Birmingham Association For Mental Health(The)

Pershore Road Residential Care

Inspection report

807 Pershore Road
Selly Park
Birmingham
West Midlands
B29 7LR

Tel: 01214155684
Website: www.birminghammind.org

Date of inspection visit:
28 November 2018

Date of publication:
27 December 2018

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

Pershore Road is a 'care home' which provides accommodation and rehabilitative support for up to ten people with mental health conditions. There were seven people living in the home when we visited. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as single package under one contractual agreement. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The inspection took place on 28 November 2018 and was unannounced.

At our last inspection on 4 February 2016 we rated the service as overall 'good'. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

People continued to receive a safe service. Medication was well managed and people received the right medication at the right time. Appropriate action had been taken to cover recent staff absence and there were sufficient staff on duty to support people. People were encouraged to take positive risks which enabled them to feel part of the community and developed their independence.

People continued to receive an effective service. The layout of the home was designed in such a way to allow people to practice and prepare for independent living. Staff received specialist training which enabled them to provide effective support to the people using the service. People enjoyed having the opportunity to prepare food that they had chosen and prepared.

People continued to receive care from staff who were polite and respectful. People's independence had improved as a result of staff support and people told us they felt involved in decisions about their care and support.

People continued to receive a responsive service. Thorough assessments were carried out prior to people moving in to ensure placements were suitable and support was personalised depending on people's well-being and progress. People knew how to complain and had used the provider's complaints procedures to raise any concerns.

The service continued to be consistently well-led. People and staff were happy and confident with the way the service was being led. The provider was proactively using a variety of ways to ensure people were involved improving the service and had established a range of partnerships with other organisations which benefitted people.

Further information is in the detailed findings below

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 remains safe.	Good
Is the service effective? The service remains effective.	Good
Is the service caring? The service remains caring.	Good
Is the service responsive? The service remains responsive.	Good
Is the service well-led? The service remains well-led.	Good

Pershore Road Residential Care

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 comprehensive inspection took place on 28 November 2018 and was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of one inspector.

When planning our inspection, we looked at information we held about the service. This included notifications received from the provider about deaths, accidents/incidents and safeguarding alerts which they are required to send us by law. Before the inspection, the provider completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We also contacted the local authority commissioners of people's care who purchase the care on behalf of people to ask them for information about the service.

During our inspection we spoke with five of the people living at Pershore Road to get their views about the service they received. We also spoke with the registered manager, the deputy manager, two staff and three professionals who were visiting the service during our inspection visit.

We looked at a range of records. This included two people's care plans, two people's medicine records, staff recruitment records and quality assurance systems that were in place.

Good

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People told us they were happy to be living at the home and felt safe. There were processes in place to keep people safe, such as regular checks of fire safety equipment and water temperatures. Staff had received training on how to safeguard people and one member of staff we spoke to told us about how concerns are passed on to managers. We saw that there was on call system so that staff could get support from managers at any time and staff told us that this worked well.

People were supported to take positive risks and were involved in decisions about how they could help to keep themselves safe. Staff had a good understanding of the risks to people and the steps they needed to take to reduce these risks. Risk assessments were completed and updated when people's needs changed and following any incidents. Visiting professionals told us that staff sought expert advice following incidents to ensure people were kept as safe as possible. One professional told us, "Staff have picked up things and it's reassuring that we have heard about incidents." The registered manager kept records of any incidents and accidents and these were monitored to ensure people and staff could take steps to reduce the risk of potential harm. For example, additional staffing was arranged for periods when people required further support.

We saw that there were sufficient staff to keep people safe and to support people's needs. People told us that staff were available if they needed support. The registered manager told us that there had been some issues with staff absence due to illness but that all shifts had been covered. We saw that agency staff had been used but had been block booked to ensure people were supported by familiar staff. We also saw that new staff had been recruited and were going to start work once background checks had taken place. One person told us, "They do use agency staff but only regular ones."

People were supported by staff who were suitable to work in the home. Staff told us that the provider had carried out pre-employment checks before they had started work and records showed that these had been done.

Staff also told us that cleaning tasks did take a significant amount of time and reduced the time they could spend with people. The registered manager was aware of this and had already submitted a proposal to the provider to recruit cleaning staff to address this issue which was being considered at the time of the inspection. We saw that the home was clean and tidy and that staff had access to cleaning materials which helped to reduce the risk of infection to people.

People received their medication at the right time on a consistent basis. Medication records showed that doses were not missed and checks took place on a daily basis to ensure staff had completed all tasks related to medication. Some people had successfully worked towards being able to self-medicate and this process was supported by audits to ensure people continued to do this safely.

Good

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The deputy manager told us all of the people currently living in the home had capacity to consent to their care and treatment. People were supported to have choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in this way. The policies and systems in the service supported this practice. For example, people's consent was obtained before care and support was given and we saw that people were given the opportunity to make choices and go out as they wished. One person told us, "I am free to go out when I like and I have a key for the front door." The deputy manager told us that people had recently been asked to consent to information being shared between the staff team and their GP to help people keep safe.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The Act requires that, as far as possible, people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment with appropriate legal authority. In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty had the appropriate legal authority were being met.

People were supported by staff who had received training which was relevant to people's needs and conditions. Staff told us that the provider encouraged staff to complete training and that training was of good quality. Records showed that training completion rates were high and that staff had monthly supervision to develop and reflect on their practice. One member of staff told us how they felt well introduced to the people and staff through their induction process.

