

# Review of compliance

<p>Parkcare Homes Limited Rose Court</p>	
<p><b>Region:</b></p>	<p>East</p>
<p><b>Location address:</b></p>	<p>12 Bradgers Hill Road Luton Bedfordshire LU2 7EL</p>
<p><b>Type of service:</b></p>	<p>Care home service without nursing</p>
<p><b>Date of Publication:</b></p>	<p>February 2012</p>
<p><b>Overview of the service:</b></p>	<p>Rose Court is registered with the Care Quality Commission as a Care Home without Nursing (CHS). It is registered to provide the Regulated Activity Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care. This home provides accommodation for up to 10 adults with Learning Disabilities.</p>

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

## Our current overall judgement

**Rose Court 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, carried out a visit on 2 February 2012, observed how people were being cared for, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

### What people told us

People that we spoke with during our visit to Rose Court on 02 February 2012 told us that they were happy and felt safe living there, and that the staff that looked after them were all helpful and friendly and treated them with respect.

People looked clean and well groomed, and where people needed support or assistance with personal care this was done in the privacy of their bedroom to protect their dignity.

We observed that people were given choices and encouraged to make decisions about all aspects of their lives, including how they spent their time and what they had to eat.

Everyone who lived at Rose Court had the opportunity to attend day centres or college courses, however if people preferred not to do this their decision was respected, and alternative activities were available or arranged for them

### What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Rose Court 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**

The Provider is compliant with this outcome.

Care is provided in a way that promotes people's dignity and respects their wishes. People are supported to make choices and decisions about the personal care, support and treatment they receive, and are also involved and consulted about all other aspects of life in the home.

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

The Provider is compliant with this outcome.

People experience safe, effective and appropriate care because there are care plans and risk assessments in place which promote holistic care and are reviewed to reflect their needs as they change.

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

The Provider is compliant with this outcome.

People who live at Rose Court are protected from abuse, because the staff have the appropriate knowledge and understanding of the safeguarding policy and protocols, and know how to raise alerts swiftly.

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

The Provider was compliant with this outcome.

There are sufficient staff that are appropriately trained to safely meet the health, welfare and social needs of people in this home.

**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 is compliant with this outcome.

People at Rose Court benefit from safe quality care because the quality monitoring processes that are in place are thorough and ensure that all aspects of people's health, safety and welfare are monitored and managed effectively.

**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 that we spoke with during our visit to Rose Court on 02 February 2012 told us that they were happy living there, and that the staff that looked after them were all helpful and friendly and treated them well.

People looked clean and well groomed, and where people needed support or assistance with personal care this was done in the privacy of their room to protect their dignity.

People told us that they were given choices and encouraged to make decisions about all aspects of their lives, including what meals were on the menus, and how they spent their leisure time.

People could participate in planned group activities that were arranged in the home, such as cookery and crafts, or have more focused sessions on a 1:1 basis that helped them with specific aspects of personal development such as understanding and managing money.

During our visit we observed a small group of people engaged in kitchen activities preparing desserts for the evening meal. Although everyone was encouraged to participate in activity groups, if someone preferred not to, their decision was supported and alternative arrangements were made for them.

Everyone in the home had the opportunity to participate in community based activities which included attending day centres or college courses of their choice. Three people

were also employed on a voluntary basis by businesses / charities in the local community.

People living at Rose Court had access to a wealth of information relating to the home which was available to them. Information documents were presented in picture format and many were also in an audio version, to ensure that everyone, whatever their level of communication and understanding, had access to this information. This included information about people's rights and how to make a complaint, how to access Advocacy Services and safeguarding contact information.

Monthly meetings were held in the home, which gave people the opportunity to share their views and opinions. This forum was also used to provide guidance for a healthy lifestyle, such as diet or dental care. We were told that these sessions were interactive and were often recorded. This was so that where people found it difficult to work in the group, they could still benefit from the session in private by watching the video.

### **Other evidence**

We were told by the manager that every effort was made to ensure that people at Rose Court were encouraged to maintain their independence, and make decisions about the support and care that they needed and how it was delivered.

We noted from the records that we saw, that people were encouraged to engage with other health professionals, such as psychologists, to help them effectively manage any significant life changes or events. However, if at any time individuals did not want to proceed with this support, it was discussed in depth with them, recorded with a plan to monitor and introduce alternative support when it was appropriate.

People were encouraged to share their views and feelings about how the home was run and how it could be improved. They were also involved in making decisions about things such as activities and the menus. This was done through resident's group meetings and 1:1 consultations with their key workers on a regular basis.

In the individual files that we looked at, care plan and risk management documentation reflected input and involvement from people regarding their personal issues.

Information about the facilities available to them, and details about how to complain if they were not satisfied with any aspect of their care, was also available in their files.

### **Our judgement**

The Provider is compliant with this outcome.

Care is provided in a way that promotes people's dignity and respects their wishes.

People are supported to make choices and decisions about the personal care, support and treatment they receive, and are also involved and consulted about all other aspects of life in the home.

## 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

Due to the varying levels of communication and understanding that people at Rose Court had, it was difficult to discuss some people's care with them in any depth, however those that we spoke with were able to demonstrate an awareness of the care and support they needed. They were happy with the staff and the way that they helped them, and told us that they talked about their care plans each month through 1:1 discussions with their key workers and the manager.

During our visit on 02 February 2012 we observed that the staff on duty spoke with people individually about what they had done during the day. This was to provide information for the daily log which the staff wrote at the end of their shift, and to promote involvement of the people who use this service, with their individual records.

