



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

## Issued by the Chief Inspector

Name of designated centre:	31 Ormond Road Residential Service
Name of provider:	ChildVision Company Limited by Guarantee
Address of centre:	Dublin 9
Type of inspection:	Announced
Date of inspection:	07 October 2020
Centre ID:	OSV-0002095
Fieldwork ID:	MON-0030462

## About the designated centre

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

This is a residential house providing care, support, education and life long learning opportunities for four young adults with visual impairment, who prefer to be called students rather than residents. The centre is situated in a vibrant community in north county Dublin and within easy reach of the city centre. The house is available to the students from Sunday evening to Friday morning and each weekend, all students go home. The house is a two storey dwelling and each student has their own private bedroom. There is a large fully furnished sitting room, a computer room, a large kitchen/dining area and a separate utility facility. There are also adequate bathrooms facilities on both floors of the house. To the front of the property there is a small private garden area, with adequate on street parking and to the rear there is a large garden area available to the residents. Systems are in place to ensure each student can avail of learning and educational opportunities so as to reach their full potential and support/maintain their independence. Students are also supported to use their community such as local shops, restaurants, and hotels. The house is staffed by a full time person in charge who is a qualified social care professional and a team of qualified social care workers.

**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 - 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
Wednesday 7 October 2020	11:30hrs to 16:30hrs	Raymond Lynch	Lead

## What residents told us and what inspectors observed

The inspector met and spoke with one student so as to get their feedback on the service provided. Written feedback on the service from family members was also reviewed by the inspector.

The student spoken with by the inspector reported that they were very happy in the house, staff were very nice and they have never had any complaints about the service. The student also reported that they made their own choices about what activities to engage in such as going for a meal out and staff were respectful and supportive of this. They also informed the inspector that they had recently started a new college course and so far, were enjoying it. They also liked to engage in other skills development programmes and social activities such as engaging in contract work in the life long learning centre, making soaps, learning and developing IT skills and horticulture.

A sample of written feedback from family members about the service was also viewed by the inspector. Family members reported that they were very satisfied with the service overall, it was safe for their loved ones, it was welcoming and was like a home away from home. They were also very satisfied with the educational provisions provided to the students and reported that the staff team were exceptionally helpful, supportive, friendly, dedicated and reliable.

The house was centred around meeting the assessed needs of the students and opportunities for self development, life long learning and on-going education formed part of the service provided. Staff were observed to know the needs of each student very well and towards the end of the inspection process, the inspector observed that students were very much at ease in the company and presence of staff and staff were respectful, warm, caring and professional in their interactions with the students.

## Capacity and capability

The students appeared very happy and content in this service and the provider ensured that appropriate supports and resources were in place to meet their assessed needs. 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 was respectful and supportive their rights, autonomy, choice 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 her 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 her team. She ensured that resources were channelled appropriately which meant that the individual and assessed needs of the students were being provided for. She 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 were bringing about positive changes to the operational management of the service. For example, an audit in September 2020 identified that one aspect of the recording of a medical log required review. While this was a minor issue, the person in charge had ensured it had been addressed in a timely manner

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 about their care plans and one student reported that they were very happy with the service provided.

Overall, from spending time with and speaking directly to one of the students, from viewing written feedback on the service provided from family members 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 needs of the students in a competent and effective manner. One student reported that they were very happy with the service and 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

## Quality and safety

The students were supported to have meaningful and active lives within the service and within their community. The quality and safety of care provided to them was being monitored and was found to be person centred and effective in meeting their social, educational and life long learning needs. The issue related to the fire doors as found on the last inspection of the service had been addressed.

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. 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. Their educational needs were also being provided for and some were attending college undertaking accredited third level programmes of study of their choosing. Students were also facilitated to access local community based amenities such as shops, restaurants and hotels.

For the most part, the students healthcare needs were provided for by their families. However, access to GP service could be provided for, each student had a medical care plan in place and the service had as required advice and support from a qualified nurse.

One student reported to the inspector that they felt safe in the house and could speak to a staff member at any time if they had any concerns. They also had access to independent advocacy services and said that they had no complaints whatsoever about the service. From a small sample of training documents viewed, staff also had training in safeguarding of vulnerable adults and from speaking with one staff member, the inspector was assured that they had the confidence, 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 and were directly consulted with about opportunities for life long learning, third level education and skills development training.

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

### 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

For the most part, the students healthcare needs were provided for by their families. However, access to GP service could be provided for, each student had a medical care plan in place and the service had as required advice and support from a qualified nurse.

Judgment: Compliant

## Regulation 8: Protection

The one student spoken with as part of this inspection reported to the inspector that they felt safe in the house and could speak to a staff member at any time if they had any concerns. They also had access to independent advocacy services and said that they had no complaints whatsoever about the service. From a small sample of training documents viewed, staff had training in safeguarding of vulnerable adults and from speaking with one staff member, the inspector was assured that they had the confidence, 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), chose what social activities to engage in and were directly consulted with about opportunities for life long learning, third level education and skills development training.

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
<b>Capacity and capability</b>	
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
<b>Quality and safety</b>	
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