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

Issued by the Chief Inspector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of designated centre:</th>
<th>DCL-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of provider:</td>
<td>Dara Residential Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of centre:</td>
<td>Kildare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of inspection:</td>
<td>Unannounced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of inspection:</td>
<td>15 June 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre ID:</td>
<td>OSV-0005868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork ID:</td>
<td>MON-0036308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About the designated centre

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

DCL-04 is a community based home which can provide residential care for a maximum four residents both male and female aged 18 years or older. Currently there are two residents residing in the centre. The aim of the provider is to support residents to achieve a good quality of life, develop and maintain social roles and relationships and realise their goals to live the life of their choice. Residents with an intellectual disability and low to medium support needs can be supported in the centre. The designated centre is based in a large town in Co. Kildare close to a variety of local amenities. There are good public transport links and residents also have access to the centre's vehicle should they require it. The premises consists of four bedrooms, two sitting rooms, a kitchen come dining room, three bathrooms and back garden. Residents are supported to attend day programmes with other specialist service providers where they are supported to avail of training and employment options. They are supported by a core staff team of support workers and regular relief are led by the Person In Charge. Staffing is arranged based on residents' needs.

The following information outlines some additional data on this centre.

| Number of residents on the date of inspection: | 2 |
How we inspect

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 (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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Times of Inspection</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 15 June 2022</td>
<td>11:00hrs to 16:00hrs</td>
<td>Maureen Burns Rees</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What residents told us and what inspectors observed

This inspection was unannounced and was completed to inspect the arrangements the registered provider had put in place in relation to infection prevention and control.

From what the inspector observed, there was evidence that the registered provider had put in place systems and arrangements which were consistent with the National Standards for infection prevention and control in community services. Overall, this promoted the protection of residents who may be at risk of healthcare-associated infections. Appropriate governance and management systems were in place which ensured that appropriate monitoring of the services provided was completed.

The centre comprised of a two storey, four bed roomed semi-detached house. It was located on the outskirts of a town in Kildare and within walking distance of a range of local amenities. The centre was registered to accommodate four adult residents but there were two vacancies. Consequently there were only two residents living in the centre at the time of inspection.

The inspector did not have an opportunity to meet with either of the residents on the day of inspection. The two residents had recently returned from a week long holiday abroad together, with the support of staff which it was reported they had really enjoyed. Both of the residents were engaged in a formal day service programme. In addition, one of the residents was in the process of completing a barber course. Numerous head hair models were to be found in the centre for the resident to practice their hair styling techniques. The two residents had been living together for an extended period and were considered to get along well together. There were limited safeguarding concerns in this centre. Each of the residents required low levels of support.

The centre was found to be comfortable, homely and overall in a good state of repair. There was a small amount of missing or stained grouting observed on wall tiles around the bath and there was some partial wearing of the floor covering in the back sitting room and in the front hallway. This meant that these areas could potentially be more difficult to clean from an infection control perspective. New flooring had recently been placed in the kitchen and new kitchen units and worktops were in the process of being installed at the time of inspection. Both of the residents had their own bedroom which 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. One of the residents had ensuite facilities whilst the other resident had sole use of the main bathroom. Each of the residents had their own television in their bedroom. Pictures of the resident and important people in their lives and other memorabilia were on display.

The inspector did not have an opportunity to meet with the relatives of any of the
residents but it was reported that they were happy with the care and support being provided in the centre. The provider had recently completed a survey with residents and relatives as part of its annual review. It was reported that these indicated that the residents and relatives were happy with the quality of the service being provided. There was evidence that the residents and their representatives were consulted and communicated with, about infection control decisions in the centre and national guidance regarding COVID-19.

Cleaning in the centre was the responsibility of the staff team and an external cleaner who attended one day per week. There were detailed checklists in use by the staff team and records were maintained of areas cleaned. The inspectors found that there were adequate resources in place to clean the centre.

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 an extended period. This provided consistency for the residents.

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 in respect of infection prevention and control arrangements.

### Capacity and capability

There were management systems and processes in place to promote the service to deliver safe and sustainable infection prevention and control arrangements.

The centre was managed by a suitably-qualified and experienced person. She was in a full time position and was responsible for one other centre which was located adjacent to this centre. The person in charge was on leave on the day of inspection so this inspection was facilitated by the Director of Administration. She presented with a good knowledge of infection prevention and control requirements and the assessed needs and support requirements for each of the residents in this regard. The person in charge held a degree in special needs assistance training, a certificate in understanding autism and a certificate in applied management. She had more than seven years management experience. The person in charge had regular formal and informal contact with her manager.

There was a clearly-defined management structures in place that identified lines of accountability and responsibility for infection prevention and control. This meant that all staff were aware of their responsibilities and who they were accountable to. The person in charge reported to the director of administration who in turn report to the chief executive officer. The person in charge and director of administration held formal meetings on a regular basis.

