



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

Issued by the Chief Inspector

Name of designated centre:	150 Gracepark Road
Name of provider:	ChildVision Company Limited by Guarantee
Address of centre:	Dublin 9
Type of inspection:	Short Notice Announced
Date of inspection:	13 October 2020
Centre ID:	OSV-0002092
Fieldwork ID:	MON-0030599

About the designated centre

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

This is a service operated by ChildVision and located in near a busy vibrant town in north county Dublin. It provides a residential and educational support for six young people (students) with a visual impairment and is open to the students from Sunday to Friday. The house is a two storey dwelling which consists of a kitchen, spacious dining room, fully furnished sitting room, a study room and five bedrooms. Private parking is available to the front of the property and a garden area to the back.

Systems and resources are in place to ensure each students assessed social, healthcare and educational needs are provided for. The house is staffed with with a qualified social care leader, and a team of qualified social care professionals. Nursing support (as required) is also available to the students.

The following information outlines some additional data on this centre.

Number of residents on the date of inspection:	2
--	---

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 - 2015 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
Tuesday 13 October 2020	10:30hrs to 17:00hrs	Raymond Lynch	Lead

What residents told us and what inspectors observed

The inspector did not meet with any of the students who avail of this service as they were attending school at the time of the inspection. However, a sample of written feedback from the students and family representatives was reviewed by the inspector so as to get their thoughts and feedback on the service provided.

The students reported that staff were very caring, encouraging and helpful. In their feedback they also reported that they are very happy with the care and support provided and were happy with the way in which their independence was being developed and promoted. One resident wrote that they loved their time in the house and that the staff team were wonderful.

Family members also reported that the care was amazing, they couldn't be happier with the house and that they were delighted they had chosen the service for the students educational support needs. They also said they were completely satisfied with the service as a whole and the staff team were approachable, friendly and fantastic.

This house was centred around meeting the assessed social and educational needs of each student so as to support their independence and reach their maximum potential. Where required, the service also had systems in place to ensure each students healthcare related needs were provided for.

Of the staff spoken with as part of this inspection process, the inspector was assured that they had the knowledge and skills necessary to provide a person centred service to each student.

Capacity and capability

Written feedback on the service from students (and family representatives) informed that they were very happy and content in this house. The provider had ensured that adequate supports and resources were in place to meet their assessed needs and this was reflected in the high levels of compliance found across the regulations assessed as part of this inspection process. The service provided to the students promoted their individual rights while at the same time, supporting their autonomy and independence.

The service had a management structure in place which was responsive to students assessed needs and feedback. There was a clearly defined and effective management structure in place which consisted of an experienced person in charge who worked on a full time basis in the organisation and was supported in their role

by a team of social care workers and the director of social care.

The person in charge was a qualified social care professional and provided good leadership and support to their team. They ensured that resources were channelled accordingly which meant that the individual and assessed needs of the students were being provided for. They also ensured staff were appropriately qualified, trained, supervised and supported so as they had the skills required to provide a person centred, responsive and effective service to each student. Of the staff spoken with, the inspector was assured that they had the skills, experience and knowledge to support the students in a safe and effective way.

The management team ensured the service was monitored and audited as required by S.I. No. 367/2013 - Health Act 2007 (Care and Support of Residents in Designated Centres for Persons (Children and Adults) with Disabilities) Regulations 2013 (the regulations). There was an annual review of the quality and safety of care available in the house along with six-monthly auditing reports. The review and auditing process was ensuring the service remained responsive to the needs of the students and was bringing about positive changes to the operational management of the service. For example, two minor actions were required from the most recent audit of the service. The inspector saw that one of these actions had been addressed at the time of this inspection and a plan was in place to address the other one (and within a reasonable time frame).

There were systems in place to ensure that the students' voice was heard and respected in the service. For example, the students were involved in the running of the house, they chose what social activities to engage in and agreed weekly menus between them. They were also consulted with (along with their parents) about their care plans and a sample of written feedback on the service provided informed that they were very satisfied with the house overall.

Systems were in place to manage, record and log complaints in the service. It was observed that there were very few complaints arising from both students and family members. However, one recent complaint had been made by a student and the inspector noted that the complaint had been recorded, logged and sent to the complaints officer immediately. At the time of this inspection the service was in the process of bringing this complaint to a resolution, that would be satisfactory to the complainant.

Overall, from viewing written feedback on the service provided from family members and students and from speaking with management and staff during the course of this inspection, the inspector was assured that the service was being managed effectively so as to meet the assessed social and educational needs of the students in a competent and effective manner. Student reported in their feedback that they were very happy with the service and the staff team working in the house.

Regulation 14: Persons in charge

There was a person in charge of the service, who was a qualified social care professional with experience of working in and managing services for students with visual disabilities.

They were also aware of their remit to the Health Act 2007 (Care and Support of Residents in Designated Centres for Persons (Children and Adults) with Disabilities) Regulations 2013 and were responsive to the regulatory and inspection process.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 15: Staffing

On completion of this inspection, the inspector was satisfied that there were appropriate staff numbers and skill mix in place to meet the assessed needs of students and to provide for the safe delivery of services.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 23: Governance and management

The inspector was satisfied that the quality of care and experience of the students was being monitored and evaluated on an ongoing basis. Effective management systems were also in place to support and promote the delivery of safe, quality care services.

