

Kingswood Care Services Limited

The Oakes

Inspection report

55 Railway Approach
Laindon
Essex
SS15 6JX

Tel: 01268441096
Website: www.kingswoodcare.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
05 January 2017

Date of publication:
26 January 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

The Oakes provides accommodation and support for up to seven people with learning disabilities, autistic spectrum disorders or mental health needs. On the day of our inspection the service did not have any vacancies. The service does not provide nursing care.

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

The service was safe. The registered provider's recruitment procedures ensured that only suitable staff were employed. There were enough staff to help keep people safe, meet their needs and protect them from harm and abuse. Risks to people's health and wellbeing were appropriately assessed, managed and reviewed. There were safe systems in place for receiving, administering and disposing of medicines.

The service was effective. People were supported by staff that had the skills and experience needed to provide effective care. The registered manager understood their responsibilities in relation to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice. People were supported to eat and drink enough and maintain a balanced diet and to access health and social care services when required.

The service was caring. Staff knew people very well and were kind and sensitive to their needs. Staff were observed providing excellent personalised care and it was evident they clearly understood people's individual needs. Staff ensured people's privacy and dignity was respected and maintained at all times. Where people required additional support staff supported them using appropriate methods of communication for their individual needs.

The service was responsive. People were involved in the planning and review of their care and support needs. Care plans were person centred and were regularly reviewed. People were encouraged and supported by staff to pursue their interests and hobbies and activities were tailored around people's likes, choices and abilities.

The service was well-led. Staff, relatives and healthcare professionals spoke positively about the registered manager who was committed to providing an excellent person centred service; ensuring people had a good quality of life. There were systems in place to regularly assess and monitor the quality of the service provided and people living and working in the service had the opportunity to say how they felt about the home and the service it provided. The registered manager was able to demonstrate how they measured and analysed the care and support provided to people, and how this ensured that the service was operating safely and was continually improving to meet people's needs.

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

The Oakes

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. This was a comprehensive inspection which means we looked at all of the fundamental standards of care.

The inspection took place on the 5 January 2017 and was unannounced. The inspection was undertaken by one inspector.

Prior to the inspection we reviewed all the information we held about the service including statutory notifications we had received about the service. Notifications are changes, events or incidents that the provider is legally obliged to send us. We also reviewed a Provider Information Return (PIR). A PIR 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.

Some people living at the service had very complex needs and were not verbally able, or choose not to, communicate with us so we used observation as our main tool to gain insight of their experiences. We spoke with two relatives, two members of staff, the deputy manager and the registered manager. We also received feedback on the service from one healthcare professional.

We looked at a range of documents and written records including three people's care plans, risk assessments and daily records of care and support. We also looked at records which showed how the service was managed, reviewed staffing records, quality assurance information and minutes from staff and resident meetings.

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 continues to be Good.

Staff we spoke with knew what action to take if they had any concerns about people's safety and felt confident that if they needed to raise any concerns that the registered manager would take appropriate action to protect people and keep them safe. Information was available to people in accessible formats such as pictorial, to enable people to understand how to raise any concerns. 'Ask Sal' posters were also displayed within the communal areas of the service. Ask Sal is a confidential helpline for people, relatives or staff to call if they had any safeguarding concerns.

People's care plans identified individual risks to people both within the service and when accessing the local community and contained detailed management plans to mitigate any identified risks. Staff had an understanding of managing risks whilst allowing people as much independence as possible. A healthcare professional told us, "They have always impressed me over the years as safely caring for people with complex problems and all sorts of potential risks."

Systems were in place to record and monitor incidents and accidents and these were monitored by the registered manager and the registered provider. This ensured that if any trends were identified prompt action would be taken to prevent reoccurrence. Records showed that staff were trained in first aid and fire awareness and how to respond to emergencies.

There were robust recruitment procedures in place to ensure staff were of good character and suitable for their role and there were sufficient staffing levels to meet people's care and support needs safely. The registered manager told us that rotas were planned to ensure sufficient staffing levels; in exceptional cases where additional staff may be required to cover any unplanned absence such as staff sickness, the service was able to source additional staffing from the registered provider's other local services. Staff told us that they felt there were always enough members of staff on each shift. During our inspection we observed staff supporting people in a timely way and sufficient staffing levels to meet people's individual needs.

Where people were supported to take medication this was managed and administered safely. Medicines were stored safely in a locked cabinet and were administered by staff who had received appropriate training. Records showed that the deputy manager checked medicines on a weekly basis to ensure people had received their prescribed medication safely.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

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

Staff had received appropriate training and support to meet the needs of people. Although records showed that not all staff had received supervision in line with the registered provider's policy, all the staff we spoke with told us that they felt very much supported by the registered manager. We discussed the absence of formal supervision with the registered manager who told us this had lapsed and that they would be working with the deputy manager to ensure all staff received formal structured supervision.

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 2005 (MCA). The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

We checked whether staff were working within the principles of the MCA and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty were being met. Staff understood the importance of consent and explained to us how they gained people's consent to their care and helped people to make choices on a day to day basis. People's mental capacity had been assessed and any decisions were made in their best interests in the least restrictive way in line with legislation. Where people had been deprived of their liberty appropriate applications had been made to the 'Supervisory Body' for a DoLS authorisation.

