

## Ashingdon Hall Care Limited Florence House

### **Inspection report**

19 Ailsa Road Westcliff On Sea Essex SS0 8BJ Date of inspection visit: 16 February 2021

Date of publication: 16 March 2021

Tel: 01702437989

### Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inspected but not rated

| Is the service safe?     | Inspected but not rated |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Is the service well-led? | Inspected but not rated |

### Summary of findings

### Overall summary

#### About the service

Florence House offers personal care and support for up to a maximum of nine adults who have a mental health condition. At the time of our visit eight people lived there.

Not everyone who used the service received personal care. CQC only inspects where people receive personal care. This is help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating. Where they do, we also consider any wider social care provided.

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

We received information raising a concern that the registered manager had isolated at the service rather than in their own home. We inspected the service to identify if people that lived in the service or staff had been put at risk. Whilst we found the registered manager had not followed current guidance for isolation, we found that they had taken every step needed to keep people and staff safe.

A visitor's protocol was in place and everyone was temperature tested, completed hand disinfection and provided with Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) prior to entering the service.

Staff had received additional training in infection prevention and control and wore PPE in line with national guidance.

People living in the service were monitored for symptoms of COVID-19. Additional monitoring such as temperature checks were carried out so that people's changing needs could be quickly identified and responded to.

There was an up to date infection, prevention and control policy in place supported by COVID-19 specific protocols.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection

The last rating for this service was good (published 13 April 2019).

Why we inspected

The inspection was prompted in part due to concerns received about the isolation processes for staff members. A decision was made for us to inspect and examine those risks.

CQC have introduced targeted inspections to follow up on Warning Notices or to check specific concerns. They do not look at an entire key question, only the part of the key question we are specifically concerned about. Targeted inspections do not change the rating from the previous inspection. This is because they do not assess all areas of a key question.

We found no evidence during this inspection that people were at risk of harm from these concerns.

#### Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our reinspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

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

We always ask the following five questions of services.

| Is the service safe?  | Inspected but not rated |
|---|-------------------------|
| At our last inspection we rated this key question good. We have<br>not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we<br>only looked at the parts of this key question we had specific<br>concerns about. |                         |
| Is the service well-led?  | Inspected but not rated |
| At our last inspection we rated this key question good. We have<br>not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we<br>only looked at the parts of this key question we had specific<br>concerns about. |                         |



# Florence House

### **Detailed findings**

### Background to this inspection

#### The inspection

This was a targeted inspection to check whether the provider had met the requirements of the specific concern we had staff isolation process during a Covid 19 outbreak. We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

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 undertaken by one inspector.

### Service and service type

This service provides care and support to people living in a 'supported living' setting, so that they can live as independently as possible. People's care and housing are provided under separate contractual agreements. CQC does not regulate premises used for supported living; this inspection looked at people's personal care and support.

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 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. We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return. This is information providers are required to send us with key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. This information helps support our inspections. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

#### During the inspection

We spoke with two people who used the service and two members of staff including the registered manager. We reviewed a range of records related to infection prevention control.

### After the inspection

The registered manager sent us additional documents related to infection prevention control.

### 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. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we have only looked at the part of the key question we had specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to explore the specific concerns we had about Florence House. We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

Preventing and controlling infection

- We were assured that the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.
- We were assured that the provider was meeting shielding and social distancing rules.
- We were assured that the provider was admitting people safely to the service.
- We were assured that the provider was using PPE effectively and safely.
- We were assured that the provider was accessing testing for people using the service and staff.
- We were assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises.

• We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.

• We were assured that the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.

### 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. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we have only looked at the part of the key question we have specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to check a specific concern we had about Florence House. We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

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

• We received a concern that the registered manager had isolated at the service rather than following the current guidance for staff to isolate in their own homes. The registered manager explained that they had moved into the service 14 days prior to needing to isolate to support people and staff during the outbreak. The registered manager had isolated in a separate area where there was no access for people or staff, they completed their isolation period in full and communicated to other staff by phone. The registered manager had been open and transparent about the decision they had made and communicated this to all relevant agencies. They are now aware of the current guidance.

• We spoke to one staff member who told us the provider had taken the safety of staff and people that used the service seriously during the outbreak.

• One person told us, "I do like it here, I have been here for four years and I am happy here." Another person told us, "The staff look after me well."