##### Other evidence

We looked at the care documentation for three of the ten people who currently lived at Rose Court. We found that there were care/ support plans and risk assessments in place that had been clearly written in a personalised way. They referred to the individual's personal choices and preferences, and their personal goals and aspirations. There were Health Action Plans in place which indicated that appointments with other health professionals, such as opticians and dentists, were made for them and took place at regular intervals or more frequently if required.

All the documentation was presented in pictorial format to help people understand them more easily. We also noted that for one person who had difficulties with communication, their file identified that parts of their care plan had been completed with the support of a video. This was because it was the most effective way to help them understand and

encourage them to be involved in planning their care.

Where people were able to, they had signed their care plans, and if they were not able to sign this was clearly recorded.

The care documents contained specific information such as potential challenging behaviours, warning signs and triggers, de escalation techniques, the aims of interventions of required support and how it should be carried out. This gave staff clear guidance to follow when giving support and care, and ensured that it was done with continuity. We found that care plans and risk assessments were all being regularly reviewed and amended where people's needs changed.

Two people in the home were being supported to prepare for moving into a supported living environment. We spoke with one of these people about this move. They were fully aware of how their lives would change in their new environment and were looking forward to an increased independence.

### **Our judgement**

The Provider is compliant with this outcome.

People experience safe, effective and appropriate care because there are care plans and risk assessments in place which promote holistic care and are reviewed to reflect their needs as they change.

## 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 that we spoke with at Rose Court told us that they felt safe living there, and that the staff were kind and treated them well. We observed that people looked comfortable and at ease with the staff who were giving them care and support.

##### Other evidence

We were aware from information held by CQC that this home reported safeguarding alerts to the appropriate organisations in a timely way. The home had a safeguarding policy in place which was accessible to all staff. There were safeguarding posters located in the reception area of the home, which gave people contact details of who they could call if they felt they had been badly treated.

The staff that we spoke with understood the safeguarding processes and their role in ensuring that the policies were followed and that alerts were raised appropriately. They told us where the home's safeguarding policy was located, and that they had attended safeguarding training.

Everyone that we spoke with was able to demonstrate a clear understanding of what issues should be reported as safeguarding alerts, which they told us they would do in the first instant via the management of the home. They were aware of what documentation needed to be completed, and knew that they could raise concerns directly with social services or the CQC if they needed to.

##### Our judgement

The Provider is compliant with this outcome.

People who live at Rose Court are protected from abuse, because the staff have the appropriate knowledge and understanding of the safeguarding policy and protocols, and know how to raise alerts swiftly.

## 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 that we spoke with when we visited Rose Court on 02 February 2012, told us that they liked the staff that supported them. They said that the staff were kind, and helped them when they could not manage on their own or when they needed advice and guidance.

We observed staff interacting confidently with people, showing patience and understanding, and encouraging people to be independent. They were friendly and professional in their approach to people.

##### Other evidence

There were ten people living at Rose Court at the time of our visit on 02 February 2012. Although some people required a high level of assistance and supervision with their personal care, for some, the support they required was more focused on developing and managing personal and social skills.

On the day of our visit, there were three support staff on duty, plus the manager and the deputy manager. We were told that although this was the normal number of staff during the day, the number of staff on duty was flexible and varied from shift to shift depending on what social activities were planned for people, and the level of support they required. For example if people wanted to go shopping or swimming, and more staff were required, then staffing numbers were increased to safely accommodate this activity. During the night there were two 'sleep in staff,' and one 'waking staff' to provide 1:1 care for one particular person.

The staff that we spoke with during our visit, were extremely knowledgeable about the people who they cared for, and they were confident about their role in effectively

meeting people's needs. They talked to us about the wide variety of training that was available to them which included topics such as Epilepsy and Autism, as well as the mandatory subjects which they had to routinely attend for updates.

Training for staff at this home was done either through e learning on the computer, which was monitored by the deputy manager, or by face to face training which was provided either in house or by external specialist trainers that could be sourced as required.

The staff that we spoke all told us that they felt well supported by the manager and they enjoyed their job which they found fulfilling.

**Our judgement**

The Provider was compliant with this outcome.

There are sufficient staff that are appropriately trained to safely meet the health, welfare and social needs of people in this home.

## 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 that we spoke with told us that they had regular meetings in the home. This gave them the opportunity to share their views and make suggestions to improve the care and support they received.

##### Other evidence

The manager told us that daily, weekly or monthly audits were carried out in relation to all aspects of health and safety in the home. These included, fire safety checks, water temperature checks, building and content maintenance, refrigerator and food temperatures and medication and care records. We looked at some of the audit records that were available and they confirmed these were being carried out regularly, and noted that where anomalies were identified these were addressed immediately. There were also systems in place to ensure that everyone who lived at Rose Court had the opportunity to discuss all aspects of their care and life in the home. This was done through group meetings and on a 1:1 basis with their key worker each month. The key worker meetings were clearly recorded and then shared with the manager, who also consulted with the individuals. Personal views and comments were incorporated into the individual's care plan reviews. The minutes from all group meetings were available in a variety of formats and showed that everyone had been consulted and their reviews taken into account.

##### Our judgement

The Provider is compliant with this outcome.

People at Rose Court benefit from safe quality care because the quality monitoring processes that are in place are thorough and ensure that all aspects of people's health, safety and welfare are monitored and managed effectively.

# 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

<b>Document purpose</b>	Review of compliance report
<b>Author</b>	Care Quality Commission
<b>Audience</b>	The general public
<b>Further copies from</b>	03000 616161 / <a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk">www.cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Copyright</b>	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

<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk">www.cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Telephone</b>	03000 616161
<b>Email address</b>	<a href="mailto:enquiries@cqc.org.uk">enquiries@cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Postal address</b>	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA