



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

Issued by the Chief Inspector

Name of designated centre:	Corrig Woods
Name of provider:	Lotus Care Limited
Address of centre:	Laois
Type of inspection:	Unannounced
Date of inspection:	18 March 2026
Centre ID:	OSV-0008770
Fieldwork ID:	MON-0044073

About the designated centre

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

Corrig Woods provides support for up to five children aged between 6 and 18 years. The centre provides care and support to children with mild to moderate intellectual disability and autism. Corrig Woods is a 5 bedroom house with a large open plan living and kitchen areas that opens up into a balcony overlooking a large garden with play facilities. All children have their own bedrooms which are personalised. The centre is staffed by a team of social care workers and healthcare assistants who report to a person in charge.

The following information outlines some additional data on this centre.

Number of residents on the date of inspection:	4
--	---

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
Wednesday 18 March 2026	15:00hrs to 19:30hrs	Jennifer Deasy	Lead
Thursday 19 March 2026	10:00hrs to 16:30hrs	Jennifer Deasy	Lead
Wednesday 18 March 2026	15:00hrs to 19:30hrs	Raymond Lynch	Support
Thursday 19 March 2026	09:30hrs to 16:30hrs	Raymond Lynch	Support

What residents told us and what inspectors observed

This was an unannounced risk inspection scheduled to monitor ongoing regulatory compliance. This designated centre has been subject to enhanced regulatory activity within the current registration cycle due to findings of non-compliance on previous inspections. The provider committed to addressing these findings through their compliance plan responses.

This inspection found that the provider had made significant progress in enhancing their oversight of the service. There were consistent and stable management arrangements which were effectively ensuring the quality and safety of care. Children living in this centre were seen to be in receipt of child-centred care which was ensuring their wellbeing, assisting with their development and upholding their rights. There was a very high level of compliance with the Regulations found on this inspection.

The designated centre is located near a town in Co. Laois. It is registered to provide care and support for up to five children, with four children living there at the time of inspection. Two inspectors attended the centre over two days and had the opportunity to spend time with the children, observing and speaking with staff, and speaking with significant others including parents and social workers. Overall, inspectors saw that the children were very comfortable and relaxed in their home. They had opportunities to play, rest and engage in personally-meaningful activities. Staff members interacted with the children in a positive, kind and respectful manner and family members and social workers spoken with were very complimentary of the care and support that was provided.

The centre is a large detached building on its' own grounds. It is split across three floors and provides each child with their own bedroom. Two of these bedrooms had en-suite bathrooms. The children's bedrooms were decorated in line with their individual tastes. They were bright and colourful and were furnished with child appropriate furniture including, for example, bean bag chairs and toys. There was plenty of storage for children's toys and belongings. Children's photographs and important personal possessions were carefully displayed.

The centre also provided children with a large living room, a sitting room, kitchen, utility and a shared bathroom. The living room was equipped with sensory equipment including a ceiling-mounted hammock-style swing, a climbing frame, spinning chairs and soft mats for play. Children were seen to utilise this equipment and, in particular, seemed to enjoy the hammock-style swing. Staff members encouraged the children to play and interacted positively with them while they were playing, praising them and offering encouragement. One child was heard asking a staff member to "spin" them and staff responded by spinning the swing chair and encouraging further communication from the child. There was plenty of space in the

centre for children to run and play, and for them to relax or have time alone if they wished.

The inspectors met the four children when they returned from school on the afternoon of the first day and spent that evening interacting with them and observing their routines. The children were seen to be comfortable and happy in their home. One of the children chose to relax in their bedroom, while the other children had snacks and dinner and played. One of the children went out with staff to get ice cream. The children knew where their preferred snacks were stored and were seen to lead staff to get snacks that they wanted. The staff team were responsive to the children's requests and clearly understood their communication, routine and preferences well.

There was a culture of positive risk-taking which contributed to a homely and relaxed feeling to the centre; for example, one child was seen to climb on to a counter top to show the staff where the snacks were that they wanted. The staff team took care to ensure the child's safety while also allowing them the freedom to communicate through their body what they wanted.

