



Report of an inspection of a Designated Centre for Disabilities (Children)

Name of designated centre:	Redhouse
Name of provider:	RehabCare
Address of centre:	Limerick
Type of inspection:	Announced
Date of inspection:	07 March 2018
Centre ID:	OSV-0002650
Fieldwork ID:	MON-0020987

About the designated centre

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

Red house is a single storey purpose built facility located outside a main city. Vehicle access is provided to enable children to access local amenities, schools and leisure facilities. There is a playground and a large garden available on the grounds of the centre.

The centre provides respite care and support services for up to five children with a diagnosis of autism. The service is provided to both male and female children between the ages of six and 18 years. The service is a regional service covering a number of counties and is funded by the Health Service Executive (HSE). It is open 284 nights each year.

The centre also offers an afterschool and daycare service. At the time of this inspection the service was open to one residential placement and provided a respite service to nine children. On the day of the inspection one child was in receipt of a residential placement and two children were in receipt of a respite service.

Children are supported by a staff team which includes care staff, a team leader and the person in charge. Each child is supported by the required number of staff that they are assessed to need.

The following information outlines some additional data on this centre.

Current registration end date:	01/08/2018
Number of residents on the date of inspection:	3

How we inspect

To prepare for this inspection the inspector or 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
07 March 2018	10:50hrs to 18:00hrs	Carol Maricle	Lead
07 March 2018	10:50hrs to 18:00hrs	Laura O'Sullivan	Support

Views of people who use the service

On the day of the inspection there were three children in receipt of a service. Each child had their own unique method of communicating their needs and wants and did not communicate verbally with the inspector. They were facilitated by staff to communicate their needs and wants through a total communication approach using such methods as Lámh, visual schedules, body language, gestures and prompts. The inspectors observed that residents were comfortable with the support provided by staff and they appeared content and well. The children were observed partaking in meaningful activities during the inspection such as outings to local outdoor facilities, playing outside in the garden and relaxing.

During this inspection, the inspectors met with the family representatives of two children in receipt of service respites and also read five questionnaires completed by families on behalf of children. The questionnaires provided feedback on the quality and safety of the service provided. Overall, family representatives expressed their satisfaction with the service that the children received in this centre. This included positive comments about how staff met the needs of the children and the activities that the children participated in. Families were complimentary of the staff team and reported that their experience, where required of making a complaint had been positive.

The main aspect that family representatives highlighted as requiring improvement was in relation to the quantity of respite offered to the children. Some families also raised compatibility issues between some of the children in receipt of services.

Capacity and capability

Inspectors observed that overall the governance, management and oversight of the delivery of the service was good and no improvements were required.

Arrangements were in place to ensure effective leadership, governance and management. There was at the time of this inspection, a clearly defined governance structure with distinct lines of authority and accountability. Both the person in charge and team leader demonstrated an in- depth knowledge of all children currently availing of the service and their regulatory responsibilities. This meant that families met by inspectors spoke highly of the management team within the centre and expressed that they would communicate with them if they had a concern in relation to the service being provided to their child.

The centre was adequately resourced however, at the time of the inspection the

mixed nature of the service was not suiting the children. This issue was actively been attended to by the wider management team and a written plan was in place to cease the mixed nature of the service over the next coming months.

A competent workforce was in place at the centre and this ensured that children were kept safe and well looked after. Adequate staffing levels were in place to meet the required needs of the the children in receipt of services. The staff team had appropriate qualifications to meet the individual needs of the children. There was evidence of the ongoing professional development of the staff team.

The provider had systems in place to ensure that information was collected, evaluated and responded to which ensured that the service was of a high quality. The provider had compiled an annual review of the service and this was informed by questionnaires completed by the children and or their family representatives. This review was also informed by two provider-led six monthly unannounced inspections of the service conducted within the previous 12 months. Following implementation of these reviews, action plans were put in place with clear time frames for the completion of all actions.

There were systems in place to ensure that incidents were responded to appropriately and the required policies were available to guide staff. The provider had put in place computerised systems for the logging of all incidents and these ensured that the management team became aware of these incidents upon point of recording by the staff member. A complaints procedure was in place which was operated in line with organisational policy. There were systems in place to address any incidents of a safeguarding matter.

The way in which service operated day to day was observed to be in keeping with the statement of purpose.

