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Summary:
This report is an overview of CQC inspection reports, published during Quarter 3 of 2016/17: (1 October – 31 December 2016). The following report 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 outside the Borough.

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

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, their business is suspended or there was only one person using the service at the time of the inspection. 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 3 2016-17

2.1 Of the 7 providers inspected, three met the requirement for an overall rating of 'good', one had a rating of 'inspected but not yet rated' and the remaining three providers were rated as 'requires improvement'.

2.2 The providers rated 'good' and the date on which they were inspected were:

- **Sincere Care.** This is a homecare provider for people with dementia, learning disabilities, physical disabilities and sensory impairments providing personal care and crisis intervention for adults over the age of 65 years. The service was inspected on 21 September 2016. Sincere Care is not on the Council's homecare framework of providers however 21 residents have packages of care with Sincere where they have either chosen Sincere Care over other providers or because other providers on the homecare framework do not have the capacity to take on the care package.
• **Triangle Community Services Limited – Harp House.** Harp House is part of an extra care service provided by Triangle Community Services Limited. The service provides individual personal care and extra care support to older to continue to live independently as tenants at Harp House. The scheme was inspected on 20 October 2016.

• **LBBD – Kallar Lodge.** This is a residential care home run by Barking and Dagenham Council providing 24 hour care for up to 37 older people living with dementia. The home was inspected on 10 November 2016.

2.3 **Shalom Care** was inspected on 26 and 30 August 2016 but was rated as ‘inspected but not yet rated’. Shalom Care is a home care provider providing personal care to adults living in their own homes. This service was inspected on 26 and 30 August 2016. Shalom is not on the Council’s homecare framework of providers. Shalom were not given a rating by the CQC as the provider only has one service user. The CQC spoke to the service user’s family who were happy with the service and the CQC reported that care was personalised, positive relationships had been formed with the service user and the care plan was detailed. The CQC asked the provider to ensure that DBS checks were in place for all staff and to ensure that robust risk assessments were in place.

3. **Providers requiring improvement (Quarter 3)**

**Efficiency for Care Limited**
Rating – Requires Improvement

3.1 Efficiency for Care is a homecare provider, with their head office located in Barking and Dagenham. They are not on the Council’s approved homecare framework and there are currently no placements from the local authority or by self-funders who live in the Borough. However, they do provide services in other local authorities – Essex County Council, Hillingdon, Woking and they are also a registered provider of staffing for Care UK. The service offers personal care to people with dementia, learning disabilities, mental health conditions, physical disabilities, sensory impairments, and provides care to both young people and adults.

3.2 The inspection was undertaken on 6 October 2016 and the inspection report was published on 17 November 2016. The inspection found that two areas (Effective and Well-Led) required improvement and that the area of Safe was inadequate:

- Safe (inadequate) – Concerns were raised around medicine administration and prompting to show people had received their prescribed medications.
- Effective (requires improvement) – CQC required improvement around staff supervision and induction processes.
- Well-Led (requires improvement) – CQC found that effective systems were not in place to monitor quality assurance and this area was rated as requires improvement.

3.3 Quality Assurance (QA) carried out an unannounced visit and checked staff recruitment and health and safety policy and procedures and there were no concerns identified with these. QA also reviewed the CQC improvement plan and identified that Efficiency for Care have already started implementing it. With regards to medication administration, it was found that this was in relation to an incident in
Hillingdon and Efficiency for Care management advised that they no longer employ the worker involved.

3.4 As it is their head office that is based in Barking and Dagenham, QA were advised that Efficiency for Care did not have staff files on site (these are kept at the local offices) so could not be reviewed. Since the visit, Efficiency for Care have provided the local authority with training files, their statement of purpose, and other information electronically which is currently being reviewed. A further announced quality assurance monitoring visit will be carried out at the end of April to review their implementation of the improvement plan.

**Abbey Care**
Rating – Requires Improvement

3.5 Abbey Care is a 20 bedded care home for older people living with dementia. Abbey Care was inspected on 24/30/31 August and the inspection report was published on 9 November 2016. Abbey Care was rated ‘requires improvement’ in four areas:

- **Safe (requires improvement)** – The CQC report found that infection control practices were not adhered to by some of the staff, risk assessments were not always up to date and there were at times, inadequate staffing levels.
- **Effective (requires improvement)** – CQC found that the premises were in a poor decorative state.
- **Responsive (requires improvement)** - CQC found that there was lack of appropriate weekend activities for residents.
- **Well-led (requires improvement)** – CQC found that there were no effective systems to monitor the quality of service.

3.6 Quality Assurance carried out an unannounced QA monitoring visit on 23 November 2016. During the visit, infection control and management systems were checked and these were found to be adequate. Service user files were also checked and risk assessments viewed were up to date. The staffing levels at the time of the visit appeared adequate and there appears to be a stable staff team.

3.7 At the time of QA’s follow-up visit it appeared that the premises were in the process of being repainted and Commissioning is continuing to work closely with the provider with regards improvements to the fabric of the care home. CQC’s improvement plan is in place and the provider is continuing to implement the improvement actions. Social workers and the QA team visit the care home on a regular basis and no further concerns have been identified.

**Alexander Court**
Rating – Requires Improvement

3.8 Alexander Court Care Centre is an 82 bedded nursing home that provides 24 hour care to older people living with dementia and young people with physical, mental and learning disabilities. The home was inspected 10/11 March 2016 but the report wasn’t published until 28 December 2016. This rated Alexander Court as:

- **Safe: (inadequate)** The CQC report found that there were inadequate staffing levels and medicines were not being administered safely.
• Effective: (requires improvement) People who use the service did not have access to nutritious food and drinks.
• Caring: (good)
• Responsive: (good)
• Well-led: (requires improvement) The CQC found that effective systems were not in place to monitor the quality of the service and the service did not act on the views of people who use the service.

3.9 Even though the report was not published until December 2016, following initial discussions with the CQC about their inspection and findings from the quality assurance team and the Clinical Commissioning Group, a suspension on placements to the home was put in place in June 2016 and all local authorities were informed. Following the implementation of an improvement plan the suspension was lifted in August 2016 with a limit on new placements put in place to ensure standards were maintained. Quality Assurance, social workers and the Clinical Commissioning Group have since undertaken regular monthly visits to the care home and improvements have continued to be seen.

3.10 We are aware that a further inspection was undertaken by the CQC on 28/29 November and 5 December 2016 and the report is yet to be published. However, ahead of publication of the report there have been a number of discussions with CQC about their concerns, which have resulted in enhanced monitoring by the local authority and the CCG and more regular liaison with the management of the care home about its improvement.

4. Consultation

4.1 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.

5. Implications

Risk Management

5.1 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.

5.2 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.

5.3 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.
Customer Impact

5.4 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.

Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults

5.5 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.

Health Issues

5.6 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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