

Paradise Lodge Care Home Limited

Willow Tree Lodge

Inspection report

133 Chignal Road
Chelmsford
Essex
CM1 2JD

Tel: 01245355434
Website: www.caringfuture.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
23 May 2017
31 May 2017

Date of publication:
03 July 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service effective?

Good ●

Is the service caring?

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Willow Tree Lodge provides accommodation and personal care for up to three people who have a learning disability and may also have mental health needs. On the day of our inspection there were 3 people living in the service.

When we last visited the service it was rated good.

At this inspection we found the service remained good.

People were safe because staff supported them to understand how to keep safe and staff knew how to manage risk effectively. There were sufficient numbers of care staff on shift with the correct skills and knowledge to keep people safe. There were appropriate arrangements in place for medicines to be stored and administered safely.

The Care Quality Commission is required by law to monitor how a provider applies the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) and to report on what we find. DoLS are in place to protect people where they do not have capacity to make decisions and where it is considered necessary to restrict their freedom in some way. Management and staff understood their responsibility in this area. Staff were committed to ensuring all decisions were made in people's best interest.

Staff had good relationships with people who used the service and were attentive to their needs. People's privacy and dignity was respected at all times. People and their relatives were involved in making decisions about their care and support.

Care plans were individual and contained information about how people preferred to communicate and their ability to make decisions.

People were encouraged to take part in activities that they enjoyed, and were supported to keep in contact with family members. When needed, they were supported to see health professionals and referrals were put through to ensure they had the appropriate care and treatment.

Relatives and staff were complimentary about the management of the service. Staff understood their roles and responsibilities in providing safe and good quality care to the people who used the service.

The management team had systems in place to monitor the quality and safety of the service provided.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Good ●

The service remains good

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains good

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains good

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains good

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains good

Willow Tree Lodge

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

This inspection took place on 23 May 2017 and 31 May 2017 and was unannounced, and was completed by one inspector. We reviewed the information we held about the service including safeguarding alerts and statutory notifications which related to the service. A notification is information about important events which the provider is required to send us by law.

We visited on the 23 May 2017 and met with the deputy manager who showed us around the home and informed us that the people who lived in the service were away on their annual holiday with the registered manager. We therefore revisited on the 31 May 2017 to meet with people who lived in the service.

During the inspection we spoke with three people who used the service, we also observed staff interactions with people. We spoke with two staff. We also spoke with the registered manager, deputy manager and the provider.

Following the inspection we made telephone calls to relatives and professionals for feedback about the service. We reviewed two people's care records, three medication administration records (MAR) and a selection of documents about how the service was managed. These included, staff recruitment files, induction, and training schedules and training plan.

We also looked at the service's arrangements for the management of medicines, complaints and compliments information, safeguarding alerts and quality monitoring and audit information.

For a more comprehensive report regarding this service, please refer to the report of our last visit which was published on 30 January 2015.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At this inspection we found the same level of protection from abuse and harm and risks to people's safety as at the previous inspection and the rating remains good.

People and their relatives told us they felt the service was a safe place. Comments included, "I am safe here definitely the staff see to that" and "All of the staff know how to work with [relative] and keep [relative] out of harm's way we never have to worry."

Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse and they understood their responsibility to report any concerns to senior staff and, if necessary, to the relevant external agencies.

The provider had systems in place for assessing and managing risks. People's care records contained risk assessments which identified risks and what support was needed to reduce and manage the risk. The staff team gave examples of specific areas of risk for people and explained how they had worked with the individuals to help them understand the risks. For example, when out in the community, or accessing the kitchen. Staff worked with people to manage a range of risks effectively.

We saw records which showed that equipment at this service, such as the fire system and the vehicles, was checked regularly and maintained. Appropriate plans were in place in case of emergencies, for example evacuation procedures in the event of a fire. We were confident that people would know what to do in the case of an emergency situation.

The manager told us how staffing levels were assessed and organised flexibly. This was to enable people to have their assessed daily living needs as well as their individual needs for social and leisure opportunities to be met. People, relatives and staff told us there was enough staff to meet people's needs and to keep people safe. There was a 24-hour on-call support system in place which provided support for staff in the event of an emergency.

Medicines were properly managed by staff. The service had procedures in place for receiving and returning medicines safely. Audits were carried out to ensure safe management of medicines.

Recruitment processes were robust. Staff employment records showed all the required checks had been completed prior to staff commencing employment. These included a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check, which is to check that staff being recruited, is not barred from working with people who require care and support, and previous employment references. Details of any previous work experience and qualifications were also clearly recorded. New staff received an induction before starting to work with people.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At this inspection people continued to be supported by staff that were trained and effective in their role. The rating remains good.

People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). We found people were being supported appropriately, in line with the law and guidance.

Staff told us they received the training and support they needed to do their job well. We looked at the staff training and monitoring records which confirmed this. Staff had received training in a range of areas which included; safeguarding, medication and communication. Staff told us that they were supported with regular supervisions and that their professional development was discussed as well as any training requirements. The managers and team leaders of each service carried out observations whilst on shift, to ensure staff were competent in putting any training they had done into practice.

