

Review of compliance

<p>HC-One Limited Orchard Court Residential Home</p>	
<p>Region:</p>	<p>East Midlands</p>
<p>Location address:</p>	<p>3a Orchard Gardens Thurmaston Leicestershire LE4 8NS</p>
<p>Type of service:</p>	<p>Care home service without nursing</p>
<p>Date of Publication:</p>	<p>May 2012</p>
<p>Overview of the service:</p>	<p>Accommodation for younger and older people. People with learning disabilities, dementia, mental health, physical disabilities and sensory impairment.</p>

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

Our current overall judgement

Orchard Court Residential Home 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 and carried out a visit on 1 May 2012.

What people told us

Some people living at Orchard Court had limited communication and were unable to answer direct questions about some of the essential standards we reviewed. We did speak with people in a general way and asked some questions. We spoke with one person and they told us that staff were good and their house was nicely decorated.

We observed care and support being provided throughout our visit, staff showed a good understanding of people's needs, they were aware of their individual likes and dislikes and they treated people with respect.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Orchard Court 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

The provider was meeting this regulation. People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected

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

The provider was meeting this regulation. People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights. People's needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with their individual care plan

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

The provider was meeting this regulation. People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse because the provider has taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening.

Outcome 10: People should be cared for in safe and accessible surroundings that support their health and welfare

The provider was meeting this regulation. People who use the service, staff and visitors were protected against the risks of unsafe and unsuitable premises.

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

The provider was meeting this regulation. People were cared for by staff who were supported to deliver care and treatment safely and to an appropriate 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 was meeting this regulation. The provider was developing systems to regularly assess and monitor the quality of service that people received.

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

Some people living at Orchard Court had limited communication and were unable to answer direct questions about some of the essential standards we reviewed. We did speak with people in a general way and asked some questions. We spoke with one person and they told us staff were good and their house was nicely decorated. We observed people and their interactions with each other and with staff.

We observed staff treating people with dignity and respect. We saw people were toileted promptly in private. Some people had difficulties with communication and staff explained what was happening as they went along. One person was seen coming out of the bathroom and had not done up their clothes. A staff member quickly intervened and reminded the person to make sure they were "covered up" after using the bathroom. We saw some people were provided with protective clothing for daytime activities and at mealtimes to maintain their dignity and clothing.

Other evidence

Records checked confirmed that the people using the service and their families had been involved in the planning of their care and support. Where changes to their support had been provided everyone involved had been consulted. This was easier to locate in the new care plans currently being developed.

People were provided with a copy of the service user's guide prior to them moving in so that they were aware of the facilities that can be offered once at the home.

Some of the staff were trained as dignity champions and would be responsible for ensuring the principles of respect, dignity and privacy were put into practice in the running of the home. We saw information around dignity themes displayed on the walls.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this regulation. People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected

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

Some people living at Orchard Court had limited communication and were unable to answer direct questions about some of the essential standards we reviewed. We did speak with people in a general way and asked some questions. We spoke with one person and they told us that staff were good and their house was nicely decorated.

We observed care and support being provided throughout our visit, staff showed a good understanding of people's needs, they were aware of their individual likes and dislikes and they treated people with respect.

We saw staff in one of the houses assist people to cook a breakfast of sausage and bacon. A small cooker had been purchased for one house to provide people with the facilities to take part in regular cooking activities. We saw a staff member make arrangements to assist a person to their dental appointment. Staff told us they had planned this visit carefully to reflect the person's needs and minimise any distress. We saw staff play ball in the lounge with a person living at Orchard Court.

One person told us they had attended the home's health and safety training and regularly assisted the cook. They said they liked working in the kitchen and thought they did a good job. This promoted the person's well being and developed their independence skills.

A visiting health professional told us staff followed her instructions and she felt confident with the care provided at the home. She observed staff had a good rapport

with individuals and were caring and kind.

Other evidence

We looked at care records for three people. Two care plans were very detailed and comprehensive. The third care plan had been reviewed and improved. This format provided staff with clearer instructions of what they needed to do to meet people's individual's needs and preferences. The manager confirmed only two care plans had been reviewed and improved, and the remaining care plans would be done. We saw care records confirmed people's cultural needs were being met. A staff member told us of plans to assist a person living at Orchard Court to their place of worship at the weekend.

Risk assessments were in place for all identified risks. Regular reviews were held involving the person living at Orchard Court and other healthcare professionals involved in their care and input from family members. The manager confirmed they had recently taken a long trip with one of the people living at Orchard Court to visit their close relative. This had benefited the person living at Orchard Court and their relative, and helped to maintain family links.

