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**Summary:**

This report is an overview of CQC inspection reports, published during the fourth quarter of 2015/16 and first quarter of 2016/17 (Quarter 4: 1 January– 31 March 2016, Quarter 1: 1 April – 30 June 2016).

It provides an overview of the inspections as well as the actions that have been taken as a result of inspections where improvements are required. The report covers CQC inspection reports on providers in the Borough or those who provide services to our residents.

Links to the CQC inspection reports themselves and a summary of the findings can be found in Appendices 1 and 2.

**Recommendation(s)**

Members of the Select Committee are recommended to review the document and to comment on the CQC findings and the actions taken as a result.

**Reason(s)**

The Council has a responsibility for ensuring the quality and sufficiency of adult social care provision in the borough. The Care Quality Commission is the quality regulator for social care and inspects local services. It is important that local people have confidence in the social care services that are provided in the borough, and part of the approach to ensuring confidence is to provide an opportunity for Elected Members to review accounts of performance. This is one such opportunity.
1. Introduction and Background

1.1 The Care Quality Commission (CQC) are responsible for inspecting all health and social care providers that fall under their regulatory remit. The ratings ask five key questions of the services that CQC inspect:

- Are they safe?
- Are they effective?
- Are they caring?
- Are they responsive to people’s needs?
- Are they well-led?

1.2 Each question has a number of lines of enquiry to guide the inspection. The results of each category then enable an overall rating to be achieved for each provider:

- Outstanding
  *The service is performing exceptionally well.*

- Good
  *The service is performing well and meeting our expectations.*

- Requires improvement
  *The service isn't performing as well as it should and we have told the service how it must improve.*

- Inadequate
  *The service is performing badly and we've taken action against the person or organisation that runs it.*

1.3 Alternatively, a provider may be given no rating where the outcome is under appeal or their business is suspended. There are no services locally where this has been the case.

1.4 The Council’s commissioning function uses the results of CQC inspections, together with its own intelligence about how services perform, to shape its own approach to quality assuring social care services. Similarly, we are in regular dialogue with the Care Quality Commission based on our experience of local services and they use our information to inform their approach to inspections.

2. CQC Findings Quarter 4 2015-16

2.1 Of the 7 providers inspected in Quarter 4 of 2015/16, 3 met the requirement for an overall rating of ‘Good’ and the 4 remaining providers were rated as ‘Requires Improvement’.

2.2 The providers rated ‘good’, and the dates on which they were inspected, were:

- Faircross 102 (Residential care for people with learning disabilities) inspected 30 December 2015.
3. **Providers requiring improvement (Quarter 4)**

3.1 **Darcy House**

Rating - Requires Improvement

3.1.1 Darcy House is one of four extra care schemes operated by Triangle Community Services and commissioned by the local authority. The service offers individuals personal care, and housing related support to continue to live independently in purpose built flats.

3.1.2 Twenty seven people were using the service at the time of the inspection, on 2 November 2015. The subsequent report issued on 6 January gave the scheme a rating of ‘Requires Improvement’. The CQC inspector at the time found areas of concern including failure to notify CQC of safeguarding allegations and insufficient staffing levels.

3.1.3 Following the inspection all residents were reviewed to ensure that they were safe and cared for and no complaints were made about the staff or the standard of care they receive. The Commissioning Team also reviewed the improvement plan and actions put in place by Triangle to report safeguarding matters to the CQC in line with their recommendations.

3.1.4 After extensive negotiations the Council was able to work with Triangle Community Services to secure an increase in the number of support hours delivered across the scheme and to uplift the hourly rate paid to the support staff. This was completed within the budget envelope for the contract by identifying cost efficiencies and reducing expenditure. These cost efficiencies will have no impact on the service users at Darcy House.

3.1.5 Support with personal care within the extra care schemes is contracted on a minimum and maximum hours per scheme per week. As Darcy House is part of a larger contract consisting of three other extra care schemes with varying levels of support needs, the Commissioning Manager agreed any underutilised hours could be transferred to Darcy House for short blocks of time as required. The transfer of hours has been monitored to ensure that this arrangement does not have a negative impact on the other remaining schemes.

3.1.6 As part of the cyclical quality assurance process for all commissioned providers, a detailed review of all the schemes that were delivered by Triangle Community Services was undertaken in April and May 2016, including Darcy House. The review was carried out by the Commissioning Team, including the Commissioning Manager and the Service Review Officer responsible for Darcy House. The findings of the CQC report were revisited and monitored and the action plan reviewed. The review found that safeguarding practices had improved and that Triangle are sending safeguarding alerts to the CQC. Additionally, it has been found that the
staffing levels have improved since the negotiations with Triangle and the flexibility in the way that staff are now used across the four sites. The review team found that improvements could be made in the way that information and support plans are filed. Additionally, service users fed back that the entertainment provided at Darcy House could be more varied. As a consequence, these actions were added to the improvement plan alongside the actions from the CQC inspection. Commissioning will continue to monitor the improvement plan with the Registered Manager from Triangle through contract monitoring and spot checks.

