



**Health
Information
and Quality
Authority**

An tÚdarás Um Fhaisnéis
agus Cáilíocht Sláinte

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

Issued by the Chief Inspector

Name of designated centre:	St. Gabriel's Children's Respite House
Name of provider:	St Gabriel's Foundation
Address of centre:	Limerick
Type of inspection:	Announced
Date of inspection:	22 January 2026
Centre ID:	OSV-0007778
Fieldwork ID:	MON-0040290

About the designated centre

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

St. Gabriel's Children's Respite House consists of a large purpose built single storey building located on the outskirts of a city. The centre provides a respite service for up to six residents of both genders between the ages of 4 and 18. The centre specifically supports children with significant physical disabilities, associated complex medical needs and those with life limiting conditions. Support to residents is provided by the person in charge, nursing staff and health care assistants while cleaning and administration support is also provided. Individual bedrooms are available for residents and other facilities in the centre include bathrooms, a kitchen-dining room, a living room, a den, a play room and staff rooms.

The following information outlines some additional data on this centre.

Number of residents on the date of inspection:	6
--	---

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:

Date	Times of Inspection	Inspector	Role
Thursday 22 January 2026	06:50hrs to 18:30hrs	Conor Brady	Lead
Friday 23 January 2026	08:30hrs to 15:00hrs	Conor Brady	Lead
Thursday 22 January 2026	06:50hrs to 18:30hrs	Angela McCormack	Support
Friday 23 January 2026	08:30hrs to 15:00hrs	Angela McCormack	Support

What residents told us and what inspectors observed

This children's respite centre consists of a large purpose built single storey building located on the outskirts of a city. The centre provides a nurse led respite service for up to six children of both genders between the ages of 4 and 18. The centre specifically supports children with significant physical disabilities, associated complex medical needs and children with life limiting conditions.

Thirty-eight children were availing of respite from this centre at the time of the inspection and inspectors had the opportunity to meet and/or speak with seven children and 14 family members. Inspectors observed care and support provided to the children, the interactions of the nurse led staff team working with the children, reviewed a large sample of the children's personal plans, care plans and centre policies, procedures, records and documentation. In addition, inspectors spoke with all members of management, clinical nurse managers, nursing staff, health care staff, clerical staff and housekeeping staff working in this centre across this two day inspection.

On arrival, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) greeted inspectors at 7am at the reception of this designated centre. This centre was observed to be purpose built, very warm, immaculately clean, very comfortable and provided a very safe and suitable respite experience. Inspectors found great communal spaces for the children to relax and interact with each other and also private spaces when they preferred time alone. The majority of children that attended this respite centre communicated non-verbally. However, staff were observed to know each child very well and understood their facial expressions, body language, movements, gestures and vocalisations. For example, inspectors joined four children for breakfast on the first morning of inspection and found a very calm and supportive environment. Some children smiled as they were supported to eat their breakfast by familiar staff while others were observed watching their peers and getting ready for their school buses and bus escorts to arrive to collect them for school.

Inspectors observed as school bus escorts arrived and waited at the centre reception after showing their photographic identification to staff and received handover information on each child. Children were then observed being supported in their wheelchairs onto their respective transport vehicles whereby children were greeted warmly and wheelchairs were safely clamped into position so they could travel safely. Overall, a calm and professional morning transition routine was observed.

Children were later observed returning to the centre and appeared in very good form having dinner and engaging in various activities such as table top play, going for walks in the local park, listening to music, watching television and relaxing in the centre's sensory room. Some children required a lot of staff support, hoisting, personal care in specialised baths and inspectors observed all centre facilities were

in place to support these children. Staff were observed being very respectful of children's dignity, rights and privacy in their approach, tone, body language and interactions with children.

Inspectors found that children were receiving a very good quality respite care and support. The atmosphere was warm and children appeared to be happy and very comfortable in the centre. Interactions between staff and children were observed to be open, caring and supportive.

Families spoken with knew about their children's rights and commended the standard of care and communication from the centre regarding their children. They were aware that they could speak to the centre's management and staff if they were worried or wanted to make a complaint. A family and children's booklet with information about the service was available and children's rights were being very well promoted. Inspectors observed and spoke with many families who frequently visited the centre freely and families said that they had good access to the centre's person in charge.

