

# Review of compliance

<p>Housing 21 Housing 21 - Fountain Court</p>	
<b>Region:</b>	North East
<b>Location address:</b>	Armstrong Street Bensham Gateshead Tyne and Wear NE8 4AF
<b>Type of service:</b>	Domiciliary care service Extra Care housing services
<b>Date of Publication:</b>	January 2012
<b>Overview of the service:</b>	Fountain Court is registered with the Care Quality Commission for the regulated activity of personal care. It provides an on-site domiciliary care and support service to people who are tenants within Fountain Court sheltered housing scheme.

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

## Our current overall judgement

**Housing 21 - Fountain 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 December 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 using the service, and a relative, were complimentary about the support they received, and told us they were satisfied with the service. Their comments included, "They take good care of us"; "We're very safe and secure here"; "The staff treat everyone as an individual"; "I'm perfectly content"; and, "They're very kind and caring".

### What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Housing 21 - Fountain 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**

We found that people using the service were respected and involved in making decisions about their care and influenced the delivery of the service.  
Overall, we found that Fountain Court was meeting this essential standard.

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

We found that people using the service were provided with well planned, personalised care to meet their needs.  
Overall, we found that Fountain Court was meeting this essential standard.

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

We found that people using the service were protected from risks of being harmed.  
Overall, we found that Fountain Court was meeting this essential standard.

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

We found that staff were provided with support and training that enhanced their skills in meeting the needs of people using the service.  
Overall, we found that Fountain Court 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**

We found that people using the service benefitted from robust systems which monitored and developed the quality of the service and promoted their safety.  
Overall, we found that Fountain Court was meeting this essential standard.

**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 using the service told us they were kept informed and consulted about the service they received. They said, "The staff listen to us and respect our choices", and, "They encourage everyone to get involved".

The people we spoke with said care workers provided support that was tailored to their needs. Their comments included, "I've kept my independence"; "They always ask my permission"; and, "The staff treat everyone as an individual". A relative told us that workers made time to sit and talk with her mother as they knew this was important to her.

#### Other evidence

A senior worker told us that people who were considering using the service were encouraged to visit and spend time at the scheme. They were given an explanation about the concept of extra care housing, and invited to ask questions about tenancy arrangements, and the range of services offered. A welcome pack was provided that set out information about the service, and details of local amenities. Some of the tenants and their relatives also contributed to a new people's introductions to the service. They talked to them about their experiences, and helped to alleviate any concerns they might have about moving in.

Care services were provided to tenants of Fountain Court over the 24 hour period, by a team of on-site care workers. Rotas were forward planned and three new bank staff had been employed to cover absences. New staff were formally introduced to the tenants, and they shadowed experienced workers in order to become familiar with people's care and support needs.

We saw that each person using the service was allocated hours of support to meet their assessed needs. Records were kept of ongoing support time and these were used to identify where people may require reassessment of their needs. People using the service, and their representatives, were involved in reviews of individual's care packages.

Care workers were provided with training on equality and diversity to give them understanding of people's diverse needs and rights.

Care records contained evidence of individual's choices and preferences about how they wished to be supported. Support plans were sensitively recorded and included details of maintaining privacy, dignity and independence. The records showed people were asked the name they preferred to be addressed by. We were told that people were consulted on their preferences to be assisted with personal care by female or male staff.

People signed their care records to confirm they had been involved in, and agreed to, their planned care. Consent forms verified permission from tenants for access to personal information, and also for staff to access their accommodation and provide support with medication.

The scheme offered a range of facilities that were used by the tenants and the wider community. There was a shop, a restaurant, hairdressing and beauty salon, and a guest room for tenants' relatives and friends. We were told that tenants often invited their families and friends to dine with them at themed restaurant evenings.

Social inclusion was built into people's support plans. For example, two people's records we viewed showed care workers assisted them to and from the restaurant each day. Communal lounge areas were used for a variety of social activities provided by the staff and local groups. These included crafts, bingo, exercise to music, dancing and reminiscence. Tenants had also recently taken part in a local creative arts and food project that promoted interaction between the younger and older generations.

People had opportunities to be involved in, and give feedback about the service. There were regular tea clubs, a social committee, and tenants' surveys were carried out. The manager told us that a previous survey on catering in the scheme had led to tenants' views being acted on, including their involvement in choosing a new chef.

### **Our judgement**

We found that people using the service were respected and involved in making decisions about their care and influenced the delivery of the service.

Overall, we found that Fountain Court 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 using the service told us about the support they received. Their comments included, "They know exactly what help I need"; "We're well looked after"; and, "They take good care of us". A relative described being very pleased with her mother's care.