There was an experienced person in charge in place who was supported in their role by the director of social care.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 3: Statement of purpose

The inspector was satisfied that the statement of purpose met the requirements of the Regulations. The statement of purpose consisted of a statement of aims and objectives of the service and a statement as to the facilities and services which were to be provided to the students. It accurately described the service that will be provided and the person in charge was aware of their remit to keep it under regular review.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 31: Notification of incidents

The person in charge was aware of their legal remit to notify the chief inspector of any adverse incident occurring in the house as required by the regulations.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 34: Complaints procedure

Systems were in place to manage, record and log complaints in the service as required by the regulations.

Judgment: Compliant

Quality and safety

Each student was supported to have meaningful lives of their choosing (with input and support from family members as required) within the service and within their community. The quality and safety of care provided was being monitored and was found to be individualised, person centred and effective in meeting their health, social and educational needs.

The individual educational and social care needs of students were being supported and encouraged. From viewing a small sample of files, the inspector saw that the students were being supported to achieve personal, educational and social goals and to maintain links with their families and community. Students were also being supported to maintain and build on skills so as to maintain and promote their independence. For example, students were learning and developing skills to travel independently and manage their own finances. They were also being supported to develop independence skills in the kitchen by participating in cooking and baking programmes with staff support. Their educational needs were also being provided for and students were attending a local school. A specialised study, with assistive technology was also provided to the students so as to ensure they could complete their homework. Students were also facilitated to access local community based amenities (with staff support where required) such as shops, restaurants and hotels.

The students healthcare needs were provided for by their families and where required, supported by the service. Access to GP service could be provided for,

along with access to a dentist, speech and language therapy and occupational therapy. Each student had a medical care plan in place and the service had as required input and support from a team of nursing professionals.

Systems were in place to ensure the students were adequately safeguarded in the house. One student wrote in their feedback that they would speak to the person in charge if they had any concerns. Students also had access to independent advocacy services. From a small sample of training documents viewed, staff had training in children's first and safeguarding of vulnerable adults. From speaking with one staff member, the inspector was assured that they had the knowledge and skills necessary to report any issue or concern to the person in charge if they had to.

There were systems in place to manage and mitigate risk and support students safety in the service. For example, where a student may be at risk with regard to independent travelling, they were provided with orientation and mobility training and a number of other supports were put in place to promote their overall safety, welfare and independence. Risks associated with skills development such as cooking were mitigated by ensuring adequate staffing support and guidance was available to the students. Systems were also in place to mitigate against the risk of infection. For example, personal protective equipment was available in the house and being used in line with national guidelines, staff had undergone training in infection control, students were provided with training about social distancing and cough etiquette, there were hand sanitizing gels readily available in the house and there was adequate hand washing facilities.

The students' rights were supported and promoted in the service and they were directly involved and consulted with about the running of the house, chose and cooked their own meals (with support as required), chose what social activities to engage in. In 2019, an independent social worker also visited the students and provided information to them on their rights as individuals and on the importance of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The person in charge also ensured that the individual communication needs of each student was provided for. Residents were facilitated with assistive technology so as to promote and enhance their educational and learning experience and to maximise their full potential.

Overall, written feedback from students and family members on the staff team and service provided was very complimentary and positive. Systems were in place to ensure the service remained person centred and effective in meeting the assessed health, social and educational needs of the students.

Regulation 10: Communication

The person in charge ensured that the individual communication needs of each student was provided for. Residents were facilitated to to access assistive technology so as to promote and enhance their educational and learning needs

and to maximise their full potential.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 26: Risk management procedures

The inspector was satisfied that the health and safety of the students and staff was being promoted and there were adequate policies and procedures in place to support the overall health, well being and safety of the students.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 27: Protection against infection

Systems were in place to mitigate against the risk of infection in the service. Staff had training in infection control, students had training in social distancing and cough etiquette and there were adequate hand sanitizing gels available in the house, along with hand washing facilities.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan

The individual educational and social care needs of students were being supported and encouraged. From viewing a small sample of files, the inspector saw that the students were being supported to achieve personal and social goals and to maintain links with their families and community.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 6: Health care

The students healthcare needs were provided for by their families and where required, supported by the service. Access to GP service could be provided for, along with access to a dentist, speech and language therapy and occupational therapy. Each student had a medical care plan in place and the service had as required input and support from a team of nursing professionals.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 8: Protection

Systems were in place to ensure the students were adequately safeguarded in the house. One student wrote in their feedback that they would speak to the person in charge if they had any concerns. Students also had access to independent advocacy services. From a small sample of training documents viewed, staff also had training in children's first aid and safeguarding of vulnerable adults. From speaking with one staff member, the inspector was assured that they had the knowledge and skills necessary to report any issue or concern to the person in charge if they had to.

Judgment: Compliant

Regulation 9: Residents' rights

The students' rights were supported and promoted in the service and they were directly involved and consulted with about the running of the house, chose and cooked their own meals (with support as required) and chose what social activities to engage in. In 2019 an independent social worker also visited the students and provided information to them on their rights as individuals and on the importance of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

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 - 2015 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 23: Governance and management	Compliant
Regulation 3: Statement of purpose	Compliant
Regulation 31: Notification of incidents	Compliant
Regulation 34: Complaints procedure	Compliant
Quality and safety	
Regulation 10: Communication	Compliant
Regulation 26: Risk management procedures	Compliant
Regulation 27: Protection against infection	Compliant
Regulation 5: Individual assessment and personal plan	Compliant
Regulation 6: Health care	Compliant
Regulation 8: Protection	Compliant
Regulation 9: Residents' rights	Compliant