Staff members were observed being busy assisting the children to get up and ready for their day again on the second day of inspection. Five of the six children were attending school that day, so the centre was busy with activity at this time. However, the atmosphere was relaxed and children were seen to be individually supported in a calm and confident manner.

Inspectors spoke with 14 families as part of the inspection. Surveys were also received that indicated high levels of satisfaction with the service provided. Families spoken with were very complimentary and grateful for the service their child received. Families spoke of the welcoming and open atmosphere in the centre and about how they were always kept informed of how their child's respite stay went. Families stated they felt that this was very reassuring and made the respite break easier for the child and for them as parents. Some parents reported how their child's face 'lit up' as they approached the centre when coming in for their respite stay. Some families reported that the respite breaks were 'a lifeline' for them and supported them a great deal in caring for their child with complex health needs.

Observations throughout the inspection were that staff members knew the children well, including their likes, food choices, preferences for leisure activities and care and support needs. Over the two day inspection, children were observed watching favourite video clips, enjoying time in the sensory room, engaging in the various purpose built play/sensory equipment and relaxing in the communal rooms where there was always activity going on.

Staff spoke to inspectors about the children's preferences. For example, one child liked to relax on their own listening to music for a while following their busy day in school. This was observed to be respected. Some children went out on the bus for a drive and get something to eat. Other children went for walks in the local park which had direct access from the centre's back garden. This was very secure and had a keypad lock so as the centres security and safety was protected.

Observations throughout the inspection were that the children were relaxed, comfortable with staff and with each other, and that their communications were known, and listened to, by caring and friendly staff.

Overall children and families met with on this inspection were found to be receiving an excellent service.

Capacity and capability

This was a very well governed and managed children's respite service with clear lines of authority and accountability found to be in place.

The registered provider had effective systems in place to ensure this children's respite centre was performing all of its function as outlined in relevant legislation, regulations, national policies and standards for children with disabilities.

The registered provider's Board and Executive oversight arrangements were found to be very strong with clear auditing, meeting minutes and sub committee oversight reviews in areas like quality and safety of care, finance, buildings/estates, social enterprise and nominations. A qualified, competent and fit Board were in place to oversee the operation of this centre.

The inspectors found this service to be appropriately resourced, with suitable recruitment, vetting, staffing and supervision arrangements to ensure oversight and accountability of the performance and quality of the staff team.

The provider's local management systems in place for the identification, oversight and review of care and support to children were found to be very effective. There was a formal framework in place for auditing centre practices by the person in charge.

The inspector observed the person in charge to have a good knowledge of the current risks, safeguards, needs, objectives and challenges in the designated centre. The person in charge used the probation, supervision and performance improvement structures available to them to ensure effective staff supervision, performance and development in a timely fashion and in line with provider policy.

The person in charge was suitably supported by the CEO, who engaged in regular supervision and governance meetings to stay apprised of matters arising in the centre and to verify audit findings, implement corrective actions and track progress.

Child protection and welfare national policies and procedures were being adhered to in the centre and had been reviewed and updated as required to reflect up-to-date best practice. Provider annual reviews and six monthly audits were taking place as

required by the requirements of the regulations. These were reviewed and demonstrated good levels of provider oversight, governance and follow up.

Regulation 14: Persons in charge

The inspector reviewed information submitted to the Chief Inspector and spoke with the person in charge extensively during this two day inspection.

There was an experienced, full time, professionally qualified person in charge in place who demonstrated very strong systems of local governance and oversight. They were very qualified and experienced in nursing/clinical management roles in health and social care settings, and held the required qualifications in the management of people. The person in charge was very skilled in working with children and families and appropriately supported. The person in charge was based in the centre and met regularly with their staff team as well as with their own line manager.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 15: Staffing

This respite centre was very well staffed by a skilled, experienced, and compassionate staffing team. These staffing levels were very much required due to the highly medical and very complex support needs of the children.

There was an established staff team and a very good staffing culture observed which ensured continuity of care and support. Children were supported by a consistent staff team who were observed working together and supporting each other in their support of the children in their care.

