

eDeposit Ireland

DCL-01, OSV-0005863, 08 October 2021

Item Type	report
Citation	Ireland. Health Information and Quality Authority, 'DCL-01, OSV-0005863, 08 October 2021', [report], Health Information and Quality Authority, 2022-06-01, Designated Centre for Disabilities
Publisher	Health Information and Quality Authority
Download date	2026-06-10 12:48:38
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14765/106473



Report of an inspection of a Designated Centre for Disabilities (Adults).

Issued by the Chief Inspector

Name of designated centre:	DCL-01
Name of provider:	Dara Residential Services
Address of centre:	Kildare
Type of inspection:	Announced
Date of inspection:	08 October 2021
Centre ID:	OSV-0005863
Fieldwork ID:	MON-0026931

About the designated centre

The following information has been submitted by the registered provider and describes the service they provide.

DCL-01 provides individualised accommodation for a maximum of four residents aged 18 years and older, diagnosed with an intellectual disability. The centre is divided into four separate homes. Two of the homes are two story buildings located beside each other in a large town in Kildare and close to a range of local amenities. The other two homes are ground floor bungalows located in a rural setting. Each of the homes has a kitchen come dining and sitting room area, bathroom and the residents own bedroom. One of the houses has a separate sitting room. The centre is staffed by a person in charge and health care assistants.

The following information outlines some additional data on this centre.

Number of residents on the date of inspection:	3
--	---

This inspection was carried out to assess compliance with the Health Act 2007 (as amended), the Health Act 2007 (Care and Support of Residents in Designated Centres for Persons (Children and Adults) with Disabilities) Regulations 2013, and the Health Act 2007 (Registration of Designated Centres for Persons (Children and Adults with Disabilities) Regulations 2013 - 2015 as amended. To prepare for this inspection the inspector of social services (**hereafter referred to as inspectors**) reviewed all information about this centre. This included any previous inspection findings, registration information, information submitted by the provider or person in charge and other unsolicited information since the last inspection.

As part of our inspection, where possible, we:

- speak with residents and the people who visit them to find out their experience of the service,
- talk with staff and management to find out how they plan, deliver and monitor the care and support services that are provided to people who live in the centre,
- observe practice and daily life to see if it reflects what people tell us,
- review documents to see if appropriate records are kept and that they reflect practice and what people tell us.

In order to summarise our inspection findings and to describe how well a service is doing, we group and report on the regulations under two dimensions of:

1. Capacity and capability of the service:

This section describes the leadership and management of the centre and how effective it is in ensuring that a good quality and safe service is being provided. It outlines how people who work in the centre are recruited and trained and whether there are appropriate systems and processes in place to underpin the safe delivery and oversight of the service.

2. Quality and safety of the service:

This section describes the care and support people receive and if it was of a good quality and ensured people were safe. It includes information about the care and supports available for people and the environment in which they live.

A full list of all regulations and the dimension they are reported under can be seen in Appendix 1.

This inspection was carried out during the following times:

Date	Times of Inspection	Inspector	Role
Friday 8 October 2021	09:00hrs to 17:00hrs	Maureen Burns Rees	Lead

What residents told us and what inspectors observed

From what the inspector observed, there was evidence that the three residents, who each lived on their own received quality care in which their independence was promoted. Appropriate governance and management systems were in place which ensured that appropriate monitoring of the services provided was completed in line with the requirements of the regulations.

The centre comprised of a four separate houses and was registered to accommodate one resident in each of the houses. The centre had previously comprised of three separate homes, each for one resident. However, the service had been reconfigured in March 2021 to include one additional house. There was one vacancy at the time of this inspection and hence there was no one living in one of the houses. For the purpose of this inspection, the inspector visited each of the four houses. The inspector met with a resident living in one of the houses who spoke warmly about the staff supporting them. It was evident that the resident had a close bond with the person in charge and staff member on duty. Warm interactions between the resident and staff caring for them was observed. This resident was observed to be relaxed in the company of staff and to laugh and joke with them on various topics.

Conversations between the inspector and the resident took place from a two metre distance, with the inspector wearing the appropriate personal protective equipment and was time limited in adherence with national guidance. A staff member spoken with outlined that the COVID-19 restrictions had negatively impacted upon community activities for a number of the residents but that residents had coped well overall and enjoyed the more relaxed daily routine.

