

R.Hart Care Limited

Hart View

Inspection report

4 Valkyrie Road
Westcliff On Sea
Essex
SS0 8BU

Tel: 01702433330
Website: www.hartcarelimited.com

Date of inspection visit:
26 June 2017

Date of publication:
12 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

We inspected Hart View on the 26 June 2017.

The service provides accommodation and support for up to eight people with mental health issues. There were eight people living at the service at the time of our inspection.

At our last inspection the service was rated as Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

The service was safe. Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that was intended to ensure people's safety and welfare. People were cared for safely by staff who had been recruited and employed after appropriate checks had been completed. People's needs were met by sufficient numbers of staff. Medication was dispensed by staff who had received training to do so.

The service was effective. People were cared for and supported by staff who had received training to support people to meet their needs. The registered manager had a good understanding of their responsibilities in relation to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. People were supported to eat and drink enough as to ensure they maintained a balanced diet and referrals to other health professionals were made when required.

The service was caring. Staff cared for people in an empathetic and kind manner. Staff had a good understanding of people's preferences of care. Staff always worked hard to promote people's independence through encouraging and supporting people to make informed choices.

The service was responsive. People and their relatives were involved in the planning and review of their care. Care plans were reviewed on a regular basis and also when there was a change in care needs. People were supported to follow their interests and participate in social activities. The registered manager responded to complaints received in a timely manner.

The service was well-led. The service had systems in place to monitor and provide good care and these were reviewed on a regular basis.

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.

Hart View

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 the 26 June 2017 and was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of one inspector.

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 reviewed previous reports and notifications that are held on the CQC database. Notifications are important events that the service has to let the CQC know about by law. We also reviewed safeguarding alerts and information received from a local authority.

During our inspection we spoke with four people, the registered manager, deputy manager and a care worker. We reviewed two care files, three staff recruitment files and their support records, audits and policies held at the service. □

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At this inspection we found the same level of protection from abuse, harm and risks as at the previous inspection and the rating continues to be Good.

People told us that they felt safe living at the service, one person said, "I like living here, its lovely the staff help you." Another person said, "I feel safe living here, it is relaxed not stressful and if I am anxious in the night I can get up and sit with staff."

Staff knew how to keep people safe and protect them from safeguarding concerns. Staff were trained and able to identify how people may be at risk of harm or abuse and what they could do to protect them. In addition staff were aware that the service had a safeguarding policy to follow and a 'whistle-blowing' policy. One member of staff said, "I would raise any safeguarding with the managers or if it was about them I would ring the safeguarding team." The registered manager displayed information for staff and people to follow if they had a safeguarding concern and kept an information folder in the main communal area for people to access with information on safeguarding. In addition the registered manager worked jointly with the local Police force to ensure they had the information they needed to support people should they display high risk behaviours such as not returning to the service when out on community leave.

Staff recruited were suitable for the role they were employed for and the provider had a robust process in place. Files contained records of interviews, appropriate references, proof of identity and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. This check ensured staff were suitable to work with vulnerable people. Staff told us that there were enough staff working to ensure people had all the support they needed including accessing the community and external appointments.

Staff had the information they needed to support people safely. Staff undertook risk assessments to keep people safe. These assessments identified how people could be supported to maintain their independence. The assessment covered access to the kitchen and using appliances, medication management, environmental risks and challenging behaviour. Risk management processes were intended to enable people to continue to enjoy things that they wanted to do rather than being restrictive. Staff demonstrated a good awareness of areas of risk for individuals and told us how people were supported to manage the risks. Staff were trained in first aid and if there was a medical emergency they would call the emergency services. Staff also received training on how to respond to fire alerts at the service.

People were cared for in a safe environment. The registered manager ensured there were regular risk assessments and audits completed of the premises and had an emergency contingency plan in place should there be an event that affected the running of the service. For day to day repairs and refurbishment the registered manager followed the provider's system to request this is done by a maintenance person. The deputy manager told us that a number of areas had been redecorated at the service. Carpets were renewed in people's rooms and they were redecorated for each new person moving into the service. One person told us, "I was asked if I wanted my room painted but I liked the colours already as they matched my belongings."

People received their medication safely and as prescribed. The service had effective systems for the ordering, booking in, storing and disposing of medicines. Medication administration records were in good order. Medication was stored safely and securely. Staff who had received training in medication administration dispensed the medication to people. People were encouraged to manage their own medication and to work towards taking their medication independently, this included taking responsibility for collecting their own prescriptions and taking these to the chemist. People told us that they were supported to take their medication regularly and when they needed them. One person showed us that they had their own medication and that this was kept in a locked drawer in their room. Another person told us, "I collect my prescription from the GP when I go, I am working towards managing my own tablets ready for when I leave here."

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At this inspection, we found staff had the same level of skill, experience and support to enable them to meet people's needs effectively, as we found at our previous inspection. People continued to have freedom of choice and were supported with their dietary and health needs. The rating continues to be Good.

The registered manager ensured staff had the correct training and skills to perform their roles. New staff had a full induction to the service and were enrolled into completing the Care Certificate. This enabled staff that were new to care to gain the knowledge and skills they needed to support them within their role. The registered manager used a mixture of training with staff which included face to face training from outside instructors and on-line training. One member of staff said, "I am doing a mental health awareness course this has really helped me understand different conditions." People told us that they felt staff had the correct training to do their job. One person said, "The staff have really done a lot of research into my condition and how best to help me. They have also come up with different prompts to remind staff how to help me. I have really appreciated how much they have done to support me."