People and their relatives told us the staff met their individual needs and that they were happy with the care provided. Relatives told us, "The staff know [relative] very well they know what they are doing, they are a consistent staff team and all work in a consistent way that is what [relative] needs to keep him happy", and "The staff understand [relative] and provide him with the opportunities to make decisions and choices."

People were complimentary about the food. They told us they had a choice of what to eat and we were shown menu plans. The menu plans were also in pictorial format to enable everyone to have an informed choice of what they wanted to eat. On a Sunday people were supported by staff to choose the menu for the following week. One person told us, "I choose what I want to eat."

People's care records showed their day to day health needs were being met and they had access to healthcare professionals according to their individual needs. For example, psychiatrists, speech and language therapists, chiropodist, dentist and GP's. Referrals had been made when required. Details of appointments and the outcomes were documented in people's care plans. We saw that people's health needs were reviewed on a regular basis.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection we found people were still happy with the service provided to them and the rating remains good. People and their relatives told us staff were caring towards them and always treated them with dignity and respect this was evident in our observations. We observed lots of laughter and humour. People were relaxed and happy when interacting with staff. One relative told us, "To see the difference in [relative] is brilliant he has grown in confidence." Staff told us, "It has been so rewarding watching the guys grow in confidence [name of person] wouldn't take part in activities to begin with now they have enrolled themselves in a maths course."

People's choice as to how they lived their daily lives had been assessed and positive risk taking had been explored. People told us how they had been supported to go on holiday to places of their choosing. They also expressed how staff supported them to do the things they wanted to do and when they wanted to them therefore, respecting their individual choices.

People told us they had visits from family and this was confirmed by the relatives we spoke with one relative told us, "We visit once a week and are always made to feel welcome by the staff."

Staff told us that each person's keyworker supported them maintain contact with their family and friends and this included supporting them to buy presents and cards for special occasions as well as keeping their care plan updated. One relative told us, "The staff have been great in supporting [name] to buy presents for his nieces and nephews and to send cards."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At this inspection we found staff were as responsive to people's needs and concerns as they were during the previous inspection. The rating continues to be good.

People led busy social life's this was evident from our discussions with them. Each person did a variety of different activities during their week including weekends. One person told us, "I like to be busy so I don't have too much time to think about negative things, I go to church every week it is very important to me and I have a lot of friends there." Staff told us that one person went to a pottery class; we saw that they had displayed the items they had made in their bedroom. Another person told us they had recently been on holiday to Skegness which is where they were born and had been a personal goal to re visit. One relative told us, "[name] is always so busy out and about; he even has his own passport now, he has a life to see the difference is amazing."

People's relatives confirmed they were invited to meetings and reviews on a regular basis and kept informed of any changes that were being made. The service was responsive to people's changing needs and people's preferences were taken into account so that they received personalised care. We saw that people had a 'characteristics document' in their support plan which clearly described the person's needs likes and dislikes. People had a designated member of staff known as a keyworker, who was responsible for supporting that person to understand their care plan and the keyworker reviewed the plan on a monthly basis highlighting any changes which was then actioned by management.

The service had a robust and clear complaints procedure, which was displayed in the home in a format that people could read and understand. People told us they had no complaints but would feel able to raise any concerns with the manager or staff. The manager confirmed that the service was not dealing with any complaints at the time of our inspection. People and relatives confirmed this and told us that they had a good relationship with the provider, manager and staff and could speak to them about any concerns and things were dealt with immediately.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At this inspection we found the service was as well-led as we had found during the previous inspection. The rating continues to be good.

There was a registered manager in place. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

Staff told us the service was well organised and they enjoyed working there they said the manager had a visible presence within the home and in the daily running of the home. They knew the people they supported and regularly worked alongside staff. They also told us that they were treated fairly, listened to and that they could approach them at any time if they had a problem.

The service carried out a range of audits to monitor the quality of the service. Records relating to auditing and monitoring the service were clearly recorded. We looked at records related to the running of the service and found that the provider had a process in place for monitoring and improving the quality of the care that people received. Surveys had been completed on annual basis by people living in the service and their relatives.

The service was in the process of adding additional bedrooms as well as a large downstairs extension which was almost completed. The manager and staff told us things had been difficult with the building works taking place however, the provider had been fully supportive and kept them informed of each stage of development. Relatives we spoke with also confirmed the provider had kept them fully informed of the proposed changes to the building.

Regular meetings took place with the registered manager and the people that lived in the service to talk about any concerns or problems as well as anything they would like to do in the forthcoming month. This information was then cascaded to staff at regular staff meetings. The registered manager also had monthly management meetings with the provider it was evident from our discussions with the staff and management team that everyone had the upmost respect for each other and worked as a team to provide in order to meet the needs of the people that lived in the service.