

Chorcare Ltd

Chorcare Ltd


Inspection report

14 Long Meadows, Chorley, PR7 2YA
Tel: 01257 369745
Website: www.chorcare.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 20 January 2015
Date of publication: 25/03/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inadequate **Is the service safe?****Inadequate** **Is the service effective?****Inadequate** **Is the service caring?****Good** **Is the service responsive?****Inadequate** **Is the service well-led?****Inadequate** 

Overall summary

This inspection took place on Tuesday 20 January 2015 and was announced.

The agency Chorcare Ltd is managed from a domestic residence located in a residential area of Chorley. Services are provided to support people to live independently in the community and the range of support includes assistance with personal care, shopping, activities and appointments.

The service first registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in April 2013 and was registered at a previous location address at the time of the last

inspection on 14 August 2013. The service was compliant at that time with the areas looked at. In May 2014 the service moved and registered at its current location. This was the first inspection of the service since that change.

The provider has submitted an application to cancel the registration of Chorcare Ltd to provide the regulated activity of personal care since the inspection.

There was a registered manager in place. 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.

Summary of findings

People told us contradictory things about the service they received. While people we spoke with were happy with the service provided, they were not happy about Chorcare Ltd who provided the service. Our own observations and the records we were able to look at did not always reflect the positive comments some people had made.

People told us there were enough staff to give them the support they needed and this was confirmed in our observations. However we found the provider had little involvement in this save for preparing rotas.

Staff knew from outside sources how to deal with and respond to incidents or allegations of abuse but no training in safeguarding adults had been provided by Chorcare Ltd.

Robust recruitment processes were not in place and staff had been sent out to work with vulnerable people without appropriate documentation and criminal records checks in place.

Staff were involved in the recording, storage and administration of medication for one person. Staff had received no training in medication management.

Staff told us they had received no induction and training. There were no induction or other training records available for staff currently employed by the service. Staff had not received any form of one to one supervision. This meant people could not be confident staff had the skills to meet their needs.

People's safety was being compromised in a number of areas. Staff we spoke with were aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) but were unable able to give us a good account of its principles. From conversations with people who received support from care staff employed by Chorcare Ltd we were happy that these principles were being applied however current staff had not received any training on the MCA or Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) via Chorcare Ltd.

People lived in their own homes and as such chose their own food and drinks. Staff we spoke with told us they would promote healthy eating and drinking. This was confirmed by people we spoke with but they would choose for themselves.

People spoke with were positive about the staff who worked with them. We were told they were friendly supportive and caring.

We looked at the one care plan in place at the time of the inspection and found it to be person centred and fully reflected the person's needs. However we were informed that the registered manager had taken no part in compilation of this care plan, was not involved in this plan or associated records.

Leadership and management of the service was poor. There were no systems in place to effectively monitor the quality of the service or drive forward improvements. Although we were shown one survey of people who used Chorcare Ltd when there had been more people supported by them. The comments we saw were positive. We also found the provider had changed the name of his business and failed to notify CQC.

We found a significant number of breaches of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 in respect of staff recruitment, training and support, involvement in care planning for people as well as leadership.

We also identified breaches of the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009. As the provider had failed to notify us of significant events as required.

You can see what action we told the provider to take at the back of the full version of the report. We did not take formal enforcement action at this stage as the provider has submitted an application to cancel the registration of Chorcare Ltd to provide the regulated activity of personal care.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Staff knew how to deal with and respond to incidents or allegations of abuse. However any knowledge displayed by staff had been acquired through training provided by their previous employers and not Chorcure. Little understanding of safeguarding reporting requirements was demonstrated by the leadership of Chorcure Ltd.

Robust recruitment processes were not in place and staff had been sent out to work with vulnerable people without appropriate documentation and criminal records checks in place.

Staff were involved in the recording, storage and administration of medication for one person. Staff had received no training in medication. There were no competency checks on their ability or practice to perform this role in place.

Inadequate



Is the service effective?

The service was not effective.

The registered manager informed us that staff had not received appropriate induction or on going training. Staff confirmed they had not received any training. Staff did not receive formal supervision to support them in their role.

Staff had received no training in the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. Staff were unable to tell us what they had to do in order to comply with the requirements of this legislation.

