

# Review of compliance

## Consensus Support Services Limited Grovelands Farmhouse

<b>Region:</b>	South East
<b>Location address:</b>	Tandridge Hill Lane Godstone Surrey RH9 8DD
<b>Type of service:</b>	Care home service without nursing
<b>Date of Publication:</b>	December 2012
<b>Overview of the service:</b>	<p>Groveland's Farmhouse is a care home that specialises in providing personal care and accommodation for up to nine adults with an Autistic Spectrum Condition and between the ages of 18 and 65 years.</p> <p>There are seven bedrooms in the main farmhouse with a separate modern bungalow offering two self contained flats.</p> <p>The company also owns a working farm</p>

	<p>next door to the home. A range of daytime services for people at the home and others occur at the farm. There is no public transport nearby.</p>
--	---

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

## Our current overall judgement

**Grovelands Farmhouse 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.

### What people told us

People who use the service told us:

"I'm alright." "I have been doing art today." "I like class." "The farm is great." "I love the farm." "I like doing the pigs." "I like it here, the food is nice." "The food is lovely and I get to choose what to eat." "I can get a snack anytime."

People also spoke about the forthcoming outing to the zoo, household tasks, lunches out, their college, choosing the colours in their rooms, and activities and their holidays.

One person said they had a complaint once and they did something about it.

Another person told us that if they don't do what they agreed, they would write a letter and make them.

We also spoke to one relative of the people who used the service who said:

"I love it here, the staff are wonderful, it feels like a family here there's a lovely atmosphere". They look after them well, "I feel they are safe here, I am asked about my views"; "I have no concerns I can't find fault but feel I could make a complaint if I needed to", "we are welcome and can visit as we please, the home is well run and I can always talk to the staff and manager."

### What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Grovelands Farmhouse 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's privacy, dignity and independence were respected.

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

People's needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with their individual care plan.

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

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 from happening.

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

There were enough qualified, skilled and experienced staff to meet people's needs.

The provider was meeting this 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**

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

The provider was meeting this 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.

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 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

### What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- \* Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
- \* Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
- \* Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
- \* Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

### What we found

#### Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

#### Our findings

##### What people who use the service experienced and told us

People who used the service told us:

"I'm alright." "I have been doing art today." "I like class." "The farm is great." "I love the farm." "I like doing the pigs." "I like it here, the food is nice." "The food is lovely and I get to choose what to eat." "I can get a snack anytime."

People also spoke about the forthcoming outing to the zoo, household tasks, lunches out, their college, choosing the colours in their rooms, and activities and their holidays.

We also spoke a relative of a person who used the service who said: "I love it here, it feels like a family here there's a lovely atmosphere", "they look after them well", "we are welcome and can visit as we please, the home is well run and I can always talk to the staff and manager."

##### Other evidence

People who used the service made choices about their lives and are treated as individuals.

We saw people being offered choices. People's meal choices were recorded and they had been informed about healthy eating. People were offered choices about their

holidays. We observed people preparing to leave for their chosen day's activity and one person choosing to cut their activity short and return home early. Other people were supported with their choices of where to be and what to do within the building, farm, or out in the community.

People were supported to promote their independence and community involvement.

We saw that people's independence was promoted. Their choices in this area were recorded. We saw people were being supported in the kitchen to prepare meals. People were supported to be independent as possible during activities. There was also one specific day every week where people were supported with shopping and their household tasks.

We saw that people could engage in activities in the community such as voluntary work, university, college, eating out, shopping, clubs, swimming, the theatre, cinema, zoo, and walks.

We saw that the farm also provided a form of community involvement, as many people from other homes used the facilities. People were seen to be socialising at the farm's tea break and many people had friends from the farm over to their home for visits.

People's diversity, values and human rights were respected.

Information was provided in accessible formats such as pictorial menus and care plans.

We observed that staff were attentive to people and they had a good understanding of their communication styles or body language. We observed staff offering support in a dignified, sensitive and caring manner. For example, staff dealt with a potential conflict calmly, sensitively and discreetly.

We saw that people's care plans included information about their cultural and religious needs and communication, and how to increase independence.

### **Our judgement**

People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected.

The provider was meeting this standard.

## Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

### What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

\* Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

### What we found

#### Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

#### Our findings

##### What people who use the service experienced and told us

People who use the service told us:

"The staff help me" and "I like it here."

We also spoke to one relative of the people who used the service who said:

"They look after them well, and I can always talk to the staff and manager."

##### Other evidence

The service provided safe appropriate care, through carrying out initial assessments.

