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Summary:

This report is an overview of CQC inspection reports, published during Quarter 2 of 2017: (1 July – 30 September 2017). The following report provides an overview of the inspections as well as the actions that have been taken. The report covers CQC inspection reports on providers in the Borough and those providing services to our residents outside the Borough.

Links to the CQC inspection reports 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 2 2017/2018

2.1 Of the seven providers inspected, five met the requirement for an overall rating of ‘good’, one provider was rated as ‘requires improvement’ and one was rated as inadequate.

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

• **Homecare UK (Dagenham) – Evita Care Ltd** – this is a domiciliary care provider registered to provide support with personal care to people living in their own homes. At the last inspection on 22nd December 2016 CQC found a breach of regulation relating to pre-employment checks. During the latest inspection on 3rd October 2017 improvements had been made. The report was published on 24th October and was rated Good in all five areas.

• **Lynwood** – this is a care home providing accommodation and support for adults with learning disabilities. The maximum capacity of the service is eight people. At the time of the CQC inspection the service was fully occupied. At the last inspection in July 2016 there were 6 breaches of the Health & Social Care Act 2008 and CQC issued two warning notices as a result. This rating of Good is a marked improvement. This service received an unannounced inspection from CQC on 7th June 2017, and the report was published on 1st August 2017 and was rated Good in all five areas.
• **Outlook Care – Maplestead Road** – this is accommodation for six adults who require nursing or personal care, they support people with mental health and substance misuse issues. At the time of the CQC inspection there were three people using the service. The service was previously inspected in February 2016 and rated Good and was again rated Good at the latest inspection on 30th June 2017, the report was published on 31st July 2017.

• **Colin Pond Court - Triangle Community Services Ltd.** – this service provides support with personal care to older people living in sheltered accommodation provided by Anchor Housing Trust. At the time of the inspection ten adults were using the service, some of whom had dementia. The service was inspected on 15th June 2017 and the report was published on 21st July giving an overall rating of Good. Previous CQC inspection was carried out in June 2015 and found the provider was in breach of regulation 12 of the Health & Social Care Act 2008. They did not always make appropriate referrals to health care professionals. On this inspection it was found that this breach had been addressed.

• **Bluebird Care** – this is a domiciliary care provider and is one of LBBD’s contracted homecare providers. At the previous inspection of this service in August 2015 it was rated Good. There was one requirement because the service had failed to notify CQC of allegations of abuse. During the latest inspection on 22nd September 2017 this issue had been addressed and the service remained Good. The report was published on 12th October 2017.

3. **Providers requiring improvement (Quarter 2)**

**Fred Tibble Court – Triangle Community Services Ltd.**  
Rating – Requires Improvement

3.1 This service provides support with personal care to older people living in sheltered accommodation provided by Hanover Housing Association. They provide support with personal care to older people who live in an extra care housing service. At the time of inspection there were 18 people using the service, some of whom had dementia.

3.2 The CQC inspection was undertaken on 24th May 2017 and the report was published 11th July 2017. The inspection found that three areas (Safe, Responsive and Well-Led) required improvement.

- Safe – Concerns were raised regarding risk assessments not including sufficient information about how to mitigate risks people faced.
- Responsive – the CQC gave a required improvement rating because care plans did not contain personalised information about supporting people with their assessed needs.
- Well-Led – the CQC found that quality assurance and monitoring systems were in place. However, they had failed to address issues of concern identified regarding risk assessments and care plans.

3.3 Contract monitoring meetings have taken place with QA and commissioning.
• Quality Assurance are working with Triangle Community Services Ltd to ensure they are carrying out the necessary actions to improve their service.

4. Providers rated as inadequate (Quarter 2)

Barking (Metropolitan Care Services)
Rating – Inadequate

4.1 This is a domiciliary care agency located in Longbridge Road, Barking. LBBD do not have any placements with this provider. Redbridge had 22 placements at the time of the CQC inspection. This service was registered with CQC in November 2016. The inspection was carried out on 15th June 2017 and the report was published on 27th July 2017.

4.2 The service was rated ‘inadequate’ in four areas and ‘requires improvement’ in one.

- Safe: Inadequate – relatives told CQC they did not feel people were safe when receiving care, risk assessments did not contain enough information to tell staff how to mitigate risks, medicines were not managed in a safe way and staff did not know how to respond to medicines errors, staff knowledge and understanding of safeguarding adults was poor.
- Effective: Inadequate – staff did not receive the training or support they needed to perform their roles, the service was not seeking consent in line with legislation and guidance, people were not always supported to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet. Care plans did not include information about people’s dietary needs and preferences. Care plans did not contain enough information about people’s healthcare needs to ensure people were supported to maintain their health.
- Caring: Requires improvement – relationships between people and care workers were negatively affected by frequent changes in care workers. People were not supported to express their views and be involved in their care plans. The service did not explore people’s relationship histories or preferences with them.
- Responsive: Inadequate – needs assessments were not completed with people or their relatives, care plans lacked details about how to support people and contained no information about people’s preferences. People and relatives told us support was not provided at a time that was in line with their preferences. Relatives reported to CQC that they had made complaints, and these had been resolved. The provider had not maintained any records of complaints made.
- Well-led: Inadequate – the provider had not identified or addressed issues with the quality and safety of the service. They had not completed audits or checks to ensure that records were up to date and in line with best practice. People and relatives did not think the service was well run.

4.3 LBBD Quality Assurance have liaised with Redbridge QA and Contracts teams regarding the issues raised by CQC as all the care packages provided are with their reablement service. Redbridge Contracts team have now made the decision to suspend any further placements. LBBD QA have recommended to move to suspension of placements, once authorised, we will be writing to all local authorities via ADASS. A letter will be written to the provider informing them of the decision and inviting them to a meeting with Quality Assurance and Commissioning teams.
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, as outlined in the Quality Assurance Policy and Procedures 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.

8. **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.
9. **List of appendices:**

Appendix 1: Quarter 2 2017/2018 CQC Reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider name</th>
<th>Name of Service</th>
<th>Link to report</th>
<th>Report date</th>
<th>Inspection date</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evita Care Ltd</td>
<td>Homecare (UK) Dagenham</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-1123272658">http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-1123272658</a></td>
<td>24th October 2017</td>
<td>3rd October 2017</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharshivi Limited</td>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-114143405">http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-114143405</a></td>
<td>1st August 2017</td>
<td>7th June 2017</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook Care</td>
<td>Maplestead Road</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-124583683">http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-124583683</a></td>
<td>31st July 2017</td>
<td>30th June 2017</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Community Services Ltd</td>
<td>Colin Pond Court</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-1698526298">http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-1698526298</a></td>
<td>21st July 2017</td>
<td>15th June 2017</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; D Hammonds Ltd</td>
<td>Bluebird Care</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-731634273/reports">http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-731634273/reports</a></td>
<td>12th October 2017</td>
<td>22nd September 2017</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Community Services Ltd</td>
<td>Fred Tibble Court</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-189037049">http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-189037049</a></td>
<td>11th July 2017</td>
<td>24th May 2017</td>
<td>Requires Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Care Services</td>
<td>Barking</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-2869391206">http://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-2869391206</a></td>
<td>27th July 2017</td>
<td>15th June 2017</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>