People lived in their own homes and made their own choices around eating and drinking supported by family and care staff.

Inadequate



Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

Only one person was supported by Chorcure at the time of our inspection. We were informed that the three care staff employed had built up a good relationship with this person and that they were kind, compassionate and caring.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was not responsive.

We found no evidence of individualised or person centred care from Chorcure Ltd. The one person who was in receipt of care and support from Chorcure Ltd did have a person centred care plan. However the registered manager informed us that he had taken no part in this care plan.

The care plan was kept at the home of the person who was supported by Chorcure Ltd and there was no copy at the office of Chorcure Ltd. The registered manager confirmed that he did not audit or review the care plan or the daily records.

Inadequate



Summary of findings

We saw no documentation which informed people how to make a complaint or how complaints would be dealt with. We were aware from information provided to the Care Quality Commission (CQC) that there had been one complaint but the registered manager had no record of it.

Is the service well-led?

The service was not well-led.

At the time of our inspection we were informed by the registered manager that Chorcare Ltd was in the process of shutting down the business. We were given inconsistent and conflicting information about the future of the business and who would be providing care to people.

Due to the current arrangements in place staff we spoke with were unclear as to who they answered to.

There were no effective systems in place to monitor the quality of the service or drive forward improvements. The registered manager was unable to produce required records within a reasonable time and required statutory notifications had not been sent to the CQC.

Inadequate



Chorcare Ltd

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, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

The inspection took place on 20 January 2015 and was announced. The provider was given 48 hours' notice because the location provides a small domiciliary care service. We needed to be sure that someone would be in.

Due to the size of this service the inspection was carried out by one adult social care inspector.

Prior to the inspection we reviewed our own records and information held on this service. This included any complaints made, safeguarding alerts and statutory notifications.

At the time of our inspection Chorcare Ltd, was providing the regulated activity of personal care to just one person. We spoke with this person, their main carer/relative and the three staff employed by the provider. The provider had started to wind down the company with a view to ending the business.

We looked at the care plan for the one person who received care from this service. In order to give balance we also looked at one further care plan for a person who no longer received care from the service until recently.

We spoke with seven people who had recently received care from Chorcare before having their care transferred to other companies or individuals.

We contacted commissioners for the local authority about this service but they were unable to give us any relevant information as they had no contracts with this service.

We asked the provider/registered manager to send us information after the visit. We asked for copies or sight of his policies and procedures in relation to Mental Capacity and DoLS, safeguarding, medication and a sample of staff files. We had been informed that these documents were kept in a secure lock up facility and would be scanned and sent by email within the week. They were not sent. We were offered sight of these on a USB pen drive at later date during an arranged meeting with the provider to discuss the inspection findings. We did not access this as it was provided after a considerable time from the inspection and for security reasons.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People we spoke with told us they felt safe in their own environment as well as around staff and other people who cared for them.

The registered manager told us safeguarding training had not been completed but was on a list of training to be done when staff were re-employed. We found staff were employed by Chorcure at the time of the inspection and staff we spoke with said they had not received safeguarding training from Chorcure in the protection of vulnerable adults. We were unable to review any training records as none were provided by the registered manager.

This was a breach of Regulation 11 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

Staff we spoke with had a good understanding of what constituted abuse and knew the correct action to take if abuse was suspected. They knew about whistleblowing and who to contact if they felt concerns were not dealt with properly. However this knowledge had been gained through thorough training provided by previous employers or self tuition via e-learning and not Chorcure Ltd. They were confident the senior member of staff on duty would respond appropriately to any concerns raised.

We were aware that one safeguarding alert had been raised with the local authority since the last inspection on 14 August 2013. We were informed by the registered manager that there was no safeguarding log kept by the registered manager. This meant there was no on going and accurate record of this incident. We asked the provider/registered manager to show us the current safeguarding policies and procedures. We were informed that they were held securely in a separate locked building as he was closing down the business. He was asked to provide these documents within a reasonable time. He failed to do so.

