

Review of compliance

Brain Injury Rehabilitation Trust Redford Court	
Region:	North West
Location address:	7 Birt Close Toxteth Liverpool Merseyside L8 7SZ
Type of service:	Care home service without nursing Rehabilitation services
Date of Publication:	July 2012
Overview of the service:	Redford Court provides support and accommodation for people with acquired/traumatic brain injury. It is run by the Brain Injury Rehabilitation Trust and has been developed in partnership with Riverside Housing Association.

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

Our current overall judgement

Redford Court was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety inspected.

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 7 June 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

We spoke individually with eight of the people living at Redford Court. One person told us "I enjoy myself living here" and another person said "it's great, can do what you want, almost no restrictions". People told us that they had been supported to make everyday decisions for themselves and that they liked the staff team.

In discussion people confirmed that they had received the support they needed with their health and personal care and in managing their everyday lives. Everyone we spoke with told us that they felt safe living at Redford Court and felt confident to raise concerns with staff, who they said would help them "to sort it out".

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Redford Court was meeting them

Outcome 02: Before people are given any examination, care, treatment or support, they should be asked if they agree to it

The provider was meeting this standard. Before people received any care or treatment they were asked for their consent and the provider acted in accordance with their wishes.

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

The provider was meeting this standard. People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and supported their rights.

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

The provider was meeting this standard. People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse, because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse occurring.

Outcome 09: People should be given the medicines they need when they need them, and in a safe way

The provider was meeting this standard. People were protected against the risks associated with medicines because the provider had appropriate arrangements in place to manage medicines.

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

The provider was meeting this standard. People were supported by suitably qualified, skilled and experienced staff.

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

The provider was meeting this standard. The provider had an effective system to regularly assess and monitor the quality of service that people receive.

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.

Where we judge that a provider is non-compliant with a standard, we make a judgement about whether the impact on people who use the service (or others) is minor, moderate or major:

A minor impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had an impact on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The impact was not significant and the matter could be managed or resolved quickly.

A moderate impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had a significant effect on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The matter may need to be resolved quickly.

A major impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had a serious current or long term impact on their health, safety and welfare, or there was a risk of this happening. The matter needs to be resolved quickly.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary changes are made.

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

Outcome 02: Consent to care and treatment

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

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

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 02: Consent to care and treatment

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

Seven of the people living at Redford Court told us they had been asked about their care and treatment and understood and consented to it. One person explained, "it's great, can do what you want, almost no restrictions", another person said they had been consulted about living at the home and had consented to this. People told us that they had been supported to make everyday decisions for themselves and that staff had talked to them about their plan of care.

Other evidence

In discussion with the manager she demonstrated an awareness of the Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Laws, these laws help to protect the interests of vulnerable people. They also provide protection to people in ensuring decisions the person is unable to make are made in their best interests. She advised us that when needed external advocates had been contacted to act independently for the person and that 'best interest' meetings had taken place.

We saw records that evidenced staff had supported one of the people living there to use these laws to make a health related decision. Records also demonstrated that assessments of people's ability to make and consent to certain decisions had been regularly undertaken. These assessments were undertaken with input from a variety of professionals as well as the person using the service . They aim to ensure people are

supported to make as many decisions for themselves as possible about their care and treatment. Where the person was unable to make a particular decision this had been clearly assessed and recorded.

In discussion with staff they demonstrated an awareness of people's right to make decisions and were able to provide clear examples of occasions this had occurred and how they had responded appropriately.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. Before people received any care or treatment they were asked for their consent and the provider acted in accordance with their wishes.

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 spoke with eight of the people living at Redford Court. They all told us they received the support they needed with their health and welfare. People told us that if they needed to make medical appointments staff assisted them with this and also supported them to attend the appointment. Those people who needed support with their personal care told us that this had always been available. One person explained staff "come quick" when they had used their call bell, another person explained that they had been made aware of how to summon general help and emergency help via their call bell and that staff had responded "quick enough" when they used it.

People told us that they talked to staff about the care and support they received and had been consulted about their care plan.

