

Review of compliance

<p>Julia's House Limited Julia's House</p>	
<p>Region:</p>	<p>South West</p>
<p>Location address:</p>	<p>135 Springdale Road Corfe Mullen Broadstone Dorset BH18 9BP</p>
<p>Type of service:</p>	<p>Hospice services Community healthcare service Diagnostic and/or screening service</p>
<p>Date of Publication:</p>	<p>January 2012</p>
<p>Overview of the service:</p>	<p>Julia's House provides palliative care for children with life threatening and life limiting conditions, living in Dorset. The hospice provides care both at Julia's House and in the community.</p>

Summary of our findings for the essential standards of quality and safety

Our current overall judgement

Julia's House was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety.

The summary below describes why we carried out this review, what we found and any action required.

Why we carried out this review

We carried out this review as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews.

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, carried out a visit on 13 December 2011, observed how people were being cared for, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

At the time of our visit the hospice supported in total 94 children.

On the day of our visit there were pre school children using the service, they were not able to give us their views.

We spoke with the parent of one child, who told us that staff were very focused on their child's needs and how they liked and needed to be supported.

The children's routines were clearly documented such as when they preferred to eat lunch, when they had a nap and when they needed support with personal care. Staff understood the needs of the children well and were knowledgeable about their routines and preferences.

We spoke with parents of children who used the hospice and they told us they knew their children were safe.

Parents of children who used the hospice told us that staff were wonderful.

Parents we spoke with told us they had been asked their views of the service.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Julia's House was meeting them

Outcome 01: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about

their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run

People were involved in the decisions about the care provided for their children. Care is based on their individual needs and preferences. People who use the service are treated with respect.

Overall, we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights

Children and parents who use the service experience effective, safe and appropriate care that meets their needs. The planning and delivery of care focuses on the needs of the child.

Overall we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights

Parents felt their children are safe. Staff are trained and able to respond appropriately to any actual or suspected abuse.

Overall, we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 14: Staff should be properly trained and supervised, and have the chance to develop and improve their skills

There are systems in place to ensure staff receive the necessary training and support to care for children who use the service. Staff have regular supervision to support them in their role.

Overall, we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care

The provider ensures that people who use the service are asked their opinion on how it is run. Staff are involved in the development of the service and their views are listened to and acted upon.

Overall, we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Other information

Please see previous reports for more information about previous reviews.

**What we found
for each essential standard of quality
and safety we reviewed**

The following pages detail our findings and our regulatory judgement for each essential standard and outcome that we reviewed, linked to specific regulated activities where appropriate.

We will have reached one of the following judgements for each essential standard.

Compliant means that people who use services are experiencing the outcomes relating to the essential standard.

A **minor concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard.

A **moderate concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and there is an impact on their health and wellbeing because of this.

A **major concern** means that people who use services are not experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and are not protected from unsafe or inappropriate care, treatment and support.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary improvements are made. Where there are a number of concerns, we may look at them together to decide the level of action to take.

More information about each of the outcomes can be found in the *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*

Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- * Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
- * Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
- * Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
- * Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We observed the care of three children in the hospice for respite the day we visited.

We spoke with the parent of one child, who told us that staff were very focused on their child's needs and how they liked and needed to be supported.

Children were given choices about activities they wanted to participate in at each session. Staff communicated well together and this was effective in supporting children who were upset or in pain. One child needed medical support as they were in a little discomfort and staff involved the child in deciding who would assist them to do the procedure.

Other evidence

Staff at Julia's House work with young people to understand what it would mean for them to agree to treatment and what it would mean for them if they did not agree to treatment. Training to do this was given to all staff at induction.

The assessment and care plan focused on the needs of the child, how they prefer to be supported and how they liked their routine during the day. The care plan provided details about when they liked to eat, what food they preferred, how they needed to be

helped in making choices. Parents had signed care plans agreeing with the information.

During our visit staff were engaged in a variety of play activities with the children. This included using a touch screen computer, making Christmas cards, playing in the sensory room and playing with toys they liked.

Staff told us that care plans were updated as the child's condition changed. This can vary from one visit to the hospice to the next.

Our judgement

People were involved in the decisions about the care provided for their children. Care is based on their individual needs and preferences. people who use the service are treated with respect.

Overall, we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We observed the care of three children who were in the hospice for respite on the day we visited.

Staff were seen supporting one child to make a decision about which member of staff would support them. The child was given choices and the staff respected the child's decision about who would support them with their health care needs.

The children's routines were clearly documented such as when they preferred to eat lunch, when they had a nap and when they needed support with personal care. Staff understood the needs of the children well and were knowledgeable about their routines and preferences.

Other evidence

We looked at three agreements of care which were personalised care plans tailored to the individual's physical, mental, social, lifestyle and spiritual needs. For example one care plan detailed how staff could communicate with one child using makaton symbols and a touch screen computer. It also detailed how the child used body language and facial expressions to show staff how they felt. Staff we spoke with were very knowledgeable about how the child communicated.

Staff told us how they prepared for a child's first respite visit and how they worked with the parents to ensure they received the care right. For example one family made a video of how they changed their child's dressings each night. Staff told us how this gave

the parents confidence to leave the child in respite. It also gave staff confidence they could make reference to the video when they needed.

We spoke with a member of staff who worked with the brothers and sisters of children who came to the hospice. They arranged a variety of activities to support these children and their parents giving everyone respite and emotional support.

