist training to make sure that staff had knowledge and skills to look after people with specialist conditions like dementia. Not all staff had received this training but it was being planned.

Staff were receiving guidance from the manager and their work was monitored to make sure that they continued to meet people's needs in a reliable way. This was being done through one to one meetings with the manager, staff meetings and handovers between

shifts.

Our judgement

People received safe care and their health and welfare needs were met by competent staff.

Overall, we found that Favorita 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 that staff consulted with them about things they wanted in their home. One person said, 'Staff have asked me what I think about things and how I like things to be done'.

People confirmed that they had been sent questionnaires about the home and had also been asked by the registered manager if they were happy with the service they received.

Relatives who had sent in questionnaires to the manager said, 'Staff have displayed the upmost empathy and caring attitude towards my mother' and 'Nothing is too much trouble, a proper home from home'.

Other evidence

There was an organised system for recording and analysing accidents such as falls and when necessary action had be taken to reduce the likelihood of them happening again. This included two people having been provided with more care so that there was less chance of them trying to walk without assistance and losing their balance.

We looked at minutes of staff meetings and questionnaires completed by relatives of the people living in the home. These demonstrated that the quality of the service was monitored and concerns addressed appropriately. The last survey was carried out in February 2011.

Quality checks had been completed of key things such as fire safety equipment. The manager and deputy also told us that they carried out regular audits on things like medication and care planning on a monthly basis but they had not recorded when and how often they did this. There was evidence that when a problem was identified it had been resolved promptly so that people could be kept safe.

We were told that people and their relatives were encouraged to come and speak to the manager or provider at any time to discuss any issues regarding the service and the care they were receiving. We saw people doing this at the time of the visit.

Our judgement

People 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 Favorita 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 9 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010	Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services
	<p>Why we have concerns: Although most peoples' care and welfare needs were met one person could not be confident that they would be reliably and consistently supported to manage a medical condition.</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