

# House Of Light Trust Limited

## Canna

### Inspection report

54 Doncaster Road  
Rotherham  
South Yorkshire  
S65 2BN  
Tel: 01709 836809

Date of inspection visit: 16 March 2015  
Date of publication: 01/05/2015

#### 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	

#### Overall summary

The inspection took place on 16 March 2015 and was unannounced. Our last scheduled inspection at this service took place in January 2014 when no breaches of legal requirements were identified.

Canna is a care home without nursing. It provides care for up to four people with learning disabilities, or autistic spectrum disorders. The home is situated close to Rotherham town centre.

The service had a registered manager in post at the time of our inspection. 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.

We spoke with staff who had a clear understanding of safeguarding adults and what action they would take if they suspected abuse. One care worker said, "If I suspected abuse I would act straight away."

# Summary of findings

Care and support was planned and delivered in a way that ensured people were safe. The support plans we looked at included risk assessments which identified any risk associated with

people's care. We saw risk assessments had been devised to help minimise and monitor the risk.

We spoke with staff and people who used the service and we found there were enough staff with the right skills, knowledge and experience to meet people's needs.

People were supported to have their assessed needs, preferences and choices met by staff who had the necessary skills and knowledge.

We found the service to be meeting the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The staff we spoke with had some knowledge of this and said they would speak to the registered manager for further advice.

People were supported to eat and drink sufficient to maintain a balanced diet. Meals were appropriately spaced throughout the day with snacks in-between. Meals were flexible to meet the needs of the people who used the service.

People were supported to maintain good health, have access to healthcare services and received ongoing healthcare support. We looked at people's records and found they had received support from healthcare professionals when required.

People who used the service were supported to maintain friendships. Support plans contained information about their circle of friends and who was important to them. We saw that people had their own interests and hobbies and took part in several activities and events on a weekly basis.

We saw staff were aware of people's needs and the best ways to support them, whilst maintaining their independence.

People's needs were assessed and care and support was planned and delivered in line with their individual support plan. The support plans were person centred and some contained pictures to assist the person to understand their plan. Support plans included healthcare, communication, personal hygiene, mobility and activities.

The service had a complaints procedure and people knew how to raise concerns. The procedure was also available in an 'easy read' version.

Staff we spoke with felt the service was well led and the registered manager was approachable and listened to them. Staff confirmed they knew their role within the organisation and the role of others. They knew what was expected of them and took accountability at their level.

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service safe?

The service was safe.

The provider had appropriate arrangements in place to manage medicines.

The service had policies and procedures in place to protect people. Staff we spoke with confirmed they had seen the policies and spoke about them in staff meetings.

Care and support was planned and delivered in a way that ensured people were safe. We saw support plans included areas of risk.

We spoke with staff and people who used the service and we found there were enough staff with the right skills, knowledge and experience to meet people's needs.

The service had robust arrangements in place for recruiting staff.

Good



### Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

People were supported to have their assessed needs, preferences and choices met by staff who had the necessary skills and knowledge.

We found the service to be meeting the requirements of the mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The staff we spoke with had some knowledge of this and said they would speak to the registered manager for further advice if needed.

People were supported to eat and drink sufficient to maintain a balanced diet.

People were supported to maintain good health, have access to healthcare services and receive ongoing healthcare support.

Good



### Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

We saw staff were aware of people's needs and the best ways to support them, whilst maintaining their independence.

People who used the service were supported to maintain friendships. Support plans contained information about their circle of friends and who was important to them.

Good



### Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

People's needs were assessed and care and support was planned and delivered in line with their individual support plan.

We saw that people had their own interests and hobbies and took part in several activities and events on a weekly basis.

Good



# Summary of findings

The service had a complaints procedure and people knew how to raise concerns. The procedure was also available in an easy read version.

## Is the service well-led?

The service was well led.

Staff we spoke with felt the service was well led and the registered manager was approachable and listened to them.

We saw various audits had taken place to make sure policies and procedures were being followed.

There was evidence that people were consulted about the service provided.

**Good**



# Canna

## 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 checked 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.

The inspection took place on the 16 March 2015 and was unannounced and the inspection team consisted of an adult social care inspector.

Before our inspection, we reviewed all the information we held about the home. We asked the provider to complete a provider information return [PIR] which helped us to prepare for the inspection. This is a document that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and any improvements they plan to make.

We spoke with the local authority and Healthwatch Rotherham to gain further information about the service. Healthwatch is an independent consumer champion that gathers and represents the views of the public about health and social care services in England.

We spoke with four people who used the service, observed care and support in communal areas and also looked at the environment. We spoke with a relative of a person who used the service.