There was evidence that infection prevention and control had been prioritised by the
registered provider and the highest levels of management within the organisation. There had been outbreaks of COVID-19 in the centre impacting staff but none of the residents. As staff members worked alone in the centre it was proposed that each of the staff cases were community acquired and not linked to each other or the centre. Overall, the risk of acquiring or transmitting the infection had been well controlled in the centre. An incident management meeting had been conducted at the onset of any outbreak which included a consideration to possible causes. There was a COVID-19 organisational strategy, contingency and outbreak plan in place which had been reviewed in May 2022.

The registered provider had a range of policies, procedures and guidelines in place which related to infection prevention and control. These were found to reflect national guidance, including Government, regulatory bodies, the Health Service Executive (HSE), and the Health Protection Surveillance Centre (HPSC) guidance. The provider's COVID-19 organisational strategy, contingency and outbreak plan detailed roles and responsibilities in the event of an outbreak for all staff and management, including the COVID-19 lead person. Organisational risk assessment for infection control risks had been completed. Scenario model and potential action plans were in place in the event of an outbreak.

Regular audits and checks were completed in the centre which considered infection prevention and control. These were found to be comprehensive in nature and there was clear evidence available to demonstrate that they had brought about positive changes in the centre. An annual review of the centre was being completed and six monthly unannounced visits had been completed. These considered infection prevention and control across a number of key areas considered by the registered provider.

There were effective systems in place for workforce planning which ensured that there were suitable numbers of staff members employed and available with the right skills and expertise to meet the centre's infection prevention and control needs. The full complement of staff were in place at the time of inspection.

The staff team were found to have completed training in the area of infection prevention and control. The inspector found that specialist supports were available to the staff and management teams from the HSE should it be required and contact information relating to these supports were documented in the centre.

### Quality and safety

The residents appeared to receive person-centred care and support whereby the residents were well informed, involved and supported in the prevention and control of health-care associated infections.

Residents were provided with appropriate information and were involved in decisions about their care to prevent, control and manage healthcare-associated
infections. Infection prevention and control, including updates on the COVID-19 pandemic were discussed at regular intervals with individual residents. It was noted that one to one work had been completed with the residents to help them to understand why infection prevention and control precautions were being taken. Posters promoting hand washing were on display.

There were arrangements in place for the laundry of resident’s clothing and linen. There were suitable domestic and recycling waste collection arrangements in place. There was no clinical waste in use. Waste was stored in an appropriate area and was collected on a regular basis by a waste management service provider. There were arrangements in place for the management of maintenance issues and staff members reported that generally maintenance issues were promptly resolved in the centre.

There was a COVID-19 organisational strategy, contingency and outbreak plan in place which reflected national guidance. It contained specific information about the roles and responsibilities of various individuals within the centre and included an escalation procedure and protocols to guide staff in the event of an outbreak in the centre. It outlined that following an outbreak a review would be undertaken of the source, potential cause and effectiveness of infection control arrangements. It was proposed that this would provide opportunities for learning to improve infection control arrangements and to enable learning to be shared across the organisation.

The inspector found that there was sufficient resources and information available to encourage and support good hand hygiene practices. All visitors were required to complete checks and provide information to facilitate contact tracing.

Specific training in relation to COVID-19 and infection control arrangements had been provided for staff. Temperature checks for staff and residents were undertaken at regular intervals.

**Regulation 27: Protection against infection**

The inspector found that the registered provider had developed and implemented effective systems and processes for the oversight and review of infection prevention and control practices in this centre. Overall, the inspector found that the centre appeared clean and in a good state of repair. However, It was noted that there was a small amount of missing or stained group on wall tiles surrounding the bath and that the flooring in the hallway and back sitting room was partially worn. This meant that these areas could be more difficult to effectively clean from an infection control perspective.

**Judgment: Substantially 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 (as amended) and the regulations considered on this inspection were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Title</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity and capability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality and safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation 27: Protection against infection</td>
<td>Substantially compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compliance Plan for DCL-04 OSV-0005868

Inspection ID: MON-0036308

Date of inspection: 15/06/2022

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. **Specific** to that regulation, **Measurable** so that they can monitor progress, **Achievable** and **Realistic**, and **Time 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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Heading</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation 27: Protection against infection</td>
<td>Substantially Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outline how you are going to come into compliance with Regulation 27: Protection against infection:
The staining on wall tiles surrounding the bath will be cleaned and regROUTed this will be done by end of July 2022. The landlord has been asked to replace or sand the flooring in the hallway and back sitting room to address the cleaning standards. This will be done in the next six months. By end of December 2022
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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Regulatory requirement</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Risk rating</th>
<th>Date to be complied with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation 27</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Substantially Compliant</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>31/12/2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>