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**Accountable Divisional Director:** Mark Tyson, Commissioning Director, Adults’ Care and Support

**Accountable Director:** Anne Bristow, Strategic Director, Service Development and Integration

**Summary:**

This report is an overview of CQC inspection reports, published during Quarter 4 of 2017: (1 January – 31 March 2017). 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 4 2016/2017

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

2.2 The two providers rated ‘good’ and the date on which they were inspected were:

- **Disablement Association of Barking and Dagenham (DABD)** – DABD provides a number of services to support adults and children in the community which include transport services, support with independent living and personal care (homecare). The service was inspected on 18, 25 and 29 January 2017. DABD is not on the Council’s homecare framework of providers however 6 residents have packages of care with DABD where they have either chosen DABD over other providers or because other providers on the homecare framework do not have the capacity to take on the care package.
Siloam Lodge – Siloam Care – Siloam Lodge is a care home that provides accommodation and personal care to a maximum of two people with mental health needs. The service was inspected on 8 December 2016. Although CQC gave the provider, Siloam Care, a 'good' rating, the local authority have concerns about this provider and have placed the provider on our highest risk rating (BLACK) and suspended all placements to the provider. The local authority have no placements at Siloam Lodge, although Thurrock Council have one individual placed at the property. Our own quality assurance processes, as well as safeguarding enquiries, have found concerns regarding recording, administration of medication and staffing levels. The Clinical Commissioning Group’s pharmacy team are currently trying to arrange a review of medication management at the premises and the Quality Assurance team are in communication with Thurrock Council.

2.3 Evita Care Limited – Homecare UK (Dagenham) had their first CQC inspection since the service was registered on 22 December 2016. The service is registered to provide support with personal care to people living in their own homes. The provider is not working with any Barking and Dagenham service users and is not on the local authority’s approved homecare list. CQC was unable to provide an overall rating for this service due to the lack of evidence available because of the limited size of the service at the time of the inspection. The service was therefore given an ‘inspected but not yet rated’ rating.

3. Providers requiring improvement (Quarter 4)

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 28 September and 6 October 2016 and the inspection report was published on 14 January 2017. 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 gave a required improvement rating 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 as well as the provider’s policies 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.

3.5 A further announced quality assurance monitoring visit was attempted at the beginning of May 2017, however there was nobody in the office. The QA team have since found out that the provider has moved offices and is now located in Ilford. The provider did not let the CQC or the local authority know and the QA team have since informed the CQC, as well as London Borough of Redbridge in order that they can complete their checks on the service.

Triangle Community Services – Darcy House
Rating – Requires Improvement

3.6 Darcy 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 adults to continue to live independently as tenants at Darcy House. The service is contracted by the local authority as part of four extra care schemes. The other three schemes have been rated as ‘good’ with the same provider. The scheme was inspected on 8 December 2016 and the report was published on 28 January 2017. The scheme was rated as ‘good’ in the categories of Caring and Responsive, but ‘requires improvement’ in three areas:

- Effective (requires improvement) – CQC found that staff did not always receive regular one to one supervision in line with the provider’s procedure.
- Safe (requires improvement) – The CQC report found that there were at times not enough staff working at the service and staff were often late in providing care to people. Although medicines were administered correctly there was poor practice with medicines record keeping.
- Well-led (requires improvement) – CQC found that Quality Assurance and monitoring systems in place were not always effective.

3.7 Triangle completed an improvement plan following the publication of the CQC report which was monitored through contract monitoring and quality assurance checks and was fully implemented over a period of 4 weeks. Unannounced and announced visits were carried out by the Quality Assurance team on 14 and 15 March respectively to check the implementation of the improvement plan. The Commissioning team also had regular meetings with the management team to provide support and follow up on the improvements on 15 March and 3 April. During the visits, it was found that files were updated and medication records were now well maintained. The service has changed their internal structure and appointed two lead carers as well as having a more defined management presence over the weekend. Following the implementation of the action plan, service users who have previously provided feedback on the service have stated that they have seen a marked improvement in the service.
In April, the Commissioning team completed consultation exercises for the upcoming re-tender of the service at Darcy House and the other extra care schemes. The visible presence of Council staff at the service has given residents and their family members an additional point of contact and we have subsequently seen one family make a complaint to the local authority about the service at Darcy House. Commissioners and Quality Assurance are working with the provider and the service user and their family to resolve the complaints that have been raised and will continue to monitor the improvements that the provider has made in response to the CQC report.

Br3akfree Ltd
Rating – Requires Improvement

Br3akfree Ltd service provides support with personal care and outreach services to adults living in their own homes. The provider is not on the LBBD provider framework and the Council do not have anyone placed with them. Two people were using the service at the time of the inspection both funded by other local authorities. The service was inspected on 6 February and the report was published on 30 March 2017. The service was found to be good in three areas (safe, responsive and caring) but requires improvement in two areas:

- Effective: Requires Improvement - CQC found that the service had sought consent from relatives without checking they had the legal authority to consent on people’s behalf.
- Well-led: Requires Improvement - CQC found that the service auditing system was not robust and had not identified the gaps in obtaining consent.

The Quality Assurance team visited Br3akfree Ltd on 30 May 2017 and discussed the CQC Service Improvement Plan with them, which was progressing. After discussions with the provider about the service provided to the two service users, it was not clear if the service should be registered with CQC. The Quality Assurance team has written to the CQC for clarification and will work with the provider accordingly following the advice from CQC.

Providers rated as inadequate (Quarter 4)

Reline Care Limited – Reline Care
Rating: Inadequate

Reline Care is located at the Barking Enterprise Centre in Barking. Reline Care is a large domiciliary care service providing personal care to people in their own homes. This provider is not on the LBBD providers’ framework and LBBD do not have anyone placed with them, although services are provided to service users in the London Boroughs of Newham, Waltham Forest and Redbridge. CQC inspected the service on 1, 2 and 5 December 2016 and published their report on 20 January. The service was rated as the following:

- Safe: Inadequate - CQC found that instances of neglect and abuse were not raised as safeguarding issues and staff did not identify neglect as a type of abuse. Risk assessments were not robust and did not contain sufficient measures to mitigate risks faced by people receiving a service.
- Effective: Inadequate - CQC found that staff training was not effective at ensuring staff had the knowledge required to perform their roles.
- Caring: Requires Improvement - CQC found that care plans were not robust and did not contain enough information about the service user’s personal histories.
- Responsive: Inadequate - CQC found that care plans were task focussed and did not contain information about people's preferences.
- Well-led: Inadequate - CQC found that Reline was not submitting notifications to CQC.

4.2 Barking and Dagenham undertook a joint unannounced visit with Newham Council in December 2016 and contacted the other Boroughs for their concerns regarding the provider. Waltham Forest and Redbridge had few concerns, although Newham had concerns and were working closely with the provider to monitor improvements against the improvement plan. Newham formally reviewed the progress made against the improvement plan in January and February 2017 with the provider and a joint meeting between Barking and Dagenham, Newham, Redbridge and Waltham Forest was held in February 2017 where it was confirmed that the provider was improving. Improvements were further confirmed by the Barking and Dagenham Quality Assurance team via a joint visit with Newham in April 2017. The provider will continue to work through the service improvement plan with Newham Council and the Barking and Dagenham QA team is in regular communication with the provider and the other local authorities to ensure that improvements are sustained.

5. Consultation

5.1 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.

6. Implications

Risk Management

6.1 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.

6.2 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.

6.3 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.
7. **Customer Impact**

7.1 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.

**Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults**

7.2 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**

7.3 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.

**List of appendices:**
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