Inspectors spoke with 13 staff in detail over the course of the inspection. Staff members were found to be very informed of the children's needs and preferences. They were seen to follow the children's lead in respect of their routines; for example, one child was asked if they wanted to change to go to the playground, however they were more interested in playing on the sensory equipment and so the staff encouraged the child to continue with their preferred choice of activity.

Staff members told the inspectors that they had received training in communication, children's rights and autism awareness. This was in addition to mandatory training which included safety interventions and first aid. One staff member told the inspectors of how they ensured that children's rights were upheld including recognising their role in advocating for the children and protecting them from harm or abuse.

Two children were seen to become distressed at various points over the course of the observations on the first evening. Inspectors saw that staff members responded in a kind and calm manner to the children during these incidents. Staff members adapted their communication and used single words, gestures and writing to assist the children to communicate their needs during these incidents. Later, a staff member showed the inspectors two communication devices which the children were learning to use in school and demonstrated to the inspector how these worked.

All of the children attended school. Inspectors were told that there were good relationships developed with the children's schools and with their care teams. Inspectors were told by several staff members of the positive outcomes that had occurred for many of the children since coming to live in the centre including, for example, improvements in personal care, increased community activities and improvements in their communication skills. The staff team told inspectors of the personally-meaningful activities which were available to the children including attending dance classes, going out for ice cream, to the cinema and playgrounds.

On day two of this inspection the inspectors spoke with one parent and two social workers over the phone so as to get their feedback on the quality and safety of care provided in the centre. The parent said that they were very happy with the care provided in the house. They said that staff were approachable and had a great relationship with their child. When they visited the house they said that they were made to feel very welcome and could speak with staff at any time. They said that their child was always well dressed and clean and went out on social outings that they enjoyed. Overall, they reported that they were happy with the quality and safety of care and saying they would not like to see their child living anywhere else.

The social workers spoken with were equally as positive. They reported that they had no concerns about the care provided in the centre and that staff were very caring towards the children. One also said that if they had any concerns, they could speak with staff and they had good communication with the staff. For example, they said that there were monthly child in care reviews and at these meetings the child's progress and overall well-being was discussed. They said that they were satisfied with the overall quality and safety of care provided and overall, had no issues.

Written feedback on the service from one family member, two social workers and one school teacher was also observed to be positive. For example, the family member expressed gratitude for the efforts, dedication and immense support their relative received from a loving and caring staff team. Additionally, the social workers were complimentary of one child's placement and the progress they were making while the other social worker said the level of care provided was excellent. One of the children's teachers was also complimentary of the staff team.

Overall, this inspection found that the children living here were in receipt of a very high standard of care which was promoting their health and development and was maximising their individual strengths and abilities. The next two sections of the report will describe the governance and management arrangements and how effective these were in ensuring the quality and safety of care.

Capacity and capability

This section of the report describes the oversight arrangements of the centre. This inspection found that there were effective leadership, governance and management systems in place which were ensuring that the children were in receipt of good quality and safe care. Leadership was demonstrated by the management team and there was a commitment to continuous improvements in the service. The centre was adequately resourced and there was continuity of staffing to ensure the promotion of attachments between the children and the staff who were supporting them.

There were clearly defined management systems in the centre. All staff spoken with were informed of the management systems and of how to escalate concerns or issues to the provider level. Staff, including leaders, were informed of their individual

roles and responsibilities. Staff were performance-managed and were supported to effectively exercise their professional and personal accountability for the provision of child-centred and safe care to the children.

Staff members were provided with training to ensure they had the necessary skills and competencies, and to ensure that they were informed of their responsibilities in respect of important issues such as child safeguarding. There were sufficient staff on duty to meet the needs of each child in a child-centred manner. Continuity of care was considered and inspectors saw that there were positive and affectionate relationships between children and staff on duty.

Admissions to the centre were planned in a careful manner, and children and their representatives had the opportunity to visit the centre prior to admissions. The age range and compatibility of children was considered as part of the admission process which further safeguarded the children.