This was a breach of Regulation 20 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

We looked at the recruitment processes used by Chorcure Ltd. The registered manager informed us that all staff had been given notice in November 2014 along with several clients of Chorcure Ltd. We were told that three staff for one person were in the process of being 're-employed' in order that care for this person could be continued under a special arrangement. As such staff files and recruitment

documentation had not yet been fully completed. We saw no evidence on the incomplete staff files of criminal record checks with the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) having been undertaken.

Staff we spoke with at the home of one person who received care and support from staff employed by Chorcure Ltd informed us that they had been employed since October 2014 and no DBS check had been completed by the registered manager. They had been sent out to work without DBS checks in place.

We spoke with the registered manager about this after the inspection and it was admitted to us that this information was correct. This meant that effective and robust recruitment processes had not been followed to ensure that suitable people were employed.

This was a breach of Regulation 21 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

We asked about medication. The registered manager informed us that staff only prompted people to take their medication. Staff did not administer medication. No training for current employed staff had been completed in respect of medication.

We spoke with staff at the home of one person who was supported by staff employed by Chorcure Ltd. Staff showed us a document entitled 'Staff handbook'. Under the section 'Roles and Responsibilities, sub heading 'Personal Care' there is a list of nine activities. The last of which states; 'Administration and monitoring of medication'. A job description for a support worker employed by Chorcure at this home and other documentation clearly stated that staff were to follow the care plan for this person as drawn up by her relative, a trained healthcare professional.

The care plan involved the administration of medication. A member of the care team told us that they were involved with the storage, recording and administration of medication for this person, but that they had been shown how to do this by the person's relative. None of the staff had received any medication training from Chorcure Ltd covering the safe use and management of medicines from. No monitoring of medication of competency, or checks on the ability of staff to perform this role were done by the provider/registered manager.

This was a breach of Regulation 13 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

Is the service safe?

We were informed by the relative of the person who received support from staff that she, as a trained healthcare professional had given instruction and supervision to the current staff in respect of medication to ensure that her relative received medication in a safe manner.

We observed there were sufficient staff to meet the needs of the one person who received care and support from staff employed by Chorcare Ltd to keep them safe. People we spoke with told us they felt there were enough staff available to provide the support they needed and no concerns were raised about the staffing levels.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The registered manager informed us that all staff had been given notice in November 2014 along with several clients of Chorcare Ltd. We were told that three staff for one person were in the process of being 're-employed' in order that care for this person could be continued under a special arrangement.

The registered manager told us that arrangements were in hand to organise suitable induction and training for these three staff. We were shown a matrix print which detailed training in Fire Safety, Moving and Handling, First Aid and Food Hygiene. However no training had been completed at the time of the inspection.

Staff we spoke with confirmed to us that none of this training had taken place. The same staff informed us that they had received an email from the registered manager on the same day as and following the inspection, instructing them to undertake some free on line training in several subjects none of which were included on the matrix print we had been shown. We were shown and provided with a copy of this email. This meant staff employed by Chorcare Ltd were not suitably supported to receive appropriate training to perform their role.

This was a breach of Regulation 23 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

People we spoke with told us they were happy with the quality and knowledge of staff to support them. However this knowledge had been gained from outside sources and not Chorcare Ltd.

The registered manager told us that none of the current staff employed by Chorcare Ltd had received any formal one to one supervision. None had been employed long enough to have received an annual appraisal of their performance. The registered manager had no documentation or records of staff supervision and staff we spoke with confirmed that this did not happen. Although they did tell us that the registered manager regularly attended the premises from which they worked and as such they had regular contact but no formally recorded supervision. The senior carer on duty we spoke with informed us that she had regular one to one meetings with the two other care workers who worked there. Whilst this

had not been recorded up to now she intended to start a record. This was confirmed by the other care staff. This meant staff employed by Chorcare Ltd were not suitably supported in relation to their responsibilities and development to perform their role.

This was a breach of Regulation 23 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) is required by law to monitor the operation of Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. We discussed the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and the associated Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS), with the registered manager. The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) is legislation designed to protect people who are unable to make decisions for themselves and to ensure that any decisions are made in people's best interests. Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) are part of this legislation and ensures where someone may be deprived of their liberty, the least restrictive option is taken. DoLS did not apply to this service as it was a domiciliary care agency and as such any applications for deprivation of a person liberty must be made to the Court of Protection.