We spoke with two care workers, and the chief executive (CEO of The House of Light Trust). The registered manager was on leave at the time of our inspection. We looked at documentation relating to people who used the service, staff and the management of the service. We looked at two people's care and support records, including the plans of their care. We saw the systems used to manage people's medication, including the storage and records kept. We also looked at the quality assurance systems to check if they were robust and identified areas for improvement.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

We spoke with all four people who used the service and they told us they were happy and felt safe.

The provider had appropriate arrangements in place to manage medicines. Medicines were delivered on a weekly basis and booked in using the Medicine Administration Record (MAR). There was a separate book to record the disposed or returned medicines to pharmacy.

Medicines were stored in line with current regulations. Medicines were kept in appropriate safe storage. The service had recently purchased a fridge to store medicines which required storage at a cool temperature. The service did not keep any controlled drugs on site, but were aware that appropriate storage would be required if they did.

We looked at the MAR sheets for the four people who used the service. We saw these records were accurate.

The service had a staff recruitment system which was robust. Pre-employment checks were obtained prior to people commencing employment. These included two references, and a satisfactory Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. The DBS checks helps employers make safer recruitment decisions in preventing unsuitable people from working with vulnerable people. This helped to reduce the risk of the registered provider employing a person who may be a risk to vulnerable adults.

We spoke with staff and people who used the service and we found there were enough staff with the right skills, knowledge and experience to meet people's needs. We found staff were available when people needed support.

There were less staff required when people were out, usually during the day on other activities and events. The service deployed staff dependent on what people wanted to do. The staff we spoke with felt there were always enough staff around and the service operated in a flexible way. We checked rotas and found the staffing levels were as determined by the provider. More staff were available to work if needed, for assisting people with activities and appointments. People we spoke with told us there were always staff around.

The service had policies and procedures in place to protect people. Staff we spoke with confirmed they had seen the policies and spoke about them in staff meetings. Staff we spoke with told us that they had received training in safeguarding vulnerable adults and this was repeated on an annual basis. The staff records we saw supported this.

We spoke with staff who had a clear understanding of safeguarding adults and what action they would take if they suspected abuse. One care worker said, "I would report anything of this nature to my manager, I know she would sort it out."

Care and support was planned and delivered in a way that ensured people were safe. The support plans we looked at included risk assessments which identified any risk associated with

people's care. We saw risk assessments had been devised to help minimise and monitor the risk. Risk assessments worked out the likelihood and consequence of the risk. Risk assessments stated the activity, the hazard and controls in place to manage the risk.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

People were supported to have their assessed needs, preferences and choices met by staff who had the necessary skills and knowledge. For instance, we spoke with staff and found they received appropriate training. Staff found the training they had was valuable and felt it gave them confidence to carry out their role effectively. One care worker said, “I get a lot out of the training sessions, there is always something I learn.”

We looked at training records and found the each staff member had a learning and development plan which was updated following their annual appraisal. The chief executive showed us a training matrix which identified training completed face to face, however training completed via e-learning was not recorded. We spoke with the chief executive about this who told us they were aware of this and were looking at how this could be recorded to ensure the registered manager was aware of when training was required to be updated.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) sets out what must be done to make sure that the human rights of people who may lack mental capacity to make decisions are protected, including balancing autonomy and protection in relation to consent or refusal of care or treatment. Staff had an awareness of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and had received training in this area. Staff were clear that when people had the mental capacity to make their own decisions, this would be respected. Staff told us they had received training in this area and the records we saw confirmed this. The service had a policy in place for monitoring and assessing if the service was working within the Act.

We found the service to be meeting the requirements of the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) are part of MCA 2005 legislation and ensures where someone may be deprived of their liberty, the least restrictive option is taken. The staff had knowledge of this and said they would talk to the registered manager for further advice if needed.

We observed staff working with people and saw they offered choices and respected people’s decisions. The person gave consent prior to the staff interacting with them.

People were supported to eat and drink sufficient to maintain a balanced diet. Meals were appropriately spaced throughout the day with snacks in-between. Meals were flexible to meet the needs of the people who used the service. We spoke with people who used the service and were told they were involved in menu planning, shopping and preparation. One person said, “I do the food shopping, it’s my job, I like it.” People told us they had a little meeting each week to decide the menu for the coming week. They made a shopping list and completed the shopping.

We observed lunch and saw choices were offered. Staff were knowledgeable about people’s likes and dislikes.

People were supported to maintain good health, have access to healthcare services and receive ongoing healthcare support. We looked at people’s records and found they had received support from healthcare professionals when required. For example, we saw involvement from chiropody, dentist and doctors. The staff we spoke with told us that people have an annual check-up with their doctor. The records we saw confirmed this.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

We spoke with people who used the service and observed care workers interacting with people.

One person said, “I am very happy here, the staff are lovely.” Another person said, “I have a key worker who knows me really well.” We spoke with a relative who said, “I am very happy with the service, my relative is happy so I am.”