There were management arrangements in place which enabled the provider to achieve their planned service objectives. There was a commitment to continuous service improvement and inspectors were informed of plans to further enhance the leadership systems of the centre, and to enhance the facilities of the centre for the children. Information governance systems were effective in monitoring the service for compliance and in responding in a timely manner to identified risks.

Regulation 15: Staffing

The designated centre was staffed in accordance with the centre's statement of purpose and in line with the assessed needs of the children. At the time of inspection, each child was determined to require 2:1 staffing; however, the person in charge detailed that due to a reduction in one child's behaviour support needs, they were seeking to reduce this ratio for this child in consultation with the child's social worker and the funder of the service.

Inspectors spoke with 13 staff over the course of the inspection and enquired with three about their qualification and experience of working with children and in health and social care settings. All of these staff spoken with had previously worked in childcare or healthcare settings. Staff members told inspectors of additional training that they had received since commencing in their roles in order to enhance their competencies. This will be discussed under Regulation 16.

Planned and actual rosters were maintained for the service. The rosters from January 2026 were reviewed by the inspectors. They showed the full names and qualifications of the staff members. Across four dates reviewed in detail it was seen that there were sufficient staff rostered on to meet the needs of the children. The rosters also showed the arrangements for managers and team leaders to be present and available in the service. There was a very low number of agency staff utilised in

the service, and inspectors saw that where agency were required, the same agency staff were employed across multiple shifts in order to assist with continuity of care.

The Schedule 2 files for ten staff members were reviewed. Inspectors saw that these contained the information required by the Regulations including an up-to-date Garda vetting record, two verified written references and photographic identification for each staff member.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 16: Training and staff development

Staff members spoken with told the inspectors that they felt well-supported in their roles. They said that the management team were readily available and were responsive to any concerns that they raised. The staff team were performance managed and supervised through regular one to one supervision sessions and monthly team meetings.

The inspectors reviewed the staff team meeting minutes from December 2025 and January 2026 and saw that these discussed pertinent issues such as fire safety, incidents of concern, children's care plans and infection, prevention and control (IPC). Inspectors also reviewed the 2025 supervision records for four staff members and saw that staff were in receipt of regular supervision which was used to performance manage and develop them.

A training folder was available in the centre which contained copies of staff training certificates; however, there was no overall training matrix maintained. This made it difficult and time-consuming for inspectors to verify that all staff were up-to-date with mandatory training. Inspectors instead focused on ensuring that all staff were up-to-date in training in Children First, and audited 50% of staff files to monitor compliance with other mandatory training. Inspectors saw evidence of all staff having an up-to-date certification in Children First and that, of the 50% of staff files reviewed, these staff were up-to-date with other mandatory training.

Inspectors asked that documentation be submitted subsequent to the inspection to confirm that all of the staff team were up to date with training in safeguarding vulnerable adults and first aid. This was submitted and demonstrated that all staff had completed this training.

Many staff members had completed additional training in areas relevant to the children's assessed needs including, for example in autism awareness, becoming trauma aware, visual supports and Lamh.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 23: Governance and management

There were clearly defined management systems in the service. A shift lead was delegated responsibility on a daily basis. They reported to a deputy team leader who, in turn reported to the team leader and person in charge. Staff members spoken with were informed of the management arrangements and of how to escalate concerns or queries to the level of the person in charge. They were also informed of the arrangements for reporting incidents of abuse and of how to contact the designated officer and the on-call management team, if required.

The person in charge had oversight of two designated centres, one of which was this centre. The roster detailed days when the person in charge was present in the centre. In their absence, a team leader and deputy team leader ensured oversight of the day to day running of the centre. The person in charge and the team leader were supernumerary in their roles which ensured that had sufficient management time. The inspectors were told that there were plans to further enhance the local management arrangements by appointing two further deputy team leaders. This would ensure oversight by a leader during the night shifts, as well as by day.

There were a series of local and provider level audits in place to monitor for the quality and safety of care. Local audits included weekly health and safety audits and monthly restrictive practice and fire safety audits. Action plans were implemented to address deficits where required.