The staff team was nurse led and comprised of a person in charge, clinical nurse manager, nurses, health care assistants, clerical/administrative support staff and housekeeping. The staffing in the respite service operated on a rolling basis. The rosters were well maintained and were reflective of staff on duty. Visual posters of all staff on duty were available to children and families so they knew who was working. The staffing rosters demonstrated that there was appropriate staffing levels in the centre to meet children's needs day and night.

The inspector completed a thorough review of 10 staff personnel files and found that they all contained the items set out in Schedule 2, including Garda Vetting, Children's First Training, staff qualifications, references and records of experience. The inspector observed positive interactions between children and the staff team at all times. Staffing levels observed were meeting the assessed needs of children

using the service, including those with high dependency and complex medical needs.

Staff spoken with were knowledgeable, attentive, and responsive, demonstrating a strong commitment to providing high-quality care to children. Ongoing supervision, training and professional development ensured staff maintained the necessary competencies to safely support children with complex and life-limiting conditions. Families were highly complimentary about the staff team in this centre.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 16: Training and staff development

The provider had good systems in place for the training and development of the staff team. From a review of all staff training records, it was evident that the staff team had completed training in areas across 15 core areas such as Fire Safety, Safeguarding, Children's First - Child Protection & Welfare Training, Manual handling, Infection Prevention & Control, Human Rights, Hand Hygiene, Transmission Procedures, Food Safety. Where it was identified that refresher training was required, this had been reviewed. This meant that the staff team had up-to-date knowledge and skills to meet the assessed needs of all children using respite.

One to one formal staff supervision was completed frequently by the person in charge and actions were found to be followed up and completed. The inspector reviewed a sample of team meeting minutes and supervision records and found that appropriate oversight was in place for all staff with management using a supportive and collaborative approach.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 23: Governance and management

Governance and management arrangements were found to be effective, well-structured, and clearly defined. The registered provider demonstrated strong oversight of the service, with excellent systems in place to monitor quality, manage risk, and drive continuous improvement.

Both the CEO and person in charge outlined and demonstrated clear and comprehensive managerial oversight in the centre.

Auditing was reviewed in the following areas:

- Management

- Healthcare Needs
- Restrictive Practices
- Report Writing
- Infection Prevention Control
- Complaints
- Children's Care Planning
- Personal Finances/Possessions

The provider had good governance and management arrangements in place to monitor and oversee the service provided with various auditing, spot checks, reminders and practice collaboration happening with the staff team. There was a clearly defined management structure in place.

The provider's systems to monitor the quality and safety of the service provided for children included unannounced provider visits every six months and an annual review which were submitted as part of this inspection. The annual review sought feedback from children's families regarding their views on the service provided. The audits were comprehensive and completed to a high standard and identified both areas of good practice and areas where improvements were required. Areas reviewed included child safeguarding, care planning, accidents and incidents, daily notes, staff knowledge, risk management, medication management, and infection prevention control.

Audits were appropriately self identifying areas in need of improvements and clear actions plans were then developed to address any actions required. Audits were discussed at team meetings and staff were communicated with all audit findings, outcomes and action plans. An On-call roster covering all periods when CNM1 or 3 not on site.

Regular (weekly) communication meetings were taking place between the person in charge and CEO. A QSOC (Quality Safety Operations Committee) was also in place which reported directly to the provider's Board of Directors, providing comprehensive oversight of care and support to children all the way to the top of the organisation. This demonstrated a very thorough level of governance and management of this centre.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 24: Admissions and contract for the provision of services

The provider had a policy and procedure in place that outlined the process for admission to the centre.

One staff member talked through, and showed inspectors the documentation and process for ensuring a safe admission for children to the centre. The referral process

and review of prospective children was based on clear and transparent criteria, one of which was the need for nursing/medical care.

Children and their families were supported to visit the centre prior to the children staying overnight. This promoted a child-centred and safe transition for the child prior to this new experience of being away from their family home.