The registered manager informed us that current staff had received no training in the MCA or DoLS. No arrangements were currently in place to rectify this situation. Staff we spoke with confirmed they had not received any training in this subject. As such they were not fully able to understand what they must do to comply with the MCA in respect of obtaining valid consent. Whilst the DoLS procedures did not apply to this service, the lack of training meant that staff were not able to understand what would amount to a deprivation of a person's liberty in order to raise concerns.

This was a breach of Regulation 18 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

The one person who was supported by staff employed by Chorcare Ltd at the time of our inspection resided in their own home. They made their own choices around food and nutrition supported by family and care staff. Staff we spoke with informed us that they would prompt and promote healthy eating and drinking when required but in the end the final choice was down to the person they supported who had the capacity to make such decisions.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At the time of this inspection only one person was in receipt of care and support from staff employed by Chorcare Ltd. The registered manager made it clear to us that he was wanting to close the business down and cancel his registration with the Care Quality Commission (CQC). One of the reasons cited by him was the attitude and punctuality of some care staff he had employed.

We were aware from information provided to CQC prior to this inspection that some people had not been happy with the attitude of some care staff that had been provided by Chorcare Ltd. We were told by the registered manager that all care staff and people who were supported by the service, with the exception of one person and three care staff, had been given notice in November 2014. This was because he was winding up the company. As such those complained about no longer worked for the service.

We were unable to speak with the one person who still received care and support from staff employed by Chorcare Ltd as when we visited they were at work. We were however able to speak with two relatives of this person.

We were informed that the care staff currently employed by Chorcare treated their relative with respect and dignity. It was felt the staff knew their relative's likes, dislikes and preferences. They were able to respond to their relative's needs in a caring and compassionate way. In a short period of time the three care staff had built up a trusting relationship with their relative.

We were told that the three care staff employed by Chorcare Ltd to care for their relative were very good. We were told: "They get on with [named person] so well". And: "[named person] likes them which is one of the reasons we have kept them on".

We asked about the registered manager. We were told: "At first [named] was always polite and attentive in all dealings with him and has remained so".

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At the time of this inspection only one person was in receipt of care and support from staff employed by Chorcare Ltd. The registered manager made it clear to us that he was wanting to close the business down and cancel his registration with the Care Quality Commission (CQC).

We found no evidence of individualised or person centred care from Chorcare Ltd. The one person who was in receipt of care and support from staff employed by Chorcare Ltd did have a care plan. The care plan was person centred. Relevant to this persons needs and had been reviewed on a regular basis. It contained sufficient detail for the three care staff employed to provide high quality care.

However the registered manager informed us that he had taken no part in the formulation this care plan. The care plan had been in place for some time even when other agencies had provided care and support. No pre assessment of needs had been done by the registered manager before care and support was provided.

The care plan had been originally drawn up and put in place by a relative of the person who received the care and support. This person was a trained healthcare professional. We looked at this care plan and we could see that the care plan was appropriate and covered all of the person's needs.

The care plan was kept at the home of the person who was supported by Chorcare Ltd however there was no copy at the office of Chorcare Ltd. A relative told us: "It's always been here. The last agency [named] had a copy at their office when we used them but Chorcare have never had a copy". The registered manager confirmed this to us.

Staff we spoke with confirmed that they kept regular daily records of care and support provided. We were shown some of these records and found them to be detailed and good recordings. Staff also confirmed that no records were held at the office of Chorcare and daily records were not checked or audited by anyone except the senior carer and the relative. The registered manager confirmed that he did not audit the care plan or the daily records.

Staff we spoke with who were currently employed by Chorcare Ltd confirmed that the registered manager had not drawn up this care plan nor did they take part in the

reviews. Senior staff told us they were involved with regular reviews but that this was with the relative and the person who received the support, not the provider/registered manager.

The relative we spoke with confirmed that they had drawn up the care plan. It was regularly reviewed and she had involved the senior member of the care team. At no point was the registered manager involved.

We viewed the job description provided to the care staff which clearly stated that they should follow the care plan as directed by [named relative].

The person who received the care and support from staff employed by Chorcare Ltd was involved in their care plan and subsequent reviews but not with the registered manager of Chorcare Ltd.