The inspector reviewed records of the person in charge monthly audits from January and February 2026. They were seen to review areas such as risk management, staffing, safeguarding, children's health and social care needs and maintenance requirements. Where actions were identified these were inputted on to an action plan tracker.

The inspectors were told that Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) audits were due to commence shortly in the service. In the meantime, the inspector was shown how the person in charge was kept informed of relevant IPC risks by the provider's quality officer. For example, the person in charge showed the inspectors a communication on concerns regarding a recent outbreak of a transmissible infection in the general public and the proactive measures which were recommended to be implemented in the service.

A monthly governance assurance report was completed by the person in charge and submitted to the regional services manager and quality safety and practice development manager for review. This report covered issues such as adverse incidents, restrictive practices, supervision and training needs of staff and children's access to meaningful activities and goals. This report ensured that risks or areas of need could be escalated to the provider for review in a timely manner.

The provider had also completed six monthly unannounced visits in line with the requirements of the Regulations. The inspectors reviewed the reports from the six-monthly visits in April 2025 and October 2025. The audits conducted as part of

these visits were very comprehensive and detailed areas for improvement to ensure the quality and safety of care. Action plans derived from these audits showed that actions were implemented and progressed.

An annual review of the service was dated July 2025. This review included feedback from family members and significant others including the children's social workers. Overall the report showed that there was very positive feedback and that the children's representatives were very happy with the service.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 24: Admissions and contract for the provision of services

The provider had an admissions policy which had been recently reviewed and updated. This policy clearly detailed the criteria for admitting children to the service. Each child had a contract of care on their file. Inspectors reviewed two of these contracts of care and saw that they were signed by the children's parents. The contracts clearly detailed the legal status of the children in respect of their care.

A transition journey document for one child was reviewed by the inspectors. This document showed the child's journey to care from the initial referral to their admission. It demonstrated that this admission was completed in a planned and careful manner and showed that the child and their representatives had the opportunity to visit the centre in advance of their admission.

Judgment: Compliant

Quality and safety

This section of the report describes the quality of the service and how safe it was for the children who lived there. Overall, inspectors found that the children who were living in this centre were in receipt of a very good quality service which was safeguarding their rights, protecting them from harm and promoting their welfare and development in a child-centred and age-appropriate manner.

The centre was seen to be homely, warm, clean and comfortable. It was designed to meet the needs of the children, including needs specific to their disabilities such as sensory needs, and needs relative to their development, for example in play. The living environment of the centre was stimulating and provided opportunities for play and recreation. There were also quieter spaces in the house, including individual bedrooms where children were seen to relax and watch television. Children's

bedrooms were decorated in an age-appropriate manner and provided sufficient storage for their personal belongings.

The centre had suitable fire management systems including equipment to detect, contain and extinguish fires. The premises was also equipped with required control measures to manage identified risks. Systems were in place to manage risk and where required, each child a number of individual risk management plans on file detailing the measures in place to support their safety and well-being.

Children's files contained comprehensive personal plans to guide staff in the provision of care and support. These plans reflected the children's preferences, their family's views and the multidisciplinary team's assessments. These plans were reviewed regularly to assess their effectiveness. Inspectors saw that children's health and well-being was promoted and that they were assisted to exercise their rights to access an appropriate education.

Positive attachments which children had made before their admission to the centre were promoted and maintained. Family members and social workers were welcomed to the service and there was good communication between the provider and important representatives. This was effective in promoting the welfare of the child.

Children had the opportunity to exercise choice across a range of activities. Their choices in respect of foods, their routines and their bedtime were all seen to be respected by staff. There were policies and procedures to ensure that children were protected from abuse and education was undertaken with children to help them to protect themselves, in a manner sensitive of their age and stage of development.

Regulation 12: Personal possessions

The children were supported to take care of their personal belongings and staff were observed to be respectful of their personal items. For example, a staff member showed the inspectors two of the children's communication devices. After showing the inspectors how these devices worked, the staff member returned them to a safe place while the children were not using them, so that no damage could come to them.

