

Rashot Ltd

Roanu House

Inspection report

2 Grosvenor Avenue
Carshalton
Surrey
SM5 3EW

Tel: 02086476366
Website: www.rashotcarehomes.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
25 August 2016

Date of publication:
21 September 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service effective?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 13 April 2016 and three breaches of regulation were found. This was because people's safety was compromised as the provider had not undertaken regular safety checks of the premises. In particular the gas safety check and the Legionella test were out of date. The provider also did not have a safe and clean environment in the kitchen area which meant people were at risk of harm. Additionally, there were risks that people might receive inappropriate care because of the lack of evidence that staff had received training to undertake their roles.

After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breaches of regulations described above.

We undertook a focused inspection on the 25 August 2016 to check they had followed their action plan and to confirm they now met legal requirements. This inspection was unannounced.

This report only covers our findings in relation to these requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Roanu House on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Roanu House provides accommodation for up to six people who require personal care on a daily basis. The home accommodates people who have mental health needs and/or learning disabilities. At the time of our inspection there were six people living at the home. One of the six people lived there at weekends only.

The service had a registered manager in post. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have a legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act and associated Regulations about how the service is run. The registered manager had only been in post since February 2016 and had registered with the CQC.

During our focused inspection we found the provider had followed their action plan. Premises safety checks had been completed and were available for us to view. There were systems in place to ensure future checks and audits were completed in a timely manner.

Broken and unsuitable furniture had been replaced. The home was clean and hygienic to help protect people from the risks associated with the premises.

There was now a systematic approach to staff training. The registered manager at Roanu House was able to monitor the training staff had received. Staff training records had been updated and staff training was being refreshed.

Whilst the provider had taken sufficient action to meet the legal requirements that were being breached at the last inspection, we have not improved our rating for the service. As we need to see consistent

improvements over time before we are able to change the rating of this service from 'requires improvement'.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

The provider has made improvements in this area. They had undertaken premises safety checks and put measures in place to minimise the risk of future checks lapsing.

Unsuitable furniture had been replaced and the kitchen area was cleaned so it was hygienic.

We have not changed the services' rating from 'requires improvement' as we need to see consistent improvements over time.

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service effective?

The provider has made improvements in this area. The registered manager monitored the training undertaken by staff and when it needed to be renewed. This meant people were receiving care from staff that were knowledgeable about current and best practice.

We have not changed the services' rating from 'requires improvement' as we need to see consistent improvements over time.

Requires Improvement ●

Roanu House

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 checked 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.

This unannounced focused inspection was undertaken by an inspector on the 25 August 2016. This inspection was arranged to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection in April 2016 had been made. We inspected the service against two of the five questions we ask about services: Is it safe? Is it effective?

Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service, this included the provider's action plan, which set out the action they would take to meet legal requirements.

During our inspection we visited the home and looked at various records relating to the management of the service and staff training records. We also toured the communal areas of the ground floor to check they were safe and clean.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our last inspection of the service on 13 April 2016 we found that the service was not always managed in a way to ensure people were protected from risks they faced in their day to day life and their safety maintained.

This was because the provider could not show some checks and audits in relation to the safety of the premises had been completed, namely, gas safety and Legionella tests. Legionella is an organism that can exist in water systems if appropriate precautions are not taken and can cause severe illness to people.

This was raised on the day of the inspection and the registered manager gave us assurances they would be completed. We subsequently received evidence the checks had been completed. The gas safety check was completed on the 15 April 2016 and the Legionella test on the 5 May 2016.

We saw the registered manager had introduced a range of checks and audits to ensure the on-going quality of the service. For example, there was now a health and safety audit and an infection control audit which was completed monthly. The registered manager monitored the checks completed by staff. Additionally there was a quality assurance record which identified when premises checks needed to be renewed. In this way the provider anticipated when checks needed to be completed, rather than waiting for them to lapse.

At our last inspection of the service in April 2016 we found the provider had not ensured the premises were safe and clean and suitable for the delivery of care. In particular, we found a dirty kitchen and unsuitable furniture.

At this inspection we completed a tour of the communal areas on the ground floor. We saw that unsuitable furniture had been removed and replaced. The kitchen area was clean and hygienic. The registered manager had introduced a cleaning schedule which identified areas in the home that required cleaning each day and once completed was signed by staff to confirm it had been undertaken.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our inspection in April we found there were risks that people might not be cared for by staff who were appropriately trained in line with their roles and responsibilities. In some circumstances we found training identified by the provider as mandatory, may not have taken place or been refreshed as often as required. For example, fire training should have been completed every three years and safeguarding adults at risk of harm or abuse, annually. After a second visit to the service, the provider was still unable to supply sufficient evidence of training. This meant people who lived at Roanu House could have been placed at risk of receiving inappropriate or unsafe care.

At this inspection we saw progress had been made with regards to training. The registered manager at Roanu House now maintained their own information relating to staff training rather than the information being held centrally by the provider. This meant the registered manager could easily and quickly identify when training was required and ensure it took place in a timely manner.

Since our last inspection, the provider had identified three strands of training. Firstly, there was online training. The second strand related to the Care Certificate. The Care Certificate is a set of standards that social care and health workers should be familiar with in their daily working life. It is the new minimum standards that should be covered as part of induction training of new care workers. The registered manager was able to monitor individual staff members' progress in relation to the training undertaken and completed. We saw the registered manager had raised issues in supervision sessions with individual staff members, if training was not being completed. The third strand related to specialist training, for example we saw the provider had arranged for classroom based teaching of first aid by a certified trainer. This meant people were now receiving care from staff who were offered training to care for and support people.