We saw that the home had obtained copies of the school and medical assessments before admission. The home undertook its own assessment, general and individual need based risk assessments. We saw that people were then involved in the care planning that was drawn from this and other health professionals' assessments.

We saw that care plans reflected the preferences of individuals. Care plans addressed people's cultural needs, their likes and dislikes, demonstrated how the person wanted to promote their independence and how they wanted their care to be carried out.

Care plans also included, for example, a hospital passport, admission details and initial assessments, behavioural management plans, nutritional assessments, communication. Health plans. Records of people's health care consultations and appointments were maintained

We saw that care plans were regularly reviewed and updated, they were regularly reviewed. We saw that staff signed the care planning files to show they have been read and understood.

we spoke with staff who demonstrated a good understanding of individual needs and preferences that mirrored information in people's care plans

We saw that the home had emergency procedures in place for example in the event of a fire, medical emergency, electricity power cuts, heating, flooding and adverse weather conditions.

**Our judgement**

People's needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with their individual care plan.

The provider was meeting this 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

We also spoke to one relative of the people who used the service who said:

"I feel they are safe here"

##### Other evidence

We saw that the provider minimised risk and the likelihood of abuse by making sure all the policies and procedures to promote safeguarding were in place.

We saw a Poster displayed in the home explaining how to report abuse.

We saw that the staff had been trained in non- restrictive intervention and there is a restraints policy to protect others if needed, and it hadn't had to be used yet.

We spoke to two members of staff who were aware of safeguarding procedures, they had attended training in this area and were able to demonstrate knowledge of those procedures.

Staff were also aware of other connected policies, such as the whistle blowing policy, and deprivation of liberty safeguards when it is was the best interest of the person who uses the service.

Staff were aware of their responsibility for reporting any incidents to the appropriate person should they witness or be made aware of any incident where the safety of

person using the service may be compromised

The home has a policy for removing a staff member from the service, without prejudice, pending the outcome of any allegation of abuse.

**Our judgement**

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 from happening.

The provider was meeting this standard.

## Outcome 13: Staffing

### What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

\* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by sufficient numbers of appropriate staff.

### What we found

#### Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 13: Staffing

#### Our findings

##### What people who use the service experienced and told us

People who use the service told us:

"The staff are nice." "I like the staff." "The staff are alright," "They're ok, you know." "The staff help me."

We also spoke to one relative of the people who used the service who said:

"The staff are wonderful, they look after them well."

##### Other evidence

There were enough qualified, skilled and experienced staff to meet people's needs.

The farmhouse had three to four staff in the morning and four to five staff in the afternoon. At night there is one sleeping in on call and one waking staff member at night.

The bungalow was staffed by three to four staff in the morning and afternoon. There were two sleeping in staff members on call at night.

Seventeen out of twenty staff members had the National Vocational Qualification in Care, level 2.

Staff have an induction and have access to additional specialist and developmental

training.

We observed staff spending time and interacting with people throughout this inspection staff had a lot of time for people and were not rushed.

The manager and some of the staff had worked at the home and they had supported people there for many years and knew them well. In discussions with staff they were able to demonstrate a good knowledge of the people they cared for.

**Our judgement**

There were enough qualified, skilled and experienced staff to meet people's needs.

The provider was meeting this 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

One person who uses the service told us that "I had a complaint once and they did something about it."

Another person told us: "If they don't do what they agreed to do, I will write a letter and make them."

We also spoke to one relative of the people who used the service who said:

"I have no concerns, I can't find fault but feel I could make a complaint if I needed to, the home is well run and I can always talk to the staff and manager."

##### Other evidence

We saw that there were systems in place to receive written feedback from people who used the service, relatives, staff and other stakeholders to gain their views about the care and support provided. Feedback was analysed and acted upon.

The home also seeks feedback through group meetings at the home and discussions on a one to one basis.

Following consultation with other care professionals there had been recent changes to the building including a security pad to the front door, a new bedroom, and a shower room. People complained about not being fully consulted during those improvements and it was agreed to put new systems in place to ensure consultation with people when

there are any changes to the home needed.

We saw that the health and safety of people was constantly promoted, reviewed and audited.

Information about risks was gathered, analysed and reviewed. Any changes required were implemented and recorded.

Audits of medication, reviews of care plans, and health and safety audits took place. Complaints were monitored for trends.

The operational manager made a monthly visit to carry out quality monitoring checks.

**Our judgement**

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

The provider was meeting this 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.

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

<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