Through a review of the documentation and discussions with staff members and families, it was clear that every effort was made to ensure the service met each child's individual needs and that the transition to respite care was done in a safe and careful manner to ensure the child was supported at this time. Families who spoke about this to inspectors, felt the transition planning and pre-assessment process were effective for their child.

Inspectors also reviewed a sample of the individual service agreements in place that were signed as agreed by the children's family representatives. These agreements outlined the fees to be charged and the terms and conditions on which respite care was offered.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 3: Statement of purpose

There was an up-to-date statement of purpose in place that included all of the information that is required under Schedule 1 of this regulation. The statement of purpose clearly outlined the type of service provided and the profiles of children who could avail of respite in the centre. Consultation with, and participation of children, their families and representatives was covered in the statement of purpose including arrangements for contact with professionals such as allocated social workers for children in care.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 34: Complaints procedure

Inspectors reviewed the complaints policies, procedures and the complaints log and found that complaints and any feedback were received openly, documented clearly and actioned by the provider.

All complaints were escalated appropriately to the management team. Easy-to-read access to the complaints procedure was provided at the main entrance and online on the provider's website. All complaints and compliments were found to be raised and discussed at team meetings with all staff, so that families could be responded to consistently. A QR code was available for families to enable them easy means of

communication and feedback. A Respite Family forum was in place which held three meetings in 2025. Feedback from the forum was very positive. While the children are very much included in decision making as appropriate, family/representatives are the primary contact for this purpose.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 4: Written policies and procedures

The provider ensured that all the policies and procedures that are required under Schedule 5 of the regulations were in place, up-to-date and available to all staff working in the centre and children and families using this respite service.

Judgment: Compliant

Quality and safety

Overall, inspectors found that the quality and safety of care provided to the children was to a very high standard and promoted their overall well-being and development.

The care and support provided to each child was informed by a comprehensive assessment of need and through adopting a partnership approach with parents, guardians and other relevant multidisciplinary team (MDT) members. Care plans developed provided clear, concise and relevant information on all aspects of the children's needs. These were kept under ongoing review with well embedded oversight and monitoring arrangements in place.

Communication systems in place strived to ensure that the voice of each child was heard with regard to their likes, dislikes, interests and care preferences. There were clear and effective processes in place in the centre to promote the safety and protection of children, including a pathway and procedures to report concerns to the relevant agency tasked with child welfare and protection.

This inspection found that the designated centre was providing an excellent standard of care to children with disabilities, significant medical needs, and life-limiting conditions. Children benefited from a highly skilled and compassionate staff team, strong clinical governance, and a service that placed children and families at the centre of all care delivery.

The service was found to be highly compliant with the relevant regulations and standards, and demonstrated best practice in the delivery of children's respite care. The inspectors found the provider and staff demonstrated dedication,

professionalism, and commitment to ensuring a safe, high-quality, and nurturing service for children and their families.

In summary, inspectors found that this centre strived to ensure that all children were safe, well supported, heard and received individualised and person-centred care.

Regulation 10: Communication

This centre had policies and procedures developed to ensure that the provision of information to the children and young people was appropriate to their needs. Children had access to speech and language therapy through the Children's Disability Network Team (CDNT) to further support a total communication approach.

Inspectors saw in the sample of care plans reviewed, that each child had a support plan around their communication preferences. Staff members were observed supporting the children in line with their individual communication needs. Staff described to inspectors how the children communicated their choices and how they would recognise if the children were uncomfortable or in pain for example.

Children communicated through a variety of means such as through body language, facial expressions, vocalisations, signs, words and objects of reference. The centre had visuals throughout, that provided information on what was in various cupboards and what staff members were working each day for example.

In addition, the children had access to various media such as SMART televisions, gaming consoles, music players and Internet on which to watch Youtube clips for example. There were appropriate parental controls on devices to ensure children could not access age inappropriate materials.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 11: Visits

The centre had a visitor's policy in place and had a visitor's book to be signed on arrival to the centre. Inspectors found that children were supported to receive visitors from families and relevant others while they stayed in the centre. Families spoken with described about how they always felt welcomed when they visited the centre. Inspectors observed visitors coming and going to the centre throughout the days of inspection. Visits were managed and on arrival there was a reception whereby visitors signed in. Inspectors saw people showing their identification and signing in to ensure there were safe admissions for visitors coming to and from this children's centre. The premises was designed and laid out for children and families to

have private space when planned family visits occurred. Overall this area was well managed by the provider.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 12: Personal possessions

Inspectors found that children were encouraged and supported to bring in, and keep, personal possessions during their respite stays. This supported children's comfort and sense of familiarity within the centre.