People were supported to eat and drink enough and maintain a balanced healthy diet. People were able to choose what food they wanted and a pictorial menu was displayed in the kitchen. Care plans noted people's food dislikes and likes.

People were supported to access healthcare services as required such as psychiatrists, GPs, opticians and dentists. The outcome of health appointments were recorded within people's care plans so that staff knew what action to take. Care records demonstrated the service worked effectively with health and social care services to help ensure people's care needs were met.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection we found people were as happy living at the service as they had been during our previous inspection. The rating continues to be Good.

Staff provided a caring and supportive environment for people who lived at the service. Many staff had worked at the service for a number of years which enabled positive relationships to develop. One relative told us, "Staff are very caring." Another said, "We come here a lot, they have freedom here it's not institutionalised, it's a very happy home. The staff know [name] and what they want." During our inspection we observed warm interactions between people and staff and it was clear that staff knew people very well.

People were involved in making decisions about their care and support. Information was provided, to them in accessible formats to help them to understand and make decisions about the care available to them. Where appropriate people, their relatives and/or advocates had been involved in the development and review of their care. Care plans were person centred and contained detailed information about people's likes, dislikes and preferences in regard to all areas of their care including cultural and religious beliefs; all the staff we spoke with were able to demonstrate a good knowledge of how people wished to be supported.

People's privacy and dignity was respected. Staff demonstrated a good understanding of privacy and dignity and described how they protected and respected people's dignity such as knocking on people's doors before entering their rooms and helping people to maintain their personal appearance. People's bedroom doors had locks on them should people wish to have privacy.

Throughout our inspection we saw that people and staff were relaxed in each other's company. There was free flowing conversation and exchanges about people's wellbeing and how they planned to spend their day. People were addressed by their preferred names and staff interacted with people in a kind and compassionate way and took time to listen closely to what people were saying to them. A healthcare professional told us, "It is a caring home with a lovely atmosphere."

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.

Each person had a care plan that was tailored to meet their individual needs such as personal care preferences, specialised care needs, and any cultural or spiritual needs and wants. Care plans were reviewed regularly.

The service actively encouraged and supported people to follow their interests and hobbies and to access their links with the local community. Although all staff knew people well and how they liked to spend their time, the registered manager told us staff were 'matched' with people who shared the same interests and that the service was flexible to enable people to do the things they wanted when they wished. Throughout our inspection we observed people engaging in the activities they wanted to do including accessing the local community.

The registered manager demonstrated to us how the service ensured people could have a good quality of life and described how they worked with other agencies to achieve this. This was confirmed by a healthcare professional who told us that the service had worked extremely well with people who had been discharged from in patient units. They went on to say, "I am particularly impressed that they have managed [person] in a very person-centred way, which I am sure has kept them out of trouble and given them a quality of life they couldn't otherwise have had."

The service had a policy in place for dealing with complaints and this was clearly displayed at the service and was accessible in different formats. The service had received no formal complaints in the last 12 months. Relatives we spoke with told us that the registered manager was approachable and operated an 'open door' policy and felt confident that they would deal appropriately with any concerns.

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.

The registered manager had worked for the registered provider for several years. 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 supported by a deputy manager who had worked at the service for 13 years. At the time of our inspection they had been promoted to the post of deputy manager for three days. Both managers were visible within the service and demonstrated their commitment and passion to ensure people received good quality care.

The registered manager's vision and values were fully embraced by staff who were committed to ensuring people had the best quality of life. Staff, relatives and healthcare professionals we spoke with told us they felt the service was well-led and put people at the forefront. One staff member said, "[Name of registered manager] is very caring and is there for the residents ensuring they have a good quality of life. He is not risk adverse and is always open to trying new things out and sometimes this works out brilliantly resulting in positive outcomes for our residents." A healthcare professional told us, "I think staff do a great job and go the extra mile. [The service] is brilliantly led, with innovation and thinking outside of the box."

Staff told us they felt supported and valued and enjoyed working at the service. Staff told us that the registered manager operated an 'open door' policy and that they were always available day or night for support and guidance. Comments included, "This is a nice place to work, and both the provider and [name of registered manager] are always approachable and supportive." And, "I come here every day for the service users they put a smile on my face when I come in and when I go home; it's not like working in a care home, we are like a family."

Regular staff meetings were held and topics such as updates on people living at the service, training, activities and the day to day running of the service were discussed. Staff told us that they were able to openly discuss any concerns and suggestions for improvements to the service. This showed us that staff had the opportunity to be involved in how the service was run.

The registered manager actively sought the views of people who used the service. This was done in a number of ways such as daily interactions with people, resident meetings and questionnaires. People's feedback was taken into account to improve the quality of the service.

There were systems in place to monitor the quality and safety of the service. The registered manager was committed to delivering a high standard of care to people and carried out regular checks and audits such as health and safety, medication and the fire system to ensure people's health and welfare. The registered provider also visited the service regularly to undertake quality assurance checks. This demonstrated that the

registered provider had a quality assurance programme in place which was effectively monitored.