

Findings of CQC visit on 26th November 2014

What have CQC told us ?	What have we said we will do ?
<p>Is the service effective: Requires Improvement</p> <p>Consent to Care and treatment: <i>Peoples' rights were not always protected in line with the Mental Capacity Act 2005</i></p> <p>CQC Comments.</p> <p>There were examples where people's rights were not fully protected in line with the Mental Capacity Act 2005. For example: we saw that relatives had been asked to sign their consent for the use of bedrails for people who lacked mental capacity. There were mental capacity assessments on file but these were not specific to the decision being made and therefore did not meet with the requirements of the Act. No best interests decision was documented to demonstrate that less restrictive options for the person had been considered.</p>	<p>We have implemented the process below to ensure that we meet residents' safety requirements while working within the framework of the Mental Capacity Act.</p> <p>A separate section has now been added to care plans to show that residents who require bed rails have been consulted and fully involved with the decision making process where possible.</p> <p>Assessments had been carried out with the residents' full knowledge and each step documented; these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clinical risk assessments for the use of bed rails. ➤ Safe use of bedrail checklist. ➤ General mental capacity assessment. ➤ Specific mental capacity assessment (for those lacking capacity) ➤ Detailed risk balance tool and risk matrix tool. <p>There is a daily and monthly check on bedrails.</p>