

S.E.L.F. (North East) Limited

# SELF Limited - 16 Park View

## Inspection report

16 Park View  
Hetton le Hole  
Houghton Le Spring  
DH5 9JH

Date of inspection visit:  
02 September 2021  
27 September 2021  
04 October 2021  
08 October 2021

Date of publication:  
14 January 2022

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inadequate 

Is the service safe?

Inadequate 

Is the service effective?

Requires Improvement 

Is the service well-led?

Inadequate 

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

### About the service

S E L F Limited - 16 Park View is a care home and provides accommodation and support for up to eight people living with a learning disability. There were eight people living at the service when we visited.

### People's experience of using this service and what we found

Risks to people were not always safely managed, monitored or assessed. The service did not have effective systems to protect people from the risk of financial abuse. COVID-19 protocols were not always followed, and the service did not have effective systems to prevent and control the spread of infections.

Quality assurance systems were not effective, they lacked detail and did not include all aspects of the service. The issues we found during the inspection had not been recognised.

The service did not ensure enough staff were deployed to meet people's needs. Staffing rotas did not always reflect the number of staff on duty and the provider's expected staffing levels were not achieved.

A training programme was in place. Staff received supervisions and appraisals.

Medicines were managed safely. People were referred to health professionals when required.

People gave mixed feedback about the service. Some people told us they were happy whilst others expressed their dissatisfaction about the restrictions which were unlawfully placed upon them.

People were not supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff did not support them in line with the legislation in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service did not support this practice

We expect health and social care providers to guarantee autistic people and people with a learning disability the choices, dignity, independence and good access to local communities that most people take for granted. Right Support, right care, right culture is the statutory guidance which supports CQC to make assessments and judgements about services providing support to people with a learning disability and/or autistic people.

Based on our review of the key questions of safe, effective and well-led the service was not able to demonstrate how they were meeting the underpinning principles of Right support, right care, right culture.

Right support: Some controlling and unlawful practices had been adopted within the home.

Right care: People did not always receive person-centred care and support.

Right culture: Attitudes and behaviours of the management team did not ensure people using service lead confident, inclusive and empowered lives.

Care staff were compassionate about ensuring people lived full lives. They recognised the issues at the service and repeatedly raised concerns with the management team.

The provider is conducting a full investigation into the failings and have put actions in place to address restrictions immediately.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

Rating at last inspection

The last rating for this service was good (published 20 May 2019).

Why we inspected

The inspection was prompted in part due to concerns received about the safety of people using the service, staffing levels and management of the service. A decision was made for us to inspect and examine those risks.

An initial inspection took place on 2 September 2021 to establish that people were safe. We inspected and found there was a concern with staffing levels and the management of the service, so we widened the scope of the inspection to become a focused inspection which included the key questions of safe, effective and well-led.

This report only covers our findings in relation to the key questions safe, effective and well-led as we were mindful of the impact and added pressures of COVID-19 pandemic on the service.

We reviewed the information we held about the service. No areas of concern were identified in the other key questions. We therefore did not inspect them. Ratings from previous comprehensive inspections for those key questions were used in calculating the overall rating at this inspection.

We looked at infection prevention and control measures under the Safe key question. We look at this in all care home inspections even if no concerns or risks have been identified. This is to provide assurance that the service can respond to COVID-19 and other infection outbreaks effectively

The overall rating for the service has changed from good to inadequate. This is based on the findings at this inspection.

We have found evidence that the provider needs to make improvement. Please see the safe, effective and well-led sections of this full report.

You can see what action we have asked the provider to take at the end of this full report.

Following the inspection, the provider has taken action to mitigate the risks. The provider was receptive to our feedback and has implemented new systems and procedures in response.

Enforcement

We are mindful of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on our regulatory function. This meant we took account of the exceptional circumstances arising as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic when considering what enforcement action was necessary and proportionate to keep people safe as a result of this inspection. We will continue to monitor the service.

We have identified breaches in relation to safe care and treatment, safeguarding, dignity and respect,

staffing and good governance at this inspection.

Please see the action we have told the provider to take at the end of this report.

Full information about CQC's regulatory response to the more serious concerns found during inspections is added to reports after any representations and appeals have been concluded.

#### Follow up

We will meet with the provider following this report being published to discuss how they will make changes to ensure they improve their rating to at least good. We will work with the local authority to monitor progress. We will return to visit as per our re-inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

The overall rating for this service is 'Inadequate' and the service is therefore in 'special measures'. This means we will keep the service under review and, if we do not propose to cancel the provider's registration, we will re-inspect within 6 months to check for significant improvements.

If the provider has not made enough improvement within this timeframe. And there is still a rating of inadequate for any key question or overall rating, we will take action in line with our enforcement procedures. This will mean we will begin the process of preventing the provider from operating this service. This will usually lead to cancellation of their registration or to varying the conditions the registration.