People had access to all the health care services they required and were able to access health care professionals such as doctors, dentists, mental health advocates, dieticians, nurses or psychiatrists whenever this was needed.

One person had regular visits from a be-friender and they would spend time together. A be-friender could help people to say what they wanted, secure their rights, represent their interests and obtain any services they need.

We saw activity plan guides for the week but in some houses these were not followed. This meant that daytime activities were not always being provided to meet people's needs. The manager confirmed the activity plans were new, and he would be taking action with the activity coordinator and staff team to address this.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this regulation. People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights. People's needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with their individual care plan

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 spoke to people using the services but their feedback did not relate to this standard.

Other evidence

We spoke with staff about safeguarding people from abuse. Staff were able to describe the correct action to take in the event of suspected abuse. Staff told us the manager would always listen to their concerns and would take appropriate action. They told us they received safeguarding adults from abuse training. Quality audits confirmed over ninety per cent of staff had received this training. We saw whistleblowing policies displayed prominently around the home.

We sampled two people's money and receipts held by staff at the home. The receipts and money were in order. We talked to the manager about- who pays when care workers go out with people who use the service, and payment for the mini bus and other transport. The manager confirmed the arrangements and explained new guidance is being developed. Managing money belonging to people who use services- policies and procedures were being reviewed by the provider. This would ensure staff understand the correct procedures, sound financial management is practised; and reduces the potential for financial abuse.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this regulation. People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse because the provider has taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening.

Outcome 10: Safety and suitability of premises

What the outcome says

This is what people should expect.

People who use services and people who work in or visit the premises:

* Are in safe, accessible surroundings that promote their wellbeing.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 10: Safety and suitability of premises

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

about some of the essential standards we reviewed. We did speak with people in a general way and asked some questions. We observed people and their interactions with each other and with staff.

One person told us they had been consulted about the re-decoration plans and liked the new décor and enjoyed watching the new flat screen television in the lounge.

A key worker told us they were keen to update some of the religious items on display for a person living at Orchard Court to ensure it was appropriate to their current religious beliefs. Bedrooms sampled appeared warm comfortable and clean, and were personalised to the needs of individual.

Other evidence

The home is located on a ground floor and made up of three connecting areas (houses). Cedar house, Primrose house, and Bluebell house. There were locked key pads which took account of peoples identified risks. We saw one person move freely around the home as they had capacity and knew the keypad numbers. We saw many parts for the home had recently been re-decorated. One of the dining rooms was being re-decorated when we visited and patio sliding doors were being mended. The manager confirmed an ongoing decoration plan is in place.

We saw notice boards with information and photographs on for everyone that was secured by thick plastic. This will prevent the information being removed.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this regulation. People who use the service, staff and visitors were protected against the risks of unsafe and unsuitable premises.

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

Some people living at Orchard Court had limited communication and were unable to answer direct questions about some of the essential standards we reviewed. We did speak with people in a general way and asked some questions. We observed people and their interactions with each other and with staff.

One person told us they liked the staff and were seen making hot drinks for staff and visitors and chatting and joking together.

Other evidence

We looked at staff training records and saw a range of training was provided to staff- mental capacity act, derivation of liberties, medication, and administering insulin. Staff were provided with monthly team meetings, monthly supervisions, and yearly appraisals were planned for June. People receive a service from a provider that supervises its staff well.

During our visit some staff were seen leaving the home to attend food hygiene and infection control training. We saw a staff member receive one to one support from a visiting tutor. A senior staff member told us they would be re-training staff in moving and handling and other essential training at the end of May. We saw staff were enabled to take part in learning and development that is relevant and appropriate so that they can carry out their role effectively.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this regulation. People were cared for by staff who were supported to deliver care and treatment safely and to an appropriate 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

Some people living at Orchard Court had limited communication and were unable to answer direct questions about some of the essential standards we reviewed. We did speak with people in a general way and asked some questions. We spoke with one person and they told us that staff were good and their house was nicely decorated.

Other evidence

The manager told us that with the help of the quality manager checks on safety and quality were carried out regularly. A quality inspection visit took place in March 2102 and an action plan had been produced. Timescales had been set and plans were still being developed.

The quality inspection report identified feedback from people who used the service was lacking. Surveys were being designed for people living at Orchard Court their families and staff. A first newsletter had been produced in March and included news, and pictures of people living at the home. People living at Orchard Court were involved in its production.

We saw new menu designs were due to start soon. The covered menu sheets showed clear pictures of sweet and savoury dishes to help people make their choice at mealtimes. These were developed by some of the people living at Orchard Court and their key workers.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this regulation. The provider was developing systems to regularly assess and monitor the quality of service that people received.

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