3.2 Elora House

Rating = Requires Improvement

3.2.1 Elora House caters for learning disabled people from 18 to 64. There are currently no LBBD services users in this home. At the time of the publication of the last CQC inspection Elora was rated good for care and being responsive but required improvement in the areas of Safe (not all staff had up to date DBS checks nor were all risk assessments up to date), Effective (staff did not receive regular training to carry out their roles effectively) and Well Led (some quality assurance systems in place were not robust enough). Following publication of the CQC report LBBD increased its quality assurance monitoring and also liaised with placing authorities on our findings.

3.2.2 This home was visited by Commissioning and Quality Assurance after the CQC report was published. The CQC action plan had been completed and no further concerns were identified.

3.3 Rupaal Care and Training

Rating = Requires Improvement

3.3.1 This is a homecare provider. Following the publication of the CQC inspection on 19 February 2016 it was rated as good in the Caring and Responsive areas but required improvements in the ‘Safe’ category, particularly for the management of medication and the robustness of recruitment processes.

3.3.2 Following the inspection, checks were carried out with Operational services and it was found that no individuals were being supported by the agency, either through a managed or self managed Personal Budget. Rupaal are not on the local authority’s approved list of homecare providers.

3.3.3 The Commissioning team tried to complete an unannounced visit to their office in LBBD. However, when the Service Review Officer arrived at the address he was advised that the company had moved to Enfield. CQC are aware of the new address. Consequently no further quality assurance work has been planned.

3.4 Br3akfree

Rating = Requires Improvement

3.4.1 Br3akfree provides homecare to people with a learning disability. CQC published their report on 8 March 2016. Br3akfree were assessed as being good in the areas of Effective, Caring and Responsive services. However, they were also rated as
requiring improvement in the areas of Safe (the service did not have robust recruitment processes) and Well Led (Spot checks were not recorded as the service’s policy and procedure states).

3.4.2 Commissioning and Service Review Officers carried out an unannounced visit following the publication of the CQC inspection report. During the LBBDB visit it was identified that this issues had been dealt with and this has now been fed back to CQC.

3.4.3 Br3akfree is not on the Borough’s approved list of homecare providers and we currently have no service users using a managed personal budget who receive services from this agency. However service users who have a personal budget are free to buy services from a provider of their choice. Consequently Br3akfree are part of LBBBD’s quality assurance monitoring process and we are monitoring their progress in sustaining improvements as part of the CQC action plan.

4. **CQC Findings Quarter 1 2016-17**

4.1 Of the 8 providers inspected, 5 met the requirement for an overall rating of ‘Good’ and the 3 remaining providers were rated as ‘Requires Improvement’.

4.2 The providers rated ‘good’, and the dates on which they were inspected, were:

- Outlook Care – Maplestead Road (Provides accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care and have mental health conditions, over and under the age of 65). Inspected 8 April 2016.

- Chaseview Care Home (Older people), inspected 9 February 2016.

- Abbeyfield East London Extra Care (Older people), inspected 30 March 2016.

- Chinite Resourcing Ltd (Homecare 65+), inspected 20 April 2016.

- Millicent Preston House (An extra care scheme run by the local authority) inspected 4 May 2016.

5. **Providers requiring improvement (Quarter 1)**

5.1 **Sahara Parkside**

Rating - Requires Improvement

5.1.1 Sahara Parkside is a 30 bedded residential home located in Barking. The home offers specialist accommodation, care and support for adults with learning disabilities, who may have other conditions, including sensory impairment, a physical disability or other complex needs.

5.1.2 This care home provides services to 14 service users. The service users have high and complex support needs requiring a minimum of 1:1 staffing with some service users receiving 2:1 support. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspection report which was published on 5 April 2016 found that four out of five of the areas (Safe, Responsive, Effective and Well-Led) required improvement. Additionally, issues to do with safeguarding, staff training and staff capability to meet the needs of the
complex service users in the home were raised by the Community Learning Disability Team and through Quality Assurance audits, concerns from other placing London Boroughs and safeguarding enquiries.

5.1.3 A strategy meeting was held with Officers in Operational Social Care and Commissioning in May 2016 which discussed the number of concerns. It was agreed that improvements were required in consideration of the risks posed to the current service users and a suspension on future admissions was agreed until the required improvements were made.

5.1.4 Sahara Parkside were informed of the decision, the London Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS) were notified and placing authorities were alerted of the concerns, feedback was requested and each Borough was recommended to carry out reviews of service users placed by them.

5.1.5 Between May and the end of June 2016, weekly meetings were held between Commissioning and the management of Sahara Parkside and an improvement plan was agreed and worked through. Regular audits were undertaken, with the final Quality Assurance Audit taking place on 30 June 2016.