Each of the four houses were found to be comfortable, homely and overall in a good state of repair. However, a small amount of worn paint and stained tile grouting was observed in the bathroom of one of the houses. Two of the houses were located on the outskirts of a large town while the other two bungalows were located in a rural setting. Each of the houses had an outdoor seating area for residents use. Each of the three occupied houses had been personalised to the individual resident's tastes and were a suitable size and layout for the resident's individual needs. This promoted the resident's independence and dignity, and recognised their individuality and personal preferences.

There was evidence that the residents and their representatives were consulted and communicated with, about decisions regarding the running of their individual homes and their care. The service and care provided was led by each of the residents in relation to their needs and preferences regarding activities and meal choices. The inspector did not have an opportunity to meet with the relatives of any of the residents avail but it was reported that they were happy with the care and support that the residents received. The provider had completed a survey with relatives as part of their annual review which indicated that relatives were happy with the care

and support being provided for their loved one.

Residents were supported to engage in meaningful activities on an individual basis. Two of the three residents were engaged in a day service, whilst the third resident chose not to engage in one. This resident engaged in some individualised activities with the support of staff from their home. In line with national guidance regarding COVID-19, the centre had implemented restrictions impacting the resident's access to some activities in the community. However, with the lifting of restrictions there was evidence that residents were re-engaging in a range of activities. Examples of activities that residents engaged in included, walks to local scenic areas, drives, yoga classes, massage and dining out. Two of the residents had each their own car which staff used to transport them to various activities. The third resident had access to a car provided by the provider. One of the residents had chosen to transition to one of the houses which was located in the countryside earlier in the year. This resident had previously been living in an urban setting and was reported to be enjoying living in the countryside.

The full complement of staff were in place at the time of inspection. The majority of the staff team had been working in the centre for a prolonged period and were generally assigned to work with individual residents in their homes. This meant that there was consistency of care for each of the residents and enabled relationships between the residents and staff to be maintained. The inspector noted that the resident's needs and preferences were well known to staff met with, and the person in charge on the day of this inspection.

The next two sections of this report present the inspection findings in relation to governance and management in the centre, and how governance and management affects the quality and safety of the service being delivered.

Capacity and capability

There were management systems and processes in place to promote the service provided to be safe, consistent and appropriate to each resident's needs.

The centre was managed by a suitably qualified and experienced person. She had a good knowledge of the assessed needs and support requirements for each resident. The person in charge held a degree in psychology and a certificate in management. She had more than three years management experience. She was in a full time position and was responsible for one other service located a short distance away. She was supported by a team leader. The person in charge reported that she felt supported in her role and had regular formal and informal contact with her manager.

There was a clearly defined management structure in place that identified lines of accountability and responsibility. This meant that all staff were aware of their responsibilities and who they were accountable to. The person in charge completed

some shifts within the centre but also had protected management hours. The person in charge reported to the director of administration who in turn reported to the chief executive officer. The person in charge and director of administration held formal meetings on a regular basis.

The provider had completed an annual review of the quality and safety of the service and unannounced visits to review the quality and safety of care on a six monthly basis as required by the regulations. A number of other audits and checks were also completed on a regular basis. Examples of these included, quality and safety checks, fire safety, finance and infection control. There was evidence that actions were taken to address issues identified in these audits and checks. There were regular staff meetings and separately management meetings with evidence of communication of shared learning at these meetings.

The staff team were found to have the right skills, qualifications and experience to meet the assessed needs of each residents. At the time of inspection, the full complement of staff were in place. This provided consistency of care for each of the residents. A small panel of relief staff were used to cover staff leave. The actual and planned duty rosters were found to be maintained to a satisfactory level.

Training had been provided to staff to support them in their role. There was a staff training and development policy. A training programme was in place and coordinated centrally. There were no volunteers working in the centre at the time of inspection. Suitable staff supervision arrangements were in place.

Regulation 14: Persons in charge

The person in charge was found to be competent, with appropriate qualifications and management experience to manage the centre and to ensure it met its stated purpose, aims and objectives.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 15: Staffing

The staff team were found to have the right skills, qualifications and experience to meet the assessed needs of residents. At the time of inspection the full complement of staff were in place.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 16: Training and staff development

Training had been provided to staff to support them in their role and to improve outcomes for residents. Staff had attended all mandatory training. Suitable staff supervision arrangements were in place.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 23: Governance and management

There were suitable governance and management arrangements in place. The provider had completed an annual review of the quality and safety of the service and unannounced visits to review the quality and safety of care on a six monthly basis as required by the regulations.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 31: Notification of incidents

Notifications of incidents were reported to the office of the chief inspector in line with the requirements of the regulations.