We were satisfied that the needs of the person who received care and support provided by staff employed by Chorcare were met. However we were concerned that the registered manager had failed to take appropriate steps to ensure that this person was protected against inappropriate or unsafe treatment or care.

This was a breach of Regulation 9 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

We were aware from information provided to the Care Quality Commission (CQC) since our last inspection of Chorcare Ltd on 14 August 2013, that a person was not happy with the service provided to their relative. We had been given full details of their complaint. We were informed that this person had been in regular contact over a period of time with the registered manager and that he was fully aware of their complaint. They had not been happy with the response and had since moved to another care provider.

The manager told us no complaints had been received since the last inspection. We mentioned the circumstances of the above complaint but were again told that no formal complaints had been received. We asked if we could view the complaints log for the service. We were told that as the business was closing down all paperwork and documents in relation to Chorcare Ltd were archived and kept in secure locked premises. We asked the complaints log to be provided along with policies and procedures on dealing

Is the service responsive?

with complaints. We were informed by the registered manager that these would be scanned and provided within the week which followed the inspection. By 5 February 2015 these had still not been received.

We looked at documentation about Chorcare Ltd in the home of the one person who was in receipt of care and support by staff employed by Chorcare Ltd. We saw no documentation which informed people how to make a

compliant or how complaints would be dealt with. Relatives and family told us they and their relative were confident they would know how to complain but this was from past experience and generic knowledge and not from information provided by Chorcare Ltd about their process.

This was a breach of Regulation 19 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Chorcare Ltd is a domiciliary care agency. The company was owned by the registered manager for the service. The registered manager had registered with the Care Quality Commission on 12 June 2014. This person's wife was a partner in the company and dealt with the financial aspects only.

At the time of our inspection we were informed by the registered manager that he was in the process of shutting down the business. All people who had received support through Chorcare Ltd and all staff had been given notice around November 2014 with the exception of one person and three care staff. This meant the registered manager was still providing the regulated activity of personal care at the time of this inspection.

We were concerned that the registered manager gave us information and rationale regarding the service provided, the business and the future of people supported and staff employed which was different to the information given to us by staff, relatives and people who were currently supported or had been supported by the service. As an example we had been told by the registered manager that all people supported by Chorcare Ltd, with the exception of one person had been transferred to the care of another provider in November 2014. Our information and conversations with other providers told us that in fact only three people had been transferred to another provider. Other arrangements had been put in place for another three people.

Staff we spoke with knew who the registered manager was but had no confidence in their leadership abilities. Staff were not supported in their career development by means of training and supervision. Due to the current arrangements in place, staff we spoke with were unclear as to who they answered to. They remained in the employ of Chorcare Ltd; however they were clearly under the direction and supervision of the relative of the one remaining person who received care and support through Chorcare Ltd. The job description they had been given clearly stated as much.

Whilst only a small group of staff remained under the employ of Chorcare Ltd, we were told that regular staff meetings as a group did not take place with the registered manager. Staff did tell us that there was regular contact at

the home of the one person who continued to receive care and support through Chorcare Ltd but on many occasions the registered manager would be providing care as well. The registered manager confirmed that no formal meetings were held with staff.

From our conversations, staff along with the registered manager understood the principles of good quality assurance in order to drive and improve the service provided. We found that the lack of appropriate communication and information provided between management and staff affected the confidence in the way staff performed their role and created anxiety. As an example, staff were aware that the registered manager wanted to shut down the company. Different messages were relayed over a period of a few months in terms of what was happening, what was planned; would they be taken on by another provider or indeed employed as personal assistance under a personal budget scheme.

We found the service was not well-led. There were no effective systems in place to monitor the quality of the service or drive forward improvements. We did see some evidence that surveys of eight people who had used the service had been completed since our last inspection on 14 August 2013. Comments made were all of a positive nature. However this was the only evidence available.

The registered manager informed us that no audits or checks had been carried out in respect of the care plan, medication, incidents or any other aspect of the care provided at the time of the inspection for the one person who received still received care and support via Chorcare Ltd. Staff we spoke with confirmed this as did the relative of this one person.