Staff told us that they had been supported to achieve nationally recognised qualifications. In addition staff said that they had regular opportunities to reflect on their practice and to discuss the running of the service during staff meetings, supervision sessions and yearly appraisals.

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 Mental Capacity Act (MCA). The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Staff knew how to support people in making decisions and how people's ability to make informed decisions can change and fluctuate from time to time. The service took the required action to protect people's rights and ensure people received the care and support they needed. Staff had received training in MCA and DoLS, and had a good understanding of the Act. Currently people living at the service all had capacity and staff supported them with the decisions they made even when these may be considered unwise. For example staff were trying to support people with healthy eating and making good choices around food and exercise, but respected at times people chose not to follow their guidance.

People had enough to eat and drink. Staff supported people to plan their weekly food menus and to budget their spending on food. Each week people had money allocated to them to buy the food they wished to eat, people would then either go shopping independently or with staff support. One person said, "I have just been shopping staff come with me as I find it difficult to carry the bags." People took it in turns to access the kitchen to make their food and, if people required support with cooking, staff were available to help them. One person said, "When I first came here I could not cook at all and had to ask for staff help all the time now I have learnt to cook two or three things such as spaghetti bolognese on my own." Throughout the inspection we saw people making their food and drinks independently.

People had access to healthcare as required. The registered manager supported people to attend out-patient appointments and to register with the local GP. The registered manager maintained good contact with people's care teams including their consultant psychiatrists and community mental health nurses and liaised closely with them to ensure people had all the supported they needed to remain living in the community. People were also supported to access the dentist and optician in the community when needed.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection people remained happy living at the service, they continued to be very complimentary of the staff and felt cared for. The rating continues to be Good.

During our observations we saw staff had positive interactions with people. The service had a very calm and relaxed environment. We saw people and staff engaged in frequent conversations about their day and what their plans were. One person told us, "The staff are very good, they are not judgemental even when I self-harm they understand and help me to feel better about myself." Another person said, "All the staff have big hearts here, they are very understanding."

People felt supported at the service. People told us how they had key workers who worked with them to ensure all their needs were met. One person said, "My keyworker has been really supportive in trying to find me my own home, they have come to all the meetings with me and to see different places." Another person said, "My key worker has really been supportive in helping me to manage my flashbacks and have helped other staff understand the grounding techniques I use."

Staff treated people with dignity and respect and supported them in spending their time in the way they chose. Staff encouraged people to be as independent as possible whilst supporting them with their preferences on how they wished to spend their time. Staff encouraged a sense of community at the service and every Sunday people sat down together to enjoy a meal. People told us that their privacy was respected. One person said, "I have my own key to my room and I can lock the door."

People's diverse needs were respected. The registered manager supported people to follow the life style they chose this included following their religious preferences. The service promoted the use of advocates for people to help them with independent support when making decisions about their care or finances. People were supported and encouraged to maintain relationships with their friends and family, this included supporting trips home and into the community.

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 remains Good.

People continued to receive care that was individual and personalised to their needs. The registered manager ensured people had a thorough assessment before they came to live at the service to ensure their needs could be met. Each person had an allocated key worker and an individual personalised support plan was developed and regularly reviewed with the person to ensure their needs continued to be met. In addition the deputy manager told us people and their relatives were encouraged to spend time at the service to see if it was suitable and if they would like to live there. One person said, "I came to look around and I was very excited to move in. It is the first time I have lived on my own without my family."

The service continued to be responsive to people's changing needs. People's care needs were kept under constant review and adjusted as required. The registered manager has developed good working relationships with people's care teams to ensure their needs are met. In addition the service made adjustments to the service in response to people's needs. For example one person needed their shower room to be adjusted for their changing physical needs.

People were encouraged to follow their own interests and hobbies. The deputy manager told us that they had an activity person to assist people with social and well-being activities. One person told us, "I am very independent and tend to go out for most of the day to different groups or to a local café to meet my friends." The deputy manager told us that people were supported to make links with local clubs and colleges to follow their interests. People were also supported to travel to places that interested them such as day trips to London with staff.

The service had a robust complaints process in place that was accessible and any complaints were dealt with effectively. The service also received compliments, one from a relative read, 'I take the opportunity to thank everyone at Hart View for all the good work being done'.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At this inspection we found staff were as well led as at the previous inspection. The rating remains Good.

The service had a registered manager. 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.

The registered manager was very visible within the service. Staff shared the registered manager's vision for the service. One member of staff told us, "We want them to move on and be independent."

Staff felt supported at the service. One member of staff said, "Support here is really good. We have a really good team here." Staff had regular meetings with the registered manager to discuss the running of the service and any ideas they may have. We noted that the meetings were also used as an opportunity for the registered manager to share training and learning with staff; for example in one meeting the manager discussed with staff how to support people who had 'flashbacks'. Staff told us that they felt they worked well together as a team and that they communicated well together to ensure everyone was kept up to date with people's care needs.

People's opinions were sought within the service. We saw the registered manager held regular meetings with people and sought their opinions on activities and the running of the service. In addition the provider sent out questionnaires to gain feedback on the service. The deputy manager told us that they speak with people all the time due to the small nature of the service. In addition key workers had 1:1 meetings with people to gain their feedback and provide any support they needed. People told us that they felt their opinions mattered to staff and that they were listened to.

The registered manager had a number of quality monitoring systems in place to continually review and improve the quality of the service provided to people. They carried out regular audits on health and safety, infection control and care records and this information was used as appropriate to continually improve the care people received.