For adult social care services, the maximum time for being in special measures will usually be no more than 12 months. If the service has demonstrated improvements when we inspect it. And it is no longer rated as inadequate for any of the five key questions it will no longer be in special measures.

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

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service safe?

**Inadequate** ●

The service was not safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

### Is the service effective?

**Requires Improvement** ●

The service was not always effective.

Details are in our effective findings below.

### Is the service well-led?

**Inadequate** ●

The service was not well-led.

Details are in our well-led findings below.

# SELF Limited - 16 Park View

## Detailed findings

### Background to this inspection

#### The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

As part of this inspection we looked at the infection control and prevention measures in place. This was conducted so we can understand the preparedness of the service in preventing or managing an infection outbreak, and to identify good practice we can share with other services.

#### Inspection team

This inspection was carried out by three inspectors.

#### Service and service type

SELF Limited - 16 Park View is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

#### Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

#### What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. The provider was not asked to complete a provider information return prior to this inspection. This is information we require providers to send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We took this into account when we inspected the service and made the judgements in this

report. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

#### During the inspection

We spoke with three people who used the service about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with members of staff including the registered manager who is also the nominated individual, the registered manager of SELF Ltd 14 Park View and 13 support workers. The nominated individual is responsible for supervising the management of the service on behalf of the provider. We spoke with three social care professionals who regularly visit the service.

We reviewed a range of records. This included three people's care records and medication records. We looked at three staff files in relation to recruitment and staff supervision. A variety of records relating to the management of the service were also reviewed.

#### After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found. We looked at quality assurance records, and care plans.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has now deteriorated to Inadequate. This meant people were not safe and were at risk of avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People were not protected from the risk of financial abuse. The service did not have effective systems to prevent financial abuse. We raised our concerns with the police and an investigation is ongoing.

The service failed to have effective systems to prevent discrimination against service users on grounds of any protected characteristics (as defined in Section 4 of the Equality Act 2010) of the service user. And the service failed to ensure effective systems were in place to protect service users from the risk of financial abuse. This was a breach of regulation 13 (Safeguarding) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

- Staff understood their safeguarding responsibilities.

Following the inspection, we referred the matter to the local authority safeguarding team and the provider advised us that they are looking into these matters.

Preventing and controlling infection

- The service did not always follow COVID-19 protocols. Visitors entering the service did not always have their temperature checked or were asked COVID-19 screening questions.
- Personal protective equipment (PPE) was not readily available around the service. There were no designated areas for staff to put on and take off PPE.
- Records relating to temperature checks and cleaning were not completed.
- The service did not have a system for recording staff members Lateral Flow Device tests. This meant the service did not have an accurate record of COVID-19 testing.

Although we found no evidence that people had been harmed, the service did not have effective systems to prevent and control the spread of infections. This was a breach of regulation 12 (Safe Care and Treatment) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risks to people were not managed safely. Action was not taken to manage known risks to people.
- Peoples behaviours which may challenge others were not robustly monitored. This made it difficult to identify when people have made improvements.

Following the inspection, the provider changed documentation to also reflect positive actions.

The provider had failed to manage the risks relating to the health, safety and welfare of people. This was a breach of regulation 12 (Safe Care and Treatment) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

#### Staffing and recruitment

- Staffing rotas did not always reflect the number of staff on duty. The provider's expected staffing levels were not achieved. This meant at times not enough staff were deployed to support people safely.
- People and staff told us there was a lack of staff to meet peoples' needs. Not enough staff were available to support people on activities in the community. One person told us at times they could not go out as there were not enough staff.

Although we found no evidence that people had been harmed, the provider had failed to ensure enough staff were deployed to meet people's needs. This was a breach of regulation 18 (Staffing) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

Following the inspection the provider advised us that they are investigating the discrepancies in the staffing rotas.

- Staff were recruited safely, and appropriate pre-employment checks were carried out.

#### Learning lessons when things go wrong

- The service did not have effective systems to learn when things went wrong and this meant that opportunities for prevention of further occurrence were missed. However, the provider was open and receptive to our inspection feedback and made changes in response.
- Accidents and incidents were not always recorded and investigated. A review was not conducted to learn from trends or patterns of incidents.

#### Using medicines safely

- Medicines were managed safely.
- People received their medicines as prescribed. There was a clear system in place for recording medicine administration and regular stock checks were carried out.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has now deteriorated to Requires improvement. This meant the effectiveness of people's care, treatment and support did not always achieve good outcomes or was inconsistent.

Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The Act requires that, as far as possible, people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA.

In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty had the appropriate legal authority and were being met.

- One person told us they were only allowed out with a staff member. There was no information to explain on what legal basis they had to have staff accompany them and no care plan or agreement whereby they agreed to be accompanied.