5.1.6 The audit demonstrated significant improvement and positive buy-in from the new on-site and area managers. They had been able to show they had taken on board the issues and put new strategies in place which should ensure continuous improvement to the service.

5.1.7 As a result of sustained and significant improvement in the provision of safe and effective services at Sahara Parkside, the suspension on placements was lifted on the 18 July 2016. Commissioners and Quality Assurance staff continue to carry out a heightened level of surveillance. The first of the follow-up audits in August found a continued effort to sustain and improve the service delivered to the residents and restore the reputation of Sahara Parkside. The level of surveillance will be reduced if no further concerns are identified going forward.

5.2. Alexander Court Care Centre

Rating - Requires Improvement

5.2.1 Alexander Court is an 80+ bed nursing home situated in Dagenham. Over the last two years there have been ongoing concerns raised by LBBF and attempts to work with the provider. However further concerns were raised by CQC during their inspection which was published on 9 June 2016. This inspection rated Alexander Court as being good at caring and being responsive, inadequate at maintaining a safe environment and a service that requires improvement in the areas of effectiveness and being well led. As a result of these concerns a joint inspection was carried out by the local authority (Operational Social Care and Commissioning), the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Environmental Health. This led to the imposition of a formal suspension on placements to the care home and a downgrading on their Environmental Health rating from 5 to 3.

5.2.2 Similarly to the actions taken with Sahara Parkside above, Alexander Court management were informed of the decision, the London Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS) were notified and placing authorities were alerted of
the concerns, feedback was requested and each Borough was recommended to carry out reviews of service users placed by them.

5.2.3 A detailed action plan was agreed with Alexander Court on 10 June 2016. The action plan covered areas of improvement which would be required to meet the CQC regulations and concerns of the local authority and the CCG. These covered; staffing, diet and nutrition, provision of call buzzers or suitable alternatives, social activity, the built environment, choice and control, complaints, and recruitment. Social Workers continued to visit during the suspension and reported some improvements. Following receipt of supporting evidence from Alexander Court, a further joint review of the care home was undertaken by the CCG and the local authority on 17 August 2016.

5.2.4 Following this it was determined that there had been sufficient significant improvement to lift the suspension of admissions at the care home on 22 August 2016.

5.2.5 To ensure that the improvements are maintained, Alexander Court will remain on a heightened level of inspection by both the CCG and LBBD over the next 6 months and the improvement plan will continued to be worked through, and maintained, by the care home.

5.3. Cloud House

Rating - Requires Improvement

5.3.1 Cloud House is a residential care home for adults with learning disabilities and mental health needs.

5.3.2 The Cloud House CQC inspection report was published on 17 June 2016 and rated the service as Good for the 'Caring' category. However, CQC also rated it as requiring improvement in the areas of Safe (Medication audits in the home were not effective and the process for staff promotions was not clear), Effective (Staff completing their induction had not received sufficient training to ensure they had the skills required to perform their roles), Responsive (The service did not complete formal needs assessments before people moved into the home) and Well-led (the service did not record the lessons learnt from incidents that occurred).

5.3.3 A review of Cloud House is currently scheduled and an update can be provided to the Select Committee at their meeting on 7 September 2016.

6. Consultation

6.1 There are no consultation requirements associated with this report, since it is presented for information and comment. In conducting their inspections, CQC consult with the Council as the host borough, and with residents and their carers.

7. Implications

7.1 Risk Management

7.1.1 The provision of social care services by providers who fail to meet the minimum CQC inspection rating of ‘Good’ are subject to increased monitoring both the
Council’s commissioning function and CQC. This feeds into a wider approach to risk-based quality assurance which the Council uses to prioritise its work with local social care services.

7.1.2 Where problems are identified, quality assurance staff will work with the provider to plan and deliver improvements, including where necessary the actions contained in the CQC action plan and exchange intelligence regarding progress with CQC. The main priority is to ensure that the service is safe for service users and the quality of the delivery meets expectations.

7.1.3 For those providers who do not adequately comply with the action plan recommendations within the timeframe, CQC will issue a warning notice which is in the public domain and alert other authorities using that provider to use caution when commissioning services from them. There is considerable impact for the provider if this course of action is taken. Ultimately, CQC have the option available to them to suspend the provider’s registration or take legal action.

8. Customer Impact

8.1 Ensuring that services are safe and effective is a critical role for the Council in the provision of social care services and the management of the local market in social care. This ensures not only basic safety but that there remains a meaningful choice in services to meet diverse needs.

9. Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults

9.1 Safeguarding vulnerable people – both children and adults – is the prime motivation for ensuring a robust system of inspection, quality assurance and regulation. This report presents one key element of that approach, led by CQC.

10. Health Issues

10.1 Effective regulation of services is important to ensure that they support people to achieve their desired outcomes, including maintaining and improving their health and wellbeing.

Background Papers Used in the Preparation of the Report:

Information on the regulation approach taken by CQC, on the website at: www.cqc.org.uk
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