Each bedroom had appropriate storage facilities for children to store their belongings securely. In addition, the centre had a laundry room with appropriate facilities to support the children to launder their clothes as needed and when they wished. The children's monies and personal possessions were kept safely while they received care at the centre, with recording systems in place to ensure that their money was protected and accounted for.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 13: General welfare and development

This centre promoted the overall welfare and development of each child in a warm, nurturing and child-centred manner.

Children were supported to take part in activities that were meaningful to them and that reflected their individual interests, abilities and developmental needs. Staff members worked in partnership with the children's families and staff members showed a strong understanding of each child's care needs to support their welfare. The service had strong links with the children's respective schools and the CDNT also which helped to further support the continuity of care to meet the children's individual developmental needs while staying in the centre.

The centre was welcoming and homely. Families were welcome to visit at any time while their child was using the respite service. The centre also provided facilities for the children to relax, play and develop life skills, such as baking. The back garden contained various playground equipment. This included a wheelchair accessible trampoline and swing. Within the centre, there were rooms designed as relaxing sensory spaces with various sensory equipment and media for watching preferred video clips. For example, one child who loved to watch the movement of a washing machine had access to video clips of this available to them. Another child who loved a particular cartoon had a 'toniebox' where they could listen to stories and enjoy the familiar sounds of their favourite cartoon.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 17: Premises

The centre's premises were of a high standard, designed and laid out to meet the various needs of the children who were availing of respite care.

The physical environment was found to be safe, clean, welcoming, and suitable for children with disabilities and complex medical needs. The centre was well maintained and adapted to support children's mobility, comfort, privacy, and clinical care requirements. The environment promoted a homely, reassuring atmosphere, supporting children to feel relaxed and secure during their respite stays.

The centre was clean, well maintained and spacious, with plenty of communal rooms. This ensured that the children could have time alone relaxing or had space to spend time with their peers. There were six individual bedrooms, most of which had en-suites. These rooms promoted accessibility for wheelchair users. There was a Jacuzzi bath that included soft lighting on the ceiling which created a relaxing and enjoyable bathing experience for the children.

The centre had a dedicated laundry room and medication room. Aids and appliances that were required to meet the children's individual needs were available and in place. This ensured that the children had a comfortable and safe stay. The service worked closely with the CDNT to ensure that the most appropriate aids and appliances were in place.

The centre also included a large kitchen area with various cooking and baking equipment, a den, a sensory room, a visitors room and communal areas for the children to relax together if they wished. The layout of the centre supported accessibility. There were wide corridors and well maintained and designed furniture, that allowed for the safe movement and supervision of the children. This was balanced well with ensuring that the environment was relaxing, homely and welcoming.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 18: Food and nutrition

This centre provided children with nutritious meals. Mealtimes took account of the each child's individual dietary needs and preferences. There were ample supplies of food, drinks and snacks available in the centre.

Children that required modified diets and alternative feeding methods, such as enteral feeding, had support plans in place that provided clear guidance to the trained staff members supporting them.

Inspectors observed mealtimes during the inspection and could see that these were social and enjoyable experiences for the children. Staff were knowledgeable about the dietary and feeding needs of the children. This could be seen in practice during the inspection.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 26: Risk management procedures

Risk was understood and well managed in this centre.

The inspector reviewed the Risk Management Policy which contained all of the necessary requirements of the regulations.

Inspectors reviewed incident and accident logs for this service, and risk assessments which had been composed based on the needs of the children.

Risk assessments had been created for risks including accidental injury, choking/aspiration, percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) feeding risks, epilepsy risks, child compatibility, medication errors, hoisting and child handling risks and supporting children in protecting their privacy. Incident records were written in detail and indicated what actions had been taken to keep children safe and reduce risk of recurrence. Where staff had been instructed to routinely monitor items such as marks and bruises, this was completed, recorded and followed up.