A parent spoken with said they were happy in the way that staff were respectful of their child's personal items to include their clothes, saying their child was supported to look their best and was always well dressed.

Records of children's possessions of value were maintained in their files. The inspectors also saw that children's finances were audited regularly to ensure that this was in line with their policy. The provider's policy on personal finances was updated in August 2025 and gave guidance to staff on how to support children with their money, including pocket money.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 13: General welfare and development

The children's general welfare and development was being promoted in the centre. Inspectors saw, and were told, of multiple positive outcomes for the children since their admission to the centre. For example, many of the children had made significant progress in respect of their personal care skills. One child had recently attended the dentist for the first time and was engaging in a tooth brushing programme, having previously had significant difficulty with this task.

There was evidence of excellent communication between the provider and important people in the children's lives. Child in Care Reviews were occurring as frequently as required and records of these meetings were maintained in the centre. Inspectors reviewed several of these records and saw that the meetings were attended by the provider, the children's social workers, their representatives including parents and, often their teachers or the principal of their school. It was evident that the provider was proactive in liaising with these representatives in order to monitor and promote outcomes for each child.

All of the children attended school. The staff team were available to support the children with accessing their education as required. Three of the children were required to travel substantial distances to their schools; however, inspectors saw, and were told, that these school placements were maintained as the child had developed important relationships in those schools and it was important for the children to maintain these positive relationships. The provider was, however, in the process of seeking an alternative education placement for one of these three children, in consultation with the child's social worker and parent. Inspector saw that, in spite of the long car journeys, children appeared cheerful and playful on return to the centre in the afternoon.

Children had opportunities to participate in age-appropriate and personally-meaningful hobbies and activities. Children had access to multiple play facilities in the centre and were seen using these over the course of the inspection. Children also took part in horse-riding, dance lessons and went out to spend their money on their preferred items or foods. Inspectors saw evidence of the children going on trips to the sensory library, out for "baby-cinos" or to play grounds and recreational centres for bowling. Photographs of children engaging in crafts for celebrations such as Valentine's Day or Easter were also seen.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 17: Premises

The premises were observed to be spacious, warm, welcoming and well-maintained on the day of this inspection. Additionally, there was adequate well-equipped play areas (both internally and externally) provided for the children to avail of.

As identified in section 1 of this report: the centre was a large detached building on its' own grounds. It was split across three floors and provided each child with their own bedroom. Two of these bedrooms had en-suite bathrooms. The children's bedrooms were decorated in line with their individual tastes. They were bright and colourful and were furnished with child appropriate furniture. There was plenty of storage for children's toys and belongings. Children's photographs and important personal possessions were carefully displayed.

The centre also provided children with a large living room, a sitting room, kitchen, utility and a shared bathroom. The living room was equipped with sensory equipment including a ceiling-mounted hammock-style swing, a climbing frame, spinning chairs and soft mats for play. Children were seen to utilise this equipment and, in particular, seemed to enjoy the hammock-style swing.

The garden area had two trampolines, a sandbox and scooters for the children to play with in times of good weather.

Staff members were observed to encourage the children to play and interacted positively with them while they were playing, praising them and offering encouragement. There was plenty of space in the centre for children to run and play, and for them to relax or have time alone if they wished.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 26: Risk management procedures

Policies, and procedures regarding the management of risk were available in the centre and, each child a number of individual risk management plans on file detailing the measures in place to support their safety and well-being.

The inspectors enquired of staff what the main risks in the centre were and how such risks were managed. Some staff said that absconsion could be a risk but this was mitigated by ensuring the children were appropriately supervised and external doors were coded so as a child could not leave the house unsupervised. Additionally, the gated entrance to the house was also kept locked so as to ensure the children could play safely in their garden.

Another staff member said that behaviour could be a risk however, this was mitigated with appropriate staffing levels, multi-disciplinary support and staff had training in the management of behaviour and in first aid. One child had pica (an eating disorder characterised by a possible consumption of non-food items) and

staff said this risk was mitigated by ensuring appropriate staff support was available to the child at all times and that they had training in first aid.