Judgment: Compliant

Quality and safety

The residents appeared to receive care and support which was of a good quality, person centred and promoted their rights.

The residents' well-being, protection and welfare was maintained by a good standard of evidence-based care and support. A personal support plan 'All about me' reflected the assessed needs of the individual residents and outlined the support required to maximise their personal development in accordance with their individual health, personal and social care needs and choices. An annual personal plan review had been completed in the last 12 months in line with the requirements of the regulations. There was evidence that the plan was reviewed on a regular basis by staff.

The health and safety of residents, visitors and staff were promoted and protected. There was a risk management policy and environmental and individual risk assessments for residents. These outlined appropriate measures in place to control and manage the risks identified. There was a risk register in place. Health and safety audits were undertaken on a regular basis with appropriate actions taken to address issues identified. There were arrangements in place for investigating and learning from incidents and adverse events involving residents availing of respite. This promoted opportunities for learning to improve services and prevent incidences.

Suitable precautions were in place against the risk of fire. There was documentary evidence that the fire fighting equipment and the fire alarm system were serviced at regular intervals by an external company and checked regularly as part of internal checks. There were adequate means of escape from each of the houses and a fire assembly point was identified for each house. A procedure for the safe evacuation of the individual residents in the event of fire was prominently displayed in each house. Personal emergency evacuation plans which adequately accounted for the mobility and cognitive understanding of individual residents were in place. Fire drills in each of the houses and involving each resident had been undertaken at regular intervals. It was noted that the resident in each of the three occupied houses evacuated in a timely manner.

There were procedures in place for the prevention and control of infection. However, a small amount of worn paint and stained tile grouting was observed in the bathroom of one of the houses. This meant that this area could be more difficult to effectively clean from an infection control perspective. All other areas in each house appeared clean and in a good state of repair. The provider had completed risk assessments and put a COVID-19 contingency plan in place which was in line with the national guidance. A cleaning schedule was in place in each house which was overseen by the person in charge. Sufficient facilities for hand hygiene were observed. There were adequate arrangements in place for the disposal of waste. Specific training in relation to COVID-19, proper use of personal protective equipment and effective hand hygiene had been provided for staff. Temperature checks for staff and the resident were being taken at regular intervals. Disposable surgical face masks were being used by staff whilst in close contact with the resident, in line with national guidance.

Regulation 17: Premises

The centre comprised of four separate houses which were each found to be homely, suitably decorated and overall in a good state of repair. The individual houses were found to be a suitable size and layout for the individual resident living there. Each of the residents had personalised their own homes according to their individual tastes and preferences.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 26: Risk management procedures

The health and safety of residents, visitors and staff were promoted and protected. Environmental and individual risk assessments were on file which had been recently reviewed. There were arrangements in place for investigating and learning from incidents and adverse events involving the residents.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 27: Protection against infection

There were procedures in place for the prevention and control of infection. However, a small amount of worn paint and stained tile grouting was observed in the bathroom of one of the houses. This meant that this area could be more difficult to effectively clean from an infection control perspective. All other areas in each house appeared clean and in a good state of repair.

Judgment: Substantially compliant

Regulation 28: Fire precautions

Suitable precautions had been put in place against the risk of fire in each of the four houses. Fire fighting equipment, emergency lighting and the fire alarm system in each of the houses were serviced at regular intervals by an external company. There were adequate means of escape from each house. A procedure for the safe evacuation of a resident from each of the houses, in the event of fire was prominently displayed.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan

Each resident's well-being and welfare was maintained by a good standard of evidence-based care and support. Personal support plans reflected the assessed needs of the individual residents and outlined the support required to maximise their quality of life in accordance with their individual health, personal and social care needs and choices.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 6: Health care

Each resident's healthcare needs appeared to be met by the care provided in the centre. Health plans were in place for residents identified to require same. Each of the residents had their own GP who they visited as required. A healthy diet and lifestyle was being promoted for residents in each of the houses.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 7: Positive behavioural support

Residents appeared to be provided with appropriate emotional and behavioural support. The residents living in this centre presented with minimal behaviours that challenge.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 8: Protection

There were measures in place to protect the residents from being harmed or suffering from abuse. The provider had a safeguarding policy in place. There had been no safeguarding concerns in the preceding period.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 9: Residents' rights

The residents' rights were promoted by the care and support provided in the centre. The residents had access to advocacy service and information about same was available for residents. There was evidence of active consultations with each resident and their families regarding their care and the running of the centre.