Other evidence

We observed that staff spoke respectfully to people and spent time interacting with people on a social basis as well as meeting their care needs. They also took time to understand and respond to peoples' different communication styles.

Care records contained a series of support plans and assessments that gave guidance to staff on how to support people with their everyday lives including their personal and health care. Staff we spoke with were aware of this guidance and able to give clear explanations of the different types of support people needed and preferred.

Discussions with staff and care records also evidenced that the service worked with

other professionals to plan and deliver the support the person required.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and supported 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

The people living at Redford Court told us they felt safe living there. One person told us if they had concerns they would speak to senior staff and "ask for a meeting in the office" and that they had confidence staff would support them to "sort it out". This was confirmed by all of the other people we spoke with.

Other evidence

A number of potential safeguarding incidents have occurred within Redford Court in the past year. The majority of these have been issues which occurred between the people living there. Our records showed the service identified and reported these to the appropriate authorities including ourselves and the Local Social Services Safeguarding team for investigation. Staff cooperated with other authorities in investigating these issues and in planning and implementing strategies to reduce future occurrences.

Training records evidenced that staff training had taken place in safeguarding adults. In discussion staff demonstrated that they had an awareness of safeguarding adults including signs and symptoms that may indicate an incident had occurred. They confirmed they had received training and that they would not hesitate to report any safeguarding issues that arose.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse, because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse occurring.

Outcome 09: Management of medicines

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

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

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 09: Management of medicines

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

Four of the people who live at Redford Court told us staff looked after their medication for them. They told us that they always got this on time and one person confirmed that when they had needed pain relief staff had supported them with this. Another person explained that they were learning to manage their own medication independently and that staff had provided them with the appropriate support.

Other evidence

During our visit we observed that medication was stored safely in locked cabinets, rooms or fridges. We looked at a sample of medication records for five people. These had all been completed correctly with information available for staff to follow on side effects of medication or when dealing with medication to be taken 'as required'. The provider may find it useful to note that some information on side effects had been recorded using medical terminology. A member of staff confirmed they did not fully understand all of the terms used. As staff were not medically qualified this could lead to a lack of understanding of potential side effects.

Records evidenced regular audits of medication had been carried out, these audits helped to identify and therefore deal with potential medication issues.

Three members of staff told us that they had received training in managing medication. Records we examined further evidenced this training had been delivered to the appropriate staff. They also showed that senior staff had undertaken observations of

staff competency in dispensing medications to people living there.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. People were protected against the risks associated with medicines because the provider had appropriate arrangements in place to manage medicines.

Outcome 12: Requirements relating to workers

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by staff who are fit, appropriately qualified and are physically and mentally able to do their job.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 12: Requirements relating to workers

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

All of the people we spoke to at Redford Court told us that they liked the staff team and found them competent. Their comments included, "Staff know what they are doing" and "staff are good company."

Other evidence

Three members of staff we spoke with confirmed they had completed an application form, attended an interview and had a Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and reference checks carried out on them before they started work at Redford Court.

We looked at recruitment files for five members of staff. We found staff had been recruited correctly with checks carried out to help ensure they were suitable to work with people who may be vulnerable.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. People were supported by suitably qualified, skilled and experienced staff.

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

Four of the people living at Redford Court told us that they were regularly consulted about the service they had received. One person explained that staff had talked to them regularly and then completed a form about their opinion.

Other evidence

Records evidenced that staff regularly met on a one to one basis with the people living at Redford Court to seek their opinion on the support the service had provided. A response to any issues raised had been given to the person and recorded. This provided a formal way for people to be consulted about how their service operated and to influence changes.

There were several reviews and audits in place at Redford Court to check and monitor the quality of the service provided. They included regular reviews of the care and support provided and audits of medication and staff records.

In addition a detailed audit had been undertaken by the company in February 2012. This covered a number of key areas and listed actions to be taken to improve the quality of the service provided.

The regular reviews and audits undertaken provided a formal system for reviewing the service provided and planning and monitoring future improvements.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. The provider had an effective system to regularly assess and monitor the quality of service that people receive.

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.

Where we judge that providers are not meeting essential standards, we may set compliance actions or take enforcement action:

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. 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