Inspectors found that incidents were identified and managed in a timely and effective manner. Overall, a robust approach to risk management was evident in this centre.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 27: Protection against infection

Inspectors found that there were effective infection prevention and control measures in place and implemented in practice. The children had their own individual aids and appliances that were kept clean and well maintained.

The centre was clean, well maintained and suitably equipped and designed to reduce the risk of infection transmission. Staff were observed contributing to a safe and healthy environment for the children through appropriate hand hygiene and

cleaning techniques. The service employed a cleaner who was observed throughout the inspection ensuring that all areas were clean, tidy and hygienic.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 28: Fire precautions

The service had fire safety arrangements in place to promote the safety of children, staff and visitors to the centre. These included fire containment measures, fire fighting equipment, exit routes, fire drills and emergency lighting.

Fire safety measures including a purpose built environment, clear safety protocols and procedures, personal evacuation procedures for each child and fire audit and assessment by the local fire fighting service were all in place.

However, the following was found and required further review:

- Inspectors requested that the fire alarm be set off so that the alert system could be reviewed as it was unclear through discussions had, and documentation reviewed, as to what the exact procedures were to alert of a possible fire. This was done at a time when the children were out of the centre so as to minimise any disruption to them. This showed that some fire containment doors did not close when the alarm went off, as was expected. In addition, one visual alert light was not working. The person in charge undertook to follow up on this immediately.
- One staff member spoken with who was working in the centre for three months had not taken part in a fire drill. Most of the children required full support from staff members to evacuate, therefore staff members need to be skilled and competent in the practical side of evacuating children to safe locations in the event of a fire. On discussion with the person in charge, they undertook to review the arrangements for fire drills and practicing simulated evacuations so that all staff members get to practice this within a reasonable time from their commencement of working in the centre

Judgment: Substantially compliant

Regulation 29: Medicines and pharmaceutical services

Medicines were found to be well managed in the centre. There were safe systems in place to ensure medicines were safely received, stored and administered.

One staff member explained to inspectors the process for managing medicines in the centre. The centre had a dedicated medicines room that was clean, spacious and where medicines were stored safely and appropriately. These included

refrigerators, clearly labelled cupboards, oxygen and suction devices and the relevant documentation to support this was readily available.

There were clear arrangements for the prescribing, storage, administration and recording of medicines. In addition, there were safe transportation arrangements for medicines agreed with families and the schools. Any changes in medication were communicated effectively with parents and other relevant healthcare professionals.

Overall, inspectors could see that medicines were managed safely and accordance with best practice. Staff members were skilled, trained and competent in administering medicines to the children in line with their care plans. This was observed in practice throughout the inspection.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan

Inspectors found that all children receiving respite in this centre had their needs assessed prior to admission and reviewed on a regular basis, to ensure that the service met their individual needs.

Children receiving respite care were found to experience a high standard of safe, responsive, and individualised care. Care plans were comprehensive, clearly documented, and reflective of each child's complex medical, physical, emotional, and developmental needs. Inspectors observed that care plans were regularly reviewed and developed in collaboration with families and relevant healthcare professionals.

Children's health and wellbeing were promoted through meticulous attention to clinical care, symptom management, and comfort. Staff demonstrated a thorough understanding of each child's medical needs, including the management of medical devices, medications, and emergency protocols. Care was delivered in a manner that was both clinically safe and emotionally supportive.

Children were treated with dignity and respect at all times. Their preferences, routines, and communication needs were well understood by staff, contributing to a calm, nurturing, and reassuring environment during respite stays.

Inspectors reviewed a sample of six care plans, including the most recent admission to the centre. One staff member talked through, and described, the process for assessing the children's needs prior to them receiving respite care. This involved close collaboration with the child, their family and the relevant MDT supporting them.

Care and support plans were then developed prior to the child staying in the centre, which included input with the children and their family members. The staff member also described how as part of this process, the children and their families visited the

centre at least three times before an overnight stay. This meant that the child was supported to get used to the environment prior to them staying overnight. It also meant that any specific preferences about how supports are given could be observed by staff and discussed with family members. All of this demonstrated that the service strived to ensure that each child's transition to respite care was done in a safe and child-centred manner.