People told us they did their own shopping so that they could buy and cook food they liked. Some people needed support with this as part of their rehabilitation and they appreciated the support staff provided. One person told us, "I cook for myself upstairs and the staff will help. They are good at that".

People's health was monitored closely by staff. People told us they had attended appointments with a range of health professionals such as GPs and had regular visits from community mental health teams. During our visit, visiting professionals were meeting with the staff team to review one person's well-being and support and they told us they were happy with the support being provided.

People lived in a homely environment which was designed to meet their needs and promote their independence. The home had large and comfortable communal rooms on the ground floor which people could use and the upper floors were arranged in flats so that people had the opportunity to use their own kitchen and bathrooms. This design was intended to replicate the type of independent living arrangements people were hoping to move to after their placements at Pershore Road ended.

Good

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People were supported by staff who were polite and respectful and they told us that staff treated them well. Visiting professionals told us that they thought people were well looked after and cared for. One professional told us, "[Person's name] is happy here and looks well looked after." Another professional told us they had placed several people at the home and had never had any concerns.

People were involved as much as possible in making decisions about their support plans and daily routines. One person told us that they were able to express their views in regular meetings. They told us, "My CPN (Community Psychiatric Nurse) comes and visits me every two weeks and I have my say in how things are going."

People's independence and privacy was promoted and respected where possible. People were able to lock their flats and they told us staff always knocked before entering their rooms. Some of the people we spoke with were able to tell us how their independent living skills had improved as a result of the support staff had given them. One person told us, "I have got much better at cleaning and laundry, I don't need prompting anymore." Another person told us about the difference the service had made to them. They said, "I thought it was going to be a box ticking issue but it's been a good transition placement. I have my independence here but there is support all the time".

The deputy manager told us that two people had been at the home longer than the 18 months expected but that the provider had continued to offer them a placement whilst they looked for their own accommodation. One person told us, "The staff are being very honest with me about moving on and I'm not hanging round for no reason. They are helping me to have a gradual transition to independence".

People were supported to maintain contact with relatives and friends that were important to them. One person told us how they were assisted to make a weekly call to their family who live abroad. Another person told us, "My Mum and Dad are coming to see me this week."

Good

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People's needs had been thoroughly assessed on an individual basis prior to admission. The registered manager told us how important it was to assess people's suitability before a placement was offered. Care and support was delivered in line with these assessments and people's preferences and beliefs. One person told us how they had been supported to find a local butcher who could supply halal meat for them in line with their wishes. A visiting professional told us, "[Person's name] has settled very quickly which demonstrates how responsive the staff have been."

People had the opportunity to access local educational and training opportunities to further their skills and independence. This included attending local colleges and day services for voluntary work. One person told us "The staff have supported me to do things and use my skills and they have responded very quickly to this."

People told us that they were involved in reviewing and planning their support. One person told us, "It's been like a breath of fresh air here compared to other places I have lived. Staff have been really helpful and they are more than willing to listen and respond. They take action as a result of what I say". Records showed that people attended a monthly review which involved staff and external professionals.The deputy manager told us how the provider had taken steps to put in a support service for people who had just moved out of the home to ensure their transition to independence was well supported.

People knew how to raise concerns and steps had been taken to enable people to complain. For example, in the PIR, the provider had planned to install a free to use telephone for people to use and we saw that this was in place. One person told us, "There is a free phone downstairs which I can use when I want. If I wasn't happy, I could talk to my family or my GP". The provider had a complaints policy in place and records showed that people had used this to raise concerns they had. These records showed that complaints had been investigated promptly and resolved. The registered manager also kept a record of compliments that had been received. Comments from visiting professionals included 'the team are accommodating and welcoming' and 'the staff knowledge of service users is accurate'.

Good

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

There was a registered manager in post. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the CQC 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. The registered manager was fully aware of the requirement to notify us of any changes or incidents that affected people who used the service and records showed that all such notifications had been submitted.

People and staff were happy with the way the service was being led and managed. The registered manager and deputy manager were described as approachable and knowledgeable and people told us they were confident to raise concerns with them. Some staff felt that it was difficult for the registered manager as they were responsible for two different homes run by the same provider. As people's needs were becoming more complex, staff felt a manager was needed in each home.

A range of audits were in place to ensure any gaps and issues were identified. These included checks on risk assessments, medication, care plans, fire safety and the cleaning of the home. Records showed that action was taken as a result of these audits when required. Summary reports were sent to the provider to ensure they maintained an oversight of how the home was being run.

At the time of inspection, the provider was engaging with staff and people using the service to refresh its vision and values. This involved people using a scrabble board to record what certain words such as 'respect' meant to them. This was work in progress but showed that the provider was working to establish a set of values which were shared by people and staff.

The registered manager told us they were well supported by the provider and had the opportunity to keep up to date with best practice through manager network meetings. The service was working with a range of external stakeholders to ensure people received the right support and had access to training and educational opportunities.

People were involved in the development of the service through resident's meetings, as well as being involved in interviewing and selecting staff for the home. The provider had a range of forums for people to attend including a quality improvement group where representatives from each home met with senior managers to plan for improvements to the provider's services.

Registered providers are required by law to display the ratings awarded to each service. We confirmed that the rating for Pershore Road was on display in the home and on the provider's website. Showing this rating demonstrates an open and transparent culture and helps people and visitors understand the quality of the service