We saw staff were aware of people’s needs and the best way to support them, whilst maintaining their independence. For example, one person enjoyed feeding the birds, and the service had a bird table. Staff supported the person to do this.

Another person was very chatty and staff had noted that sometimes the person got stuck while trying to explain something. Staff told us that if they say, ‘what do you think,’ it prompted the person to continue. We saw staff working with this person in this way which showed their understanding and knowledge of how to support the person.

People who used the service were supported to maintain friendships. People’s support plans contained information about their circle of friends and who was important to them. People invited their friends for tea and special occasions. People also socialised with their friends during the week at social clubs and events. It was clear that people’s families were welcome at the service at any time. This service is one of three homes owned by the House of Light Trust in the area. The people living at these three services met frequently and held coffee mornings and other social events.

We spoke with the chief executive who saw the service as part of the community and supported people to access social events which took place in the local area. The service was situated near a large park and people took part in events held there, such as the Rotherham show and Bonfire night celebrations.

The service supported people to express their views and be actively involved in making decisions about their care and support. People were involved in their support plans, which included their views and choices. Each person had a keyworker assigned to them who worked with them closely, and ensured the person received appropriate care. They also supported the person with values such as privacy, dignity, independence and choice. For example, key workers held regular meetings with the person to ensure they were happy, to reflect on previous events and to plan future ones. Staff we spoke with were keen to ensure that people made their own choice where possible and to respect the decision they had made.

We observed staff working with people and found they were supportive, caring and compassionate. Staff responded to people as they had expressed in their individual support plan. Staff were patient and offered choice, waited for a response and then proceeded with the option expressed.

We saw the service had a ‘Residents charter’ in place which had been designed by the people who used the service with support from staff. The charter was about what people wanted in their home. For example, ‘Always knock on my door and wait for a response before entering’ Other statements included that staff should have respect for people’s home and their individual space. We saw that the items in the resident’s charter were respected.



# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

People's needs were assessed and care and support was planned and delivered in line with their individual support plan. The support plans were person centred and some contained pictures to assist in the person understanding their plan. Support plans included healthcare, communication, personal hygiene, mobility and activities.

People had the opportunity to discuss their support plan, with their keyworker, on a monthly basis. This was to look at what went well over the past month and to set mini goals to achieve the following month. Staff we spoke with felt this was a good way of ensuring the person was consulted about their plan and were able to contribute.

We saw that people had their own interests and hobbies and took part in several activities and events on a weekly basis. For example, some people enjoyed football and went to the local matches, others preferred to be at home. Others took part in church events, college, and community café, and shopping. People took part in social events and celebrated occasions such as birthdays, Christmas, and Easter.

On the day of our inspection we saw people were supported to do what they wanted to do. One person had a couple of appointments to attend and staff supported the person with these, one person preferred to stay at home. Another person went out with their relative.

The service had a complaints procedure and people knew how to raise concerns. The procedure was available in an 'easy read' version. People we spoke with told us they would talk to staff if they had a worry, and felt they would sort it out. We spoke with the chief executive about concerns received. The service had not received any complaints in the last year. The chief executive showed us a book which would be used to record complaints and the outcomes.

The chief executive told us that people were asked at in house meetings if they had any concerns and were supported to discuss them. The chief executive told us that any concerns would be dealt with promptly. This ensured people were listened to.

People we spoke with told us they had no complaints but felt they could speak to staff if they had a problem. People were confident that issues would be resolved.

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

At the time of our inspection the service had a manager in post who was registered with the Care Quality Commission.

Staff we spoke with felt the service was well led and the registered manager approachable and listened to them. They felt people were involved and that their opinion counted. One care worker said, “The manager is so helpful and she listens to us and offers guidance.”

We saw various audits had taken place to make sure policies and procedures were being followed. This included an audit completed by a member of the Trust’s committee. This was last completed in January 2015. This audit included health and well-being, conduct and attitude of staff, cleanliness of the service, care plans, and records. Care and support plans were monitored by keyworkers on a monthly basis.

There was evidence that people were consulted about the service provided. We saw that house meetings took place

to discuss things such as meals, events, and concerns. We saw that their opinions about the service were sought and respected. In addition to the house meetings the service had a resident’s forum meeting. This meeting included representatives from the other two local House of Light Trust services. These meetings were used to plan holidays and events, reflect back on what went well and decide if people would like to do something again. For example, at Christmas a group of people went to Chatsworth House and the feedback was that people would like to go again next year. This will be a consideration for the service activity plan for the coming year.

We spoke with the chief executive about gaining feedback from relatives and other professionals. The chief executive told us that surveys were sent out on an annual basis and areas for action identified would be addressed. However, recent surveys had been very positive.

Staff confirmed they knew their role within the organisation and the role of others. They knew what was expected of them and took accountability at their level.