

# The London Borough of Tower Hamlets Reablement Service

## Inspection report

1 Gladstone Place  
London  
E3 5EQ

Tel: 02073642820

Date of inspection visit:  
27 February 2017

Date of publication:  
10 April 2017

### Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good ●
Is the service well-led?	Good ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection of this service on 6 September 2016. Breaches of legal requirements were found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the submission of notifications. We undertook this focused inspection on 27 February 2017 to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements.

This report only covers our findings in relation to this requirement. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for 'Reablement Service' on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

Reablement Service- London Borough of Tower Hamlets provides assessment, equipment and short term support to people in their own homes, following discharge from hospital. The service is provided for up to six weeks and aims to support people to regain the skills, confidence and independence they require, and assess people's needs for longer term care. At the time of the inspection, there were 100 to 110 people receiving support from the service.

During this inspection, we found that the provider had followed their plan which they had told us would be completed between September 2016 and November 2016 and legal requirements had been met.

The service had a registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) had been notified of significant events that affected the service. Notifications had been received when safeguarding incidents had occurred. Reports highlighted where the service was required to submit these notifications to the CQC.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service well-led?

Good ●

We found that action had been taken to improve how the service was run.

The CQC had received formal notifications of incidents that had occurred. A notification procedure had been introduced.

This meant that the provider was now meeting the legal requirements and we have improved the rating for this question from requires improvement to good.

# Reablement Service

## **Detailed findings**

### Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

We undertook a focused inspection of Reablement Service on 27 February 2017. This inspection was completed to ensure improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 6 September 2016 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service well led? This was because the service was not meeting some of the legal requirements. One inspector carried out the inspection.

Before the inspection, we looked at the information we held about the service. This included notifications of significant incidents reported to the Care Quality Commission (CQC), the providers' action plan and the last inspection report of 6 September 2016. During our inspection, we spoke with the registered manager and reviewed key documents in relation to the management of notifications.

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

At our last comprehensive inspection on 6 September 2016, we found that the Care Quality Commission (CQC) had not received a number of notifications relating to safeguarding concerns and deaths. At this inspection, we found that the provider had followed their action plan to address the shortfalls in relation to this regulation.

At our last inspection, there had been some changes in the staff team which had caused delays in notifications being sent to CQC as required. At this inspection, there was an improvement action plan in place with designated timescales. The four-point action plan recorded the backlog of notifications that were required to be sent to the CQC. This included a timescale for when safeguarding concerns and death notifications must be referred to us. We had received these backdated notifications as identified in the action plan. The registered manager informed us the service was at full capacity and there were no longer any issues with the staff structure.

Outcomes of these incidents were recorded in monthly reports including where specific cases were to be investigated by the safeguarding team. Furthermore, a new notifications procedure had been introduced. The procedure highlighted the cases that 'could' require a notification to be submitted to the CQC and when staff should be reporting these to the registered manager. The senior staff member took responsibility for submitting the notifications in the absence of the registered manager.

Staff who worked in the service had been informed about the new procedures and requirements of the notification procedure. This also included them being booked on refresher training for safeguarding people from abuse. The registered manager explained that although staff were aware of the safeguarding processes and were knowledgeable about their responsibilities in relation to reporting concerns, he wanted to raise awareness regarding the importance of this.

We have improved the rating for this question from requires improvement to good because we found that concerns had been addressed by the provider. They had put the appropriate measures in place to address concerns and improvements had been sustained.