

Care Assist Limited

Care Assist in Harrow (Whitehall Road)

Inspection report

2 Whitehall Road
Harrow
Middlesex
HA1 3AJ

Tel: 02088690070
Website: www.careassistuk.net

Date of inspection visit:
15 March 2017

Date of publication:
31 March 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service effective?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

At our last inspection of Care Assist in Harrow (Whitehall Road) on 6 October 2015 we found that there was a breach of legal regulation. We found people were potentially being deprived of their liberties because the home had not made attempts to identify whether any people were subject to restrictions on their liberty.

We undertook this announced focused inspection on the 15 March 2017 to check the provider had taken action and were now meeting legal requirements.

This report only covers our findings in relation to the effective topic area. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Care Assist in Harrow (Whitehall Road) on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

At our last inspection in October 2015 we rated the service good and in the four topic areas; safe, caring, responsive and well-led. The service was rated requires improvement in the topic area effective. The overall rating was good and the overall rating continues to be good after this inspection.

Care Assist in Harrow (Whitehall Road) provides accommodation and personal care to a maximum of six people with mental health needs. At the time of our inspection, there were six people using the service.

There was a registered manager in place. 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 legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

At this focused inspection on the 15 March 2017, we found the legal requirements had been met. The provider had taken action to address our concerns about following the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 including the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Records showed the registered manager had identified areas of people's care in which their liberties were being deprived. We saw the relevant processes had been followed and standard authorisations were in place for people using the service.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

We found action had been taken to ensure the service was effective.

The service was following the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 including the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Care Assist in Harrow (Whitehall Road)

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.

We undertook an announced focused inspection of 15 March 2017. The provider was given 48 hours' notice because the location was a small care home for people with mental health needs who are often out during the day; we needed to be sure that someone would be in.

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector. Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service.

During the inspection we spoke with the registered manager and deputy. We checked six people's care plans and reviewed two DoLS authorisations.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection on the 6 October 2015 we found the home had failed to make attempts to identify whether any people were being deprived and such information was not recorded in people's care plans.

This was a breach of the Regulation 13 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At this focused inspection on 15 March 2017 we found that the provider had taken action and met the requirements of Regulation 13 described above.

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.

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA. Records showed staff had received MCA and DoLS training. There were arrangements in place to obtain, and act in accordance with the consent of people using the service. Care plans contained information about people's mental state, levels of comprehension and the support needed for a person in areas where they may lack the capacity to give consent. For example, in one person's care plan, it stated 'I have memory loss where I am unable to retain information that has been given to me.' Areas in which a person was unable to give verbal consent, records showed the person's next of kin and relevant health professionals were involved to ensure decisions were made in the person's best interest. Records also showed there were appointees in place for people using the service as they did not have the capacity to make some decisions themselves.

Records showed that people using the service had been assessed to establish whether any people would need applications for DoLS authorisations. We saw the relevant processes had been followed and two standard authorisations were in place for people using the service as it was recognised that there were areas of the person's care in which the person's liberties were being deprived. These areas included not being able to leave the home unaccompanied, locked doors and constant supervision with aspects of people's care.

DoLS authorisations had not been applied for the remainder of the people living in the home as they were deemed to have capacity and there were no areas of people's care in which their liberties were being deprived. During the inspection, we saw people using the service were not restricted from leaving the home on their own. There was evidence that showed people went out and enjoyed various activities and community outings.

We identified that the provider had developed their system so that the appropriate authorisations were in

place to ensure people were not deprived of their liberties unlawfully.