One inspector reviewed a number of risk assessments for three of the children and found that where risk was identified, a number of control measures were in place (as described above, by the staff team) to keep the children safe.

For example, where the risk of absconsion was identified, the following control measures were in place:

- high staffing support levels were provided to each child throughout the day to promote their safety and well being. All children were on 2:1 staff support
- all external doors were secured with coded access as was the garden gate so as to ensure the children could play safely in their home and in their garden
- a missing persons policy was in place
- the children carried identification on them when accessing the community
- all children were to be kept in direct line of sight by staff when on outings

Additionally, where there was a risk of behaviours of concern, the following controls were in place:

- each child had 2:1 support throughout the day
- support was available from a multi-disciplinary team which included occupational therapy, speech and language therapy and positive behaviour support
- key work sessions on positive behavioural support was provided to the children
- where required, the children had positive behavioural support plans in place
- all children had access to GP services
- staff had training in positive behavioural support

The inspectors observed over the course of this two-day inspection that the staffing levels were as detailed (2:1) in individual risk management plans to support the children's safety in the centre. Additionally, as documented in the risk assessments, inspectors found that all external doors and the garden gate were key coded so as the children could play in safety and staff had training in first aid and positive behavioural support.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 28: Fire precautions

Fire fighting systems were in place in the centre to include a fire alarm panel, emergency lighting, fire extinguishers and fire doors. Equipment was being serviced as required and the issues as found on the last inspection pertaining to the fire doors had been addressed.

The fire alarm system and emergency lighting was being inspected on a quarterly basis with the last service documented for the month of January 2026. The fire extinguishers has last been serviced in April 2025.

Fire evacuation drills were being facilitated and the inspectors reviewed paperwork from two recent fire drills. One drill held in January 2026 informed that it took the four children 2 minutes to evacuate the building with no issues or concerns noted. An early morning drill (undertook at 07.15am) informed that it took the 4 children and 8 staff 5 minutes and 20 seconds to evacuate the premises again, with no concerns noted.

Each child had a personal emergency evacuation plan in place which detailed the level of support and guidance they required during a fire drill. Each child was also on 2:1 staff support throughout the day and, there were four waking staff on duty overnight.

It was observed however, that these plans required an amendment so as to accurately describe the fire evacuation arrangements. Once this was brought to the attention of the person in charge, the four personal emergency evacuation plans had been reviewed and updated prior to the end of this inspection process.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan

The inspectors reviewed two of the children's individual assessments of their health and social care needs. Each child had a comprehensive assessment of their needs which was informed by the child's representatives and the multidisciplinary team. These assessments were used to inform detailed care plans which provided guidance to staff in meeting children's needs. Care plans were written in a child-centred manner and clearly reflected children's preferences in respect of their care. For example, one care plan detailed the type of clothing that the child preferred to wear.

Inspectors saw that children's care plans were informed by relevant multidisciplinary professionals including, for example, positive behaviour support specialists, psychology, speech and language therapy and occupational therapy. Children were also supported to attend for appointments with other allied health professionals including dentists and optometrists. Two children had recently been prescribed glasses and were being supported to begin to wear these and to get used to them. Other children had attended dentists for reviews for the first time and were engaging positively with staff in oral hygiene programmes.

Children's care plans detailed their family access arrangements and the details of their allocated social workers and Guardian Ad Litem. Copies of the children's individual education plans were on file and it was evident that the person in charge

was proactive in liaising with educators and social workers to ensure that children's social and education care needs were being met.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 8: Protection

Policies and procedures were in place to support the children's welfare and safety in the centre however, at the time of this inspection, there were no active safeguarding concerns.

The centre had an up-to-date child welfare and protection policy which informed that the safety of the children was everyone's business and, proportional interventions must be taken where required to ensure the children were safe.

The person in charge informed the inspectors that, if any concern was brought to their attention, it would be investigated as required, appropriate actions would be taken to ensure the children's safety, a safeguarding plan would be put in place and the issue would be reported to the Office of Chief Inspector as well as the child and welfare protection agency.