The care and support plans reviewed were found to provide clear information and guidance to staff members on how to best support each child with their individual needs. Staff members were observed supporting the children in line with these support plans and appeared very knowledgeable about each of the children receiving respite at the time of inspection.

Meetings occurred annually where each child's needs were reviewed with their family representatives. A collaborative approach to the children's care and support was evident through the inspectors' review of these meetings.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 6: Health care

Each child's health care needs were assessed prior to them receiving respite care in the centre. The children's healthcare needs were reviewed on an ongoing basis. Care plans were updated as required to ensure that all staff supporting the children had the most up-to-date information on their health and wellbeing.

Inspectors found that the centre had very good communication systems in place between families, MDT, schools and healthcare professionals involved in the children's care. This ensured that any change in a child's health was shared among all people supporting them. This also ensured that each child received safe care and support that promoted their health and wellbeing.

One staff member described the systems that were in place with regard to communication with families prior to, during, and following each child's stay in the centre. Families spoken with also spoke about the communication with them by the centre and found it reassuring and effective in making sure their child's healthcare needs were met. Within the centre, the communication systems for the handover of important information on each child was comprehensive with dedicated time allocated each day for a handover meeting between staff members. This all ensured that each child's needs and any deterioration in their health could be quickly identified and responded to.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 7: Positive behavioural support

The centre had policies and procedures in place for positively supporting behaviours and for the use of restrictive practices. A number of restrictive practices were in place for the safety of the children and were reviewed and recommended by the multidisciplinary team involved in the children's care.

The control measures for some risks included the use of physical or environmental restrictive practices such as bed sides/specialised beds (29 children), observational points on doors and use of monitors (26 children). The inspector reviewed a sample of how these were reviewed and found their rationale to be clearly identified, and examples of where the associated risk was sufficiently reduced so that the restriction could be retired as a control measure. However many of these practices were required given the complex medical profile and need for continuous observation of these children.

The restrictive practices within this centre are reviewed on an ongoing basis by a specialist team. Consultation with family representatives to ensure respite interventions are appropriate.

The following required review;

- One restrictive practice included the use of a seat belt device to support one child's safety should they take off their seat belt while travelling. However, it was not clear through the documentation reviewed or the discussions with the person in charge if this restriction had been reviewed to ensure that it was the least restrictive option for the shortest duration and proportionate to the risks. The provider's policy included a template to be used for the review of restrictions to ensure the rationale was clear and that it was assessed to be the least restrictive option. While this template had been completed for other restrictions, it had not been for this practice. On the second day of inspection, the person in charge explained that they had begun to review this restriction in light of the frequency of incidents to see if it was still required. This action required completion.

Overall a very good and thorough approach was found regarding balancing rights and restriction in this respite centre.

Judgment: Substantially compliant

Regulation 8: Protection

Children were found to be safe and very well protected and safeguarded in this centre. Management and staff were trained in ensuring the protection and welfare of vulnerable children was of paramount consideration in this centre.

The provider had notified a small number of minor peer to peer safeguarding incidents (hair pulling, grabbing) since the centre's previous inspection. The inspector observed how the provider was managing and responding to these incidents to identify where trends were emerging or where children were deemed no longer compatible to attend their respite at the same time. Other safeguarding control measures had been implemented in response to specific risks, such as ensuring vigilant night time monitoring of children with specific medical conditions (observed on inspection), manual handling and hoisting larger children safely and very clear reporting all possible safeguarding matters to Child and Family Agency (Tusla) . Inspectors saw good links with the Child and Family Agency (Tusla) and clear referrals that had been made by the provider regarding suspected child protection, welfare and safeguarding concerns. This was done in a timely fashion and always followed up by the provider and a safeguarding plan put in place.

There were clear systems in place for reporting child protection and welfare concerns in line with Children First (2017). The centre had a safeguarding statement in place and on display in the hallway of the centre. The person in charge was the designated liaison person (DLP) The staff who inspectors spoke with had a clear understanding of the role and responsibilities of both the DLP and mandated persons. Centre staff worked in partnership with parents, foster carers, social workers and clinicians to safeguard children.