Judgment: Compliant

Appendix 1 - Full list of regulations considered under each dimension

This inspection was carried out to assess compliance with the Health Act 2007 (as amended), the Health Act 2007 (Care and Support of Residents in Designated Centres for Persons (Children and Adults) with Disabilities) Regulations 2013, and the Health Act 2007 (Registration of Designated Centres for Persons (Children and Adults with Disabilities) Regulations 2013 - 2015 as amended and the regulations considered on this inspection were:

Regulation Title	Judgment
Capacity and capability	
Regulation 14: Persons in charge	Compliant
Regulation 15: Staffing	Compliant
Regulation 16: Training and staff development	Compliant
Regulation 23: Governance and management	Compliant
Regulation 31: Notification of incidents	Compliant
Quality and safety	
Regulation 17: Premises	Compliant
Regulation 26: Risk management procedures	Compliant
Regulation 27: Protection against infection	Substantially compliant
Regulation 28: Fire precautions	Compliant
Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan	Compliant
Regulation 6: Health care	Compliant
Regulation 7: Positive behavioural support	Compliant
Regulation 8: Protection	Compliant
Regulation 9: Residents' rights	Compliant

Compliance Plan for DCL-01 OSV-0005863

Inspection ID: MON-0026931

Date of inspection: 08/10/2021

Introduction and instruction

This document sets out the regulations where it has been assessed that the provider or person in charge are not compliant with the Health Act 2007 (Care and Support of Residents in Designated Centres for Persons (Children And Adults) With Disabilities) Regulations 2013, Health Act 2007 (Registration of Designated Centres for Persons (Children and Adults with Disabilities) Regulations 2013 and the National Standards for Residential Services for Children and Adults with Disabilities.

This document is divided into two sections:

Section 1 is the compliance plan. It outlines which regulations the provider or person in charge must take action on to comply. In this section the provider or person in charge must consider the overall regulation when responding and not just the individual non compliances as listed section 2.

Section 2 is the list of all regulations where it has been assessed the provider or person in charge is not compliant. Each regulation is risk assessed as to the impact of the non-compliance on the safety, health and welfare of residents using the service.

A finding of:

- **Substantially compliant** - A judgment of substantially compliant means that the provider or person in charge has generally met the requirements of the regulation but some action is required to be fully compliant. This finding will have a risk rating of yellow which is low risk.
- **Not compliant** - A judgment of not compliant means the provider or person in charge has not complied with a regulation and considerable action is required to come into compliance. Continued non-compliance or where the non-compliance poses a significant risk to the safety, health and welfare of residents using the service will be risk rated red (high risk) and the inspector have identified the date by which the provider must comply. Where the non-compliance does not pose a risk to the safety, health and welfare of residents using the service it is risk rated orange (moderate risk) and the provider must take action *within a reasonable timeframe* to come into compliance.

Section 1

The provider and or the person in charge is required to set out what action they have taken or intend to take to comply with the regulation in order to bring the centre back into compliance. The plan should be **SMART** in nature. **S**pecific to that regulation, **M**easurable so that they can monitor progress, **A**chievable and **R**ealistic, and **T**ime bound. The response must consider the details and risk rating of each regulation set out in section 2 when making the response. It is the provider's responsibility to ensure they implement the actions within the timeframe.

Compliance plan provider's response:

Regulation Heading	Judgment
Regulation 27: Protection against infection	Substantially Compliant
Outline how you are going to come into compliance with Regulation 27: Protection against infection: The worn paint and stained tiled grouting in the bathroom in DCL-01 (house 36) will be repaired by maintenance	

Section 2:

Regulations to be complied with

The provider or person in charge must consider the details and risk rating of the following regulations when completing the compliance plan in section 1. Where a regulation has been risk rated red (high risk) the inspector has set out the date by which the provider or person in charge must comply. Where a regulation has been risk rated yellow (low risk) or orange (moderate risk) the provider must include a date (DD Month YY) of when they will be compliant.

The registered provider or person in charge has failed to comply with the following regulation(s).

Regulation	Regulatory requirement	Judgment	Risk rating	Date to be complied with
Regulation 27	The registered provider shall ensure that residents who may be at risk of a healthcare associated infection are protected by adopting procedures consistent with the standards for the prevention and control of healthcare associated infections published by the Authority.	Substantially Compliant	Yellow	30/11/2021