Inspectors also noted the following:

- staff spoken with said they would report any concern (if they had one) about the welfare of the children to the person in charge immediately. However, they also said that they had no concerns at this time
- all staff had training in Children's First and safeguarding
- staff had an up-to-date Garda vetting disclosure on file
- staff went through an easy read version of safeguarding with the children via key working sessions
- staff had weekly meetings with the children and at those meetings the children were supported to communicate their feelings and emotions
- the centre had a safeguarding statement on display in the hallway which was a written declaration of intent on how to keep the children safe. It was observed that this document required some updating however, prior to the end of this inspection, the person in charge had addressed this issue.
- there were no active complaints on file about the quality or safety of care provided in the centre at the time of this inspection
- one parent spoken with over the phone was very complimentary about the quality and safety of care provided to their child. They told the inspector that they wouldn't like to see their child live anywhere else because they were very happy in Corrig Woods
- two social workers were spoken with over the phone and they reported that they had no concerns about the quality or safety of care provided in the house

- written feedback from two social workers viewed by the inspectors was complimentary of the children's placements and the progress the children were making. One social worker also said that the level of care provided, was excellent.
- one of the children's school teachers was complimentary of the staff team

At all times over the course of this two-day unannounced inspection, staff were observed to support the children in a caring, child-centred and professional manner. The children were also observed to be relaxed and comfortable in the company and presence of staff.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 9: Residents' rights

On the day of this inspection, staff were observed to support and respect the wishes of the children with regard to their preferred choices and daily routines. The children's right to an education was provided for and a number of staff also had training in human rights.

Inspectors saw that the children's right to be happy, safe, and healthy and have access to a clean and suitable environment was provided for. For example, the children were observed to be happy in their home. They were comfortable in the company of staff and felt safe and supported to play with staff. Staff were observed to be child-centred in their approach and were supportive of the children's rights to engage in leisure and recreational activities of their choosing. Again for example, when a child wanted to play on a swing, with building blocks or on a climbing frame (of which they did multiple times over the course of this inspection), staff ensured they could partake in these activities safely. The children were also observed to very much enjoy these activities and spending time with staff. This was important as engaging in such activities can not only support the children with emotional regulation, but help develop social skills as well.

The children's right to education was also provided for in this centre and, the staff team ensured each child was supported to attend school each day. The was also important as education can help support the child's personal growth and development and help provide them with the skills required to live a more independent life.

The right to a good standard of living was afforded to the children. For example, they were provided with appropriate, child-friendly, and safe accommodation. They had warm clothing and had access to suitable food options including fresh fruit and vegetables. One staff member described the positive changes to some of the children's diets since coming to live in the centre.

The inspectors observed that the children were clean and well presented on the day of this unannounced inspection. Their clothes were clean, their bedrooms were

clean and decorated to their individual preferences, and staff were observed to be very respectful of their personal belongings. Additionally, the children were provided with regular meals of their choosing with staff support and guidance.

The children's right to communicate their wishes and opinions in a style that suited them was supported and promoted by staff. For example, some children used high-tech devices as an aid to their communication and staff were familiar with these aids and how they worked. The children also communicated their preferences for social or recreational activities to engage in each day to the staff and staff ensured these activities were provided for. For example, over the course of this inspection children were supported to go on outings to a sensory library, go to playgrounds and go for ice-cream.

This service also had a system in place to ensure the children's right to be protected from harm and feel safe in their home was promoted. For example, a number of individual risk assessments were in place to support each child's safety and well-being. Additionally, child protection and safeguarding policies and practices were in place as an essential tool to safeguard children from harm or abuse.

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 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
Quality and safety	
Regulation 12: Personal possessions	Compliant
Regulation 13: General welfare and development	Compliant
Regulation 17: Premises	Compliant
Regulation 26: Risk management procedures	Compliant
Regulation 28: Fire precautions	Compliant
Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan	Compliant
Regulation 8: Protection	Compliant
Regulation 9: Residents' rights	Compliant