This was a breach of Regulation 10 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

We were told that as the business was closing down all paperwork and documents in relation to Chorcare Ltd were archived and kept in secure locked premises. During the inspection we asked the registered manager to produce for our inspection a number of documents. For example policies and procedures in relation to safeguarding, the MCA, training records, complaints and staff files. We were informed that all of these documents would be produced for us within a reasonable time. Whilst we were given during a meeting with the provider at a later date on 5

Is the service well-led?

February 2015 three old staff records and a pen drive which we were informed contained relevant policies and procedures. These were not produced for inspection within a reasonable time.

This was a breach of Regulation 20 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

We had received information during the inspection from people we spoke with that the provider had changed the name of the company from Chorcure Ltd to Chorcure Staffing Solutions. The provider confirmed this with us and the fact that they had not notified the Care Quality Commission (CQC) regarding this change.

This was a breach of Regulation 15 of the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009.

The service had one safeguarding incident in the last twelve months. An allegation of abuse was reported to the local authority by another professional agency. The incident had been investigated by the local authority and police. The provider had been made aware of the investigation by the local authority and police. The registered provider and registered manager failed to notify the Care Quality Commission (CQC) of this incident of alleged abuse. Registered persons are required to report reported incidents of abuse the CQC.

This was a breach of Regulation 18 of the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows where regulations were not being met and we have asked the provider to send us a report that says what action they are going to take. We did not take formal enforcement action at this stage. We will check that this action is taken by the provider.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Personal care	Regulation 11 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 Safeguarding people who use services from abuse The provider did not take reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent it before it occurs by training staff in the safeguarding of adults. Regulation 11 (1) (a).

Regulated activity	Regulation
Personal care	Regulation 20 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 Records The provider was not able to produce required documents and records for inspection within a reasonable time. Regulation 20 (1) (a)(b) 2(a).

Regulated activity	Regulation
Personal care	Regulation 21 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 Requirements relating to workers The provider did not have effective and robust recruitment processes in place to keep people safe. Regulation 21 (a) (i)(ii)(iii) (b).

Regulated activity	Regulation
Personal care	Regulation 13 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 Management of medicines The provider did not have appropriate arrangements in place for the obtaining, recording, handling, using safe keeping, safe administration and disposal of medication to keep people safe. Regulation 13.

Regulated activity	Regulation
--------------------	------------

This section is primarily information for the provider

Action we have told the provider to take

Personal care

Regulation 23 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations
2010 Supporting staff

Staff employed by Chorcare Ltd were not suitably supported to receive appropriate training, and supervision relation to their responsibilities and development to perform their role. Regulation 23 (1) (a)(b).

Regulated activity

Regulation

Personal care

Regulation 18 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations
2010 Consent to care and treatment

The provider did not have suitable arrangements in place for obtaining and acting in accordance with and obtaining valid consent as staff had not received any training in the Mental capacity Act 2005. Regulation 18.

Regulated activity

Regulation

Personal care

Regulation 9 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations
2010 Care and welfare of people who use services

The provider failed to carry out appropriated assessments of need, risk assessments and reviews of care records to ensure people were protected against inappropriate or unsafe treatment or care. Regulation 9 (1) (a) (b) (i)(ii).

Regulated activity

Regulation

Personal care

Regulation 19 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations
2010 Complaints

The provider failed to provide people with information about the complaints process and did not have any method of recording complaints. Regulation 19 (1) (2) (a) 9 (c) (d).

Regulated activity

Regulation

This section is primarily information for the provider

Action we have told the provider to take

Personal care

Regulation 10 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

The provider manager had no audits or checks in place to monitor the quality of the service provided. Regulation 10(1)(a)(b) (2)(b)(i) (c)(i).

Regulated activity

Regulation

Personal care

Regulation 15 CQC (Registration) Regulations 2009 Notifications – notice of changes

The provider failed to inform the Care Quality Commission that they had changed the name of the partnership business. Regulation 15(1)(d).

Regulated activity

Regulation

Personal care

Regulation 18 CQC (Registration) Regulations 2009 Notification of other incidents

The provider manager failed to notify the Care Quality Commission about a safeguarding investigation carried out by the police and local authority as required. Regulation 18 (1) (e) (f).