This inspection demonstrated that the provider was in compliance with the regulations inspected against. The provider had submitted a complete application to renew the registration of this centre. As part of the announced inspection, 22 regulations reviewed and all were found to be compliant with regulations and standards. At the time of this inspection, there was an application to vary submitted to HIQA which meant that a residential service was provided for a limited time.

Registration Regulation 5: Application for registration or renewal of registration

The provider had ensured that documentation required for the renewal of the registration of the centre was submitted to the chief inspector as required.

Judgment: Compliant

Registration Regulation 8 (1)

At the time of this inspection, the provider had submitted an application to vary to allow for the continuation of a mixed residential and respite service for a particular time-period. The provider submitted the appropriate documentation that set out the rationale for the variation and demonstrated that there was a plan to then discontinue this mixed service in line with the dates set out in the varied condition.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 14: Persons in charge

A person in charge had been appointed to the centre. They possessed the necessary skills, knowledge and experience as required under Regulation 14. They were also appointed as person in charge of a second centre. Inspectors were satisfied that the person in charge ensured the effective governance and operational management within the centre.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 15: Staffing

There were sufficient numbers of staff with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to meet the needs of the children currently availing of the service within the centre. An actual and planned rota was in place to ensure adequate supports were in place as required.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 16: Training and staff development

All staff members had completed the appropriate training to meet the needs of the children. There was evidence of continuous professional development for all members of the team. A training schedule was in place to ensure this training remained up-to date and relevant.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 23: Governance and management

An annual review of the quality and safety of care had been implemented including consultation with families. There was evidence of robust action planning post implementation of review with a set time-frame for actions to be completed. Clear management systems were in place to ensure the service delivery was safe and effective through on-going audit and monitoring of systems.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 24: Admissions and contract for the provision of services

The provider had ensured that where a residential or respite placement was in place there was an appropriate written agreement to match each type of placement.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 3: Statement of purpose

A statement of purpose was available within the centre. This document accurately described the service provided currently within the centre. The statement of purpose was regularly reviewed.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 31: Notification of incidents

All notifications were submitted to the chief inspector as required. The person in charge articulated an awareness of her regulatory requirements in relation to notifications.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 34: Complaints procedure

A complaints policy was in place to ensure complaints were investigated

and resolved by the centre. Families were aware of the complaints procedure. A complaints log was present with evidence that all complaints were logged, investigated and resolved in a timely manner.

Judgment: Compliant

Quality and safety

Overall, inspectors observed that the quality and safety of the service received by children was good.

There were systems to ensure that the children, their needs and their supports were to the fore of the service. In keeping with their individual profile, each child's particular needs were assessed and planned for. Their specialised support requirements especially in the area of autism were central to daily planning, staff engagement and interactions with each child. The service placed an important emphasis on the building of relationships with families to ensure that the needs of the children were continuously shared with them and addressed.

At the time of this inspection, the service was addressing the mixed nature of the service provided and this would ensure that the concerns raised by families regarding compatibility of respite and residential recipients was addressed in a time-bound manner. In this way, the provider was striving to achieve the best possible outcome for both residential and respite recipients.

The rights of the children were promoted and children were facilitated to exercise their rights. Staff asked children for their views on how they would like to spend their time at respite. In relation to the residential service provided, inspectors observed staff promoting the rights of the individual in their education, their right to privacy, their right to play and their right to spend time with their family.

Children were protected while they were in the care of this service. Their welfare was promoted and it was recognised when things went wrong. Any situation or matter that could cause harm for the resident was identified and addressed, with the child's complex condition considered in this process. Also, to further ensure the resident's safety, any possible abusive type matter or situation was identified and appropriately responded to. There was evidence that any incidents and allegations of a child protection matter were reported, screened, investigated and responded to. This included reporting of the matter to the designated liaison person and to the relevant statutory authority such as the Child and Family Agency (Tusla). Over the course of the inspection, staff engagement and interactions with the children were observed to be person-centred and positive in nature.

There were systems to ensure that the health, personal development and wellbeing of the children were identified and promoted. The care that the children received was underpinned by policy and practice. Personal plans were created and reviewed

regularly, in conjunction with the relevant persons such as family members and the multidisciplinary teams. Education was promoted and facilitated. Each child was supported to spend their day in a manner that was meaningful and purposeful for them. This included availing of local community facilities and amenities. Where appropriate, children that had turned 18 years of age and were approaching the end of their full-time education were supported by staff as they commenced their transition to discharge from the service.