Each child had a comprehensive care plan that outlined the supports that they required with their personal and intimate care. These support plans were developed in collaboration with the childrens' families and provided clear guidance to staff on each child's needs and their individual preferences. This also included information on what the child can do independently and what they needed help with. This helped to promote the child's autonomy and make sure that their choices were recorded and known by all staff supporting them.

A discussion was had between inspectors and the person in charge about the protection of children in relation to photographs taken in the centre. This risk was already identified and assessed by the person in charge with measures in place to protect the children. On discussion the person in charge undertook to review this to ensure that the use of photographs is clearly documented, promotes privacy and protection and that it is discussed at team meetings to remind all staff members.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 9: Residents' rights

This centre was found to provide child-centred and individualised care and support. Each child's preferences, choices and rights were seen to be respected throughout the inspection.

Staff members were observed supporting the children in a caring and respectful manner and in a way that promoted their privacy and dignity. Care was observed to be given in a manner that ensured the children were involved and that their choices were respected. For example, inspectors observed mealtimes where it was seen that children could make choices about their food and snacks.

For most children receiving respite in the centre their families were their main advocates. The service worked in partnership with the children's families to ensure that each child's interests, likes and preferences about their care were known. Children could bring their personal items in with them also so that they had ready access to their preferred toys for example.

All families spoken with were very happy about the care their child received, with some families saying that their child loved going into respite and that this was a great reassurance to the parents. Families were also happy with the communication with the service. This helped to ensure that the children who did not communicate verbally had their voice, needs and preferences heard through their parents advocating for them.

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 (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 24: Admissions and contract for the provision of services	Compliant
Regulation 3: Statement of purpose	Compliant
Regulation 34: Complaints procedure	Compliant
Regulation 4: Written policies and procedures	Compliant
Quality and safety	
Regulation 10: Communication	Compliant
Regulation 11: Visits	Compliant
Regulation 12: Personal possessions	Compliant
Regulation 13: General welfare and development	Compliant
Regulation 17: Premises	Compliant
Regulation 18: Food and nutrition	Compliant
Regulation 26: Risk management procedures	Compliant
Regulation 27: Protection against infection	Compliant
Regulation 28: Fire precautions	Substantially compliant
Regulation 29: Medicines and pharmaceutical services	Compliant
Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan	Compliant
Regulation 6: Health care	Compliant
Regulation 7: Positive behavioural support	Substantially compliant
Regulation 8: Protection	Compliant
Regulation 9: Residents' rights	Compliant

Compliance Plan for St. Gabriel's Children's Respite House OSV-0007778

Inspection ID: MON-0040290

Date of inspection: 23/01/2026

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 28: Fire precautions	Substantially Compliant
Outline how you are going to come into compliance with Regulation 28: Fire precautions: Repairs have been completed to the fire doors requiring adjustment to ensure they close on alarm sounding. The visual alert light has been repaired and checked. New Staff employed in the centre will have the sounding of the house fire alarm system included in their induction process to ensure a full understanding and enable rapid recognition of the alarm and evacuation procedures. This will be incorporated into our service Induction Form.	
Regulation 7: Positive behavioural support	Substantially Compliant
Outline how you are going to come into compliance with Regulation 7: Positive behavioural support: A full review of the use of the identified restrictive practice is being undertaken, will be documented on the template included in the organisations policy and reviewed at a minimum yearly or as required. We will ensure the rationale is clearly outlined and the least restrictive option agreed with the child's family representatives and CDNT (children's disability network team).	

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 28(3)(d)	The registered provider shall make adequate arrangements for evacuating, where necessary in the event of fire, all persons in the designated centre and bringing them to safe locations.	Substantially Compliant	Yellow	28/02/2026
Regulation 07(5)(c)	The person in charge shall ensure that, where a resident's behaviour necessitates intervention under this Regulation the least restrictive procedure, for the shortest duration necessary, is used.	Substantially Compliant	Yellow	31/03/2026