The service failed to have effective systems to prevent discrimination against people on grounds of any protected characteristics (as defined in Section 4 of the Equality Act 2010) of the service user. And the service failed to ensure effective systems were in place to ensure people were not deprived of their liberty unlawfully. This was a breach of regulation 13 (Safeguarding) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

- Staff had completed MCA training.

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet

- People were involved in decisions about their diet. Meal choices were discussed at service user meeting which included all of the provider's three homes.
- Care plans did not record people's preferences or outline any activity involving being part of the

preparation of meals.

Adapting service, design, decoration to meet people's needs

- The home was clean and tidy with a homely feel.
- People decorated their rooms as they wished.

Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support; Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law

- Pre-assessments took place prior to people moving to the service to ensure their needs could be met.
- People's care plans lacked detail and did not describe people's preference in the way they wished to be supported. This was not in line with expectations of right support right care right culture.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- The service had a three-year training programme. Staff had started to complete refresher training.
- New members of staff completed an induction and a period of working with experienced staff.
- Staff had supervisions and appraisals. The majority of staff told us they did not feel supported by the management team and if they raised concerns or challenged situations, they alleged they felt related to poor care there were repercussions for them.

Following the inspection, we asked the provider to investigate the allegations.

Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care

- The service had systems and procedures in place to refer people to other professionals when required. People were supported to access the GP, and district nurses.
- Health and social care professionals told us the staff team had worked with people and achieved positive outcomes. One healthcare professionals told us, "[Person] is the best they have been, they are really settled."

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

Well-led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has now deteriorated to Inadequate: This meant there were widespread and significant shortfalls in service leadership. Leaders and the culture they created did not assure the delivery of high-quality care.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements;

- Quality assurance within the service was not effective. Audits had failed to identify the issues found during this inspection regarding risk, infection control issues and management of the service.
- The registered manager failed to have any oversight of the home, including supporting people with their finances. The registered manager had delegated some managerial duties to another manager. However, they did not monitor and assess the manager in that role.

The service failed to have effective systems to assess, monitor and improve the quality and safety of the services. This was a breach of regulation 17 (Good governance) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

- Staff spoke positively about their roles. They were passionate about ensuring people received great care and support. Staff worked extended hours to ensure people were safe. They recognised the safeguarding issues in the home and repeatedly tried to address this with the management team. Some staff had whistled to the CQC and their information prompted the inspection.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- The home did not promote a positive and open culture. Morale amongst staff was low. Staff told us they were not listened to when expressing their views.
- The home was not person-centred. Some people had unlawful restrictions placed upon them.
- Staff did not feel valued and respected. Staff expressed concerns to us and especially about the lack of opportunities for people to develop new skills, be autonomous and explore new things.

Following the inspection, we asked the provider to review the culture and practice in the home in line with the regulatory expectations and the right support, right care, right culture guidance.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics; working in partnership with others

- The service regularly sought feedback from staff, people, and relatives. Feedback reviewed was positive from all. However, during our inspection, staff and people we spoke with expressed concerns about the management of the service as detailed above which meant that the feedback system being deployed was

not effective or representative of what was actually felt about the service provision .

Following the inspection, the provider advised they were looking into the concerns raised.

Continuous learning and improving care

- In line with all of the findings above it was strongly evident the service did not have effective systems to reflect and analyse information to drive improvement. Important information was not always escalated to the provider by the management team.

Following the inspection in light of the widespread and significant failings we asked the provider to address these issues urgently. We also shared our findings with the local authorities who had people placed at the service.

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 will check that this action is taken by the provider.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care	Regulation 12 HSCA RA Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment  The provider had failed to manage the risks relating to the health, safety and welfare of people. The service did not have effective systems to prevent and control the spread of infections  Regulation 12(2)(a), 12(2)(h)
Regulated activity	Regulation
Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care	Regulation 13 HSCA RA Regulations 2014 Safeguarding service users from abuse and improper treatment  The service failed to ensure effective systems were in place to protect service users from the risk of financial abuse. The service failed to have effective systems to prevent discrimination against service users on grounds of any protected characteristics (as defined in Section 4 of the Equality Act 2010) of the service user. The service failed to ensure effective systems were in place to ensure people were not deprived of their liberty unlawfully Regulation 13(1), 13(4)(a), 13(5)
Regulated activity	Regulation
Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care	Regulation 18 HSCA RA Regulations 2014 Staffing  The provider had failed to ensure enough staff were deployed to meet people's needs.  Regulation 18(1)

This section is primarily information for the provider

## Enforcement actions

The table below shows where regulations were not being met and we have taken enforcement action.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care	Regulation 17 HSCA RA Regulations 2014 Good governance  The service failed to have effective systems to assess, monitor and improve the quality and safety of the services.  Regulation 17(1)

**The enforcement action we took:**

Warning notice issued