##### Other evidence

A senior worker told us there was good communication between staff and handovers of information about people's welfare took place at each shift change. She said senior workers had designated office time each week during which they updated and audited care records. The manager and senior staff had recently undertaken training on new care documentation that was being introduced.

We examined the care records of three people who used the service. These contained comprehensive assessments that identified the individual's needs. Support plans included a pen picture of the person and useful information, such as past medical history and family support. The plans were person centred and recorded in specific detail. They clearly showed the care and support required at each visit, the person's independent skills, and desired outcomes.

Some people had an advance care plan that set out their wishes for care and support in the future. A senior worker said the service had cared for people until the end of their lives and this had included co-ordinated work with other professionals such as cancer specialist nurses.

Risk assessments were carried out and strategies were in place to minimise or manage risks associated with provision of personal care, moving and handling, mobility and taking medication.

Care workers completed records at each visit to people using the service, to confirm the support they had provided. We saw that these entries matched with people's planned care. Ongoing records of assistance with prescribed medication were also kept. Some recording issues were noted which the manager had followed up through discussion at a staff meeting and introduction of weekly audits.

**Our judgement**

We found that people using the service were provided with well planned, personalised care to meet their needs.

Overall, we found that Fountain Court 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 using the service told us they had no concerns about how they were treated. Their comments included, "We're very safe and secure here"; "The carers are all lovely"; "They check in on me to make sure I'm okay"; and, "We know our rights and what to do if anyone doesn't treat us properly".

##### Other evidence

We saw that information about safeguarding and complaints processes was displayed on a notice board and given to people using the service.

Care workers were provided with training during their induction, and at two yearly intervals, on how to safeguard vulnerable adults from abuse.

No safeguarding concerns or alerts had been raised about the service. The manager demonstrated that she was aware of her responsibility to respond to any incidents or allegations of abuse.

People using the service were able to contact staff throughout the day and night. They had pull cords in their accommodation and pendants that could be worn on the body to alert care workers via handsets. A backup company was used as a contingency in the event of any faults to the handsets. Master keys to the tenants' flats were kept to gain access in emergency circumstances.

Support with managing personal finances was not currently provided. A recording

system was available to document any financial transactions carried out by staff on behalf of people using the service.

**Our judgement**

We found that people using the service were protected from risks of being harmed. Overall, we found that Fountain Court 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 using the service, and a relative we spoke with, praised the manager and staff. They described them as, "brilliant", "very kind and caring", and one person said they were, "the best".

##### Other evidence

New staff received four days of induction training, followed by a period of shadowing experienced workers, before they started to work on their own.

The service kept a staff training matrix with an overview of all training completed by the team and dates when courses were to be updated. This showed that care workers received training relevant to their roles that included safeguarding, moving and handling, fire safety, and medication. Training specific to the needs of people using the service was also provided such as dementia, nutrition, and equality and diversity.

The majority of care workers had achieved National Vocational Qualifications (NVQ) in care at levels 2 or 3. The remaining workers were enrolled to start studying for these qualifications.

A schedule for staff supervision was maintained. Care workers were provided with individual supervision every three months, and annual appraisals. This included sessions where they were observed whilst carrying out their duties with people using the service. Additional checks on workers' performance and care practice were also conducted.

The staff we spoke with told us they received sufficient training and felt well supported.

**Our judgement**

We found that staff were provided with support and training that enhanced their skills in meeting the needs of people using the service.

Overall, we found that Fountain Court 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

The people we spoke with told us they were happy with the service and had no complaints. Their comments included, "I'm perfectly content"; "We're very satisfied"; and, "It's excellent".

##### Other evidence

The manager told us that the provider organisation was looking towards expanding the service, to deliver personal care and support to people in their own homes, within a three mile radius of the scheme.

We reviewed some of the methods used to monitor the quality of the service. A new quality team from the provider organisation had recently carried out an inspection of the scheme. This had shown where there was compliance with standards, and where improvements needed to be made. We saw evidence that the manager had taken action to address the improvements needed.

Records showed that people using the service were consulted and involved in how their support was assessed, planned and reviewed. Communication systems were well established and these kept care workers up to date about people's well-being, and enabled them to act promptly on any changes to their people's needs.

People's views on the delivery of the service were sought informally, and through meetings and surveys. The manager told us she had obtained feedback from tenants on particular aspects of the scheme, such as catering and domestic services, through

surveys.

No complaints had been received about the service. Audits of records and spot checks on care workers were used to validate the support provided in practice, and identify any areas that required development.

Staff were trained in safe working practices and health and safety. They were guided by care records that showed them how to manage risks and ensure personal safety.

**Our judgement**

We found that people using the service benefitted from robust systems which monitored and developed the quality of the service and promoted their safety.

Overall, we found that Fountain Court was meeting this essential standard.

# 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