Each resident had their own bedroom, access to shared spaces and plenty of outdoor play space. There was a sensory room available to children should they wish to use this room to support their needs. There were robust procedures and practices to ensure that the children could safely evacuate the building in the event of a fire. Inspectors acknowledged that time-bound costed plans were in progress with regard to improving some of the windows throughout the premises and the furnishings of bathrooms. The centre was found to be clean and suitably decorated in a child-centred manner.

Regulation 10: Communication

Staff were observed assisting children to communicate at all times using a total communication approach. During discussion, staff could describe to the inspectors how each individual child attending for respite communicated their needs.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 13: General welfare and development

In relation to the residential service provided, the person in charge had ensured that children were supported to access opportunities for education. Where children were in receipt of a respite service, the person in charge had ensured that they were fully aware of relevant information pertaining to the education of each child. The person in charge and staff team maintained good relations with all school personnel ensuring that there was appropriate communication between all parties.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 17: Premises

At this inspection, the inspectors found that the centre was clean and suitably decorated. There were suitable practices in place to address the on-going cleanliness of this centre.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 25: Temporary absence, transition and discharge of residents

The person in charge was at the time of this inspection preparing children for their discharge from both the residential and respite service. This was done in a planned manner in the best interests of each child. The families of children and where appropriate statutory bodies were involved in all decisions made.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 26: Risk management procedures

The provider had ensured that there were systems in place for the assessment, management and ongoing review of risk. These systems were supported by organisational policies and practices. The inspectors found a risk register was in place. This contained a detailed analysis of hazards at the centre, their risk rating and the controls in place to mitigate against the risk.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 28: Fire precautions

The provider had ensured that fire safety management systems were in place. At the previous inspection, there had been a non-compliance identified in relation to the containment of fires as some fire doors were observed being kept open by furniture. During this inspection, the person in charge confirmed how there were

now effective systems in place to ensure that doors were not held back and none were observed by inspectors to be held back.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan

Each child had a personal plan in place which was reviewed on an annual basis or as and when required. These plans were drawn up with the families who acted as the representative of the child and were available in an accessible format.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 6: Health care

As this was mainly a respite service there was appropriate liaison conducted by the person in charge and the staff team with the families of each child in order for staff to have the necessary information regarding the healthcare of each child. Upon each admission, the inspectors observed and read how information was shared with staff on the health of each child arriving for respite. Where there were healthcare needs identified, staff acted in accordance with policy and ensured that these needs were met. Upon review of a sample of personal plans of children who resided at the centre, the inspectors could clearly see the identified healthcare needs of each child and how staff met these needs.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 7: Positive behavioural support

Children were supported appropriately by staff when they engaged in behaviours that required a response. There were behavioural plans in place where required and these were reviewed regularly. Staff were trained to appropriately respond to behaviours. There was a small number of restrictive procedures in use and where these were applied they were in accordance with the policy of the organisation and subject to regular review.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 8: Protection

The provider had appropriate systems in place to protect children from potential abuse. Staff at the centre had a good understanding of identifying and reporting suspected abuse. Where there had been any concerns raised of this nature, the person in charge had followed organisational policy and the guidance of Children First (2011): National Guidance for the Protection and Welfare of Children. Each child had an intimate care plan in place that guided staff on the appropriate level of assistance that the child required in their intimate care. At the time of this inspection, records showed that all staff had attended formal training in child protection.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 9: Residents' rights

The provider had systems in place to ensure that the centre operated in a manner that respected the age, disability, family status, religious beliefs and cultural background of each child. There was information available to children and their families on advocacy services. Children were involved in the running of the centre as upon each respite admission their views were ascertained on how they wished to spend their time during respite.

Judgment: Compliant

Appendix 1 - Full list of regulations considered under each dimension

Regulation Title	Judgment
Capacity and capability	
Registration Regulation 5: Application for registration or renewal of registration	Compliant
Registration Regulation 8 (1)	Compliant
Regulation 14: Persons in charge	Compliant
Regulation 15: Staffing	Compliant
Regulation 16: Training and staff development	Compliant
Regulation 23: Governance and management	Compliant
Regulation 24: Admissions and contract for the provision of services	Compliant
Regulation 3: Statement of purpose	Compliant
Regulation 31: Notification of incidents	Compliant
Regulation 34: Complaints procedure	Compliant
Quality and safety	
Regulation 10: Communication	Compliant
Regulation 13: General welfare and development	Compliant
Regulation 17: Premises	Compliant
Regulation 25: Temporary absence, transition and discharge of residents	Compliant
Regulation 26: Risk management procedures	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