Our judgement

Children and parents who use the service experience effective, safe and appropriate care that meets their needs. The planning and delivery of care focuses on the needs of the child.

Overall we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are respected and upheld.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We spoke with parents of children who use the hospice and they told us they knew their children were safe.

Other evidence

All staff and volunteers received safeguarding training as part of their induction.

Staff told us that all policies and procedures were available to them either electronically or in a paper version. Staff were given a disc so they can access the information when they need it. Staff attend a debrief session at the end of all hospice sessions when they were able to discuss any concerns. Staff were also able to request an urgent debrief at any time from their supervisor at Julia's House if they were worried about a situation.

Staff we spoke with understood the signs of abuse and what to do if they were concerned or if a child disclosed abuse to them.

All staff received training in the use of restraint. The hospice had a restraint policy which was accessible to staff. All incidents involving restraint were documented and monitored to identify areas of concern and enable the staff to put other measures in place.

There had been no safeguarding alerts in the past 12 months.

Our judgement

Parents felt their children are safe. Staff are trained and able to respond appropriately

to any actual or suspected abuse.

Overall, we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 14: Supporting staff

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by competent staff.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 14: Supporting staff

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

Parents of children who used the hospice told us that staff were wonderful.

Staff were supportive of each other, communicated well on issues related to the health and welfare of the children they were supporting.

Other evidence

Care staff completed a set of foundation competencies. On completion of these competencies new care team staff will either shadow an existing care team member or work alongside a qualified nurse. All competencies were updated annually.

Mandatory training included, safeguarding children, basic food hygiene, resuscitation, manual handling and infection control.

Staff we spoke with told us they had both individual supervision and team supervision every four to six weeks. Team supervision gave staff the opportunity for peer support and reflective practice.

One member of staff we spoke with told us the training was fantastic.

Our judgement

There are systems in place to ensure staff receive the necessary training and support to care for children who use the service. Staff have regular supervision to support them in their role.

Overall, we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support, due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

Parents we spoke with told us they had been asked their views of the service.

Staff we spoke with told us they were asked their views and able to give them anonymously if they wish. Julia's House used a third party to find out what staff think about their work and their employer.

Other evidence

We were told there was a rolling calendar for auditing various aspects of the service.

An annual parent/family survey was carried out in the form of a questionnaire. This was then followed up by specific individual questions by an independent researcher. Alternative methods of communication were looked at to ensure all people who used the service had a voice. We were told that parent responses from the current questionnaire were being evaluated and a report was due at the end of December 2011. This will be debated by the hospice's clinical governance group in January 2012.

In September 2011 all staff were invited to attend a team work training day which contained a 'free speak' focus group to seek staff's views. This group was about how the service can be improved and how the provider can improve as an employer. For example one of the feedback ideas included evening training for carers to maximise attendance. The response identified how this could be achieved and when they would put it into practice.

We spoke with the registered manager who told us that staff had participated in a best companies employee survey and Julia's House had come top of a list of 100 best places to work in the public and charity sector.

Our judgement

The provider ensures that people who use the service are asked their opinion on how it is run. Staff are involved in the development of the service and their views are listened to and acted upon.

Overall, we found that Julia's House was meeting this essential standard.

What is a review of compliance?

By law, providers of certain adult social care and health care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has written guidance about what people who use services should experience when providers are meeting essential standards, called *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*.

CQC licenses services if they meet essential standards and will constantly monitor whether they continue to do so. We formally review services when we receive information that is of concern and as a result decide we need to check whether a service is still meeting one or more of the essential standards. We also formally review them at least every two years to check whether a service is meeting all of the essential standards in each of their locations. Our reviews include checking all available information and intelligence we hold about a provider. We may seek further information by contacting people who use services, public representative groups and organisations such as other regulators. We may also ask for further information from the provider and carry out a visit with direct observations of care.

When making our judgements about whether services are meeting essential standards, we decide whether we need to take further regulatory action. This might include discussions with the provider about how they could improve. We only use this approach where issues can be resolved quickly, easily and where there is no immediate risk of serious harm to people.

Where we have concerns that providers are not meeting essential standards, or where we judge that they are not going to keep meeting them, we may also set improvement actions or compliance actions, or take enforcement action:

Improvement actions: These are actions a provider should take so that they **maintain** continuous compliance with essential standards. Where a provider is complying with essential standards, but we are concerned that they will not be able to maintain this, we ask them to send us a report describing the improvements they will make to enable them to do so.

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. Where a provider is not meeting the essential standards but people are not at immediate risk of serious harm, we ask them to send us a report that says what they will do to make sure they comply. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action to make sure that essential standards are met.

Enforcement action: These are actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers are set out in the law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

Information for the reader

Document purpose	Review of compliance report
Author	Care Quality Commission
Audience	The general public
Further copies from	03000 616161 / www.cqc.org.uk
Copyright	Copyright © (2010) Care Quality Commission (CQC). This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part, free of charge, in any format or medium provided that it is not used for commercial gain. This consent is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and on proviso that it is not used in a derogatory manner or misleading context. The material should be acknowledged as CQC copyright, with the title and date of publication of the document specified.

Care Quality Commission

Website	www.cqc.org.uk
Telephone	03000 616161
Email address	enquiries@cqc.org.uk
Postal address	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA