

Mark Jonathan Gilbert and Luke William Gilbert

Dovecote Manor

Inspection report

13-15 Alexandra Road
Southport
Merseyside
PR9 0NB

Tel: 01704500412
Website: www.dovehavencarehomes.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
29 April 2019
30 April 2019

Date of publication:
11 June 2019

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

About the service:

Dovecote Manor provides accommodation, personal care and support for up to 30 older people. There were 25 people accommodated at the time of the inspection.

People's experience of using this service:

There was a positive atmosphere in the home which we found to be homily and well run. People living in the home interacted freely and staff were seen to be caring and supportive.

The assessment and planning of people's care was individualised. We found care records that supported people were completed and reviewed with the person's input.

Systems were in place to monitor medication so that people received their medicines safely.

We were given positive feedback from the people we spoke with who were living at Dovecote Manor. They told us they enjoyed living at the home and their quality of life was good. People said they were well cared for. People were listened to and had the support they needed to express their needs and wishes. People could make decisions and choices.

All the people we spoke with told us they felt safe and well supported. One person said, "The staff are excellent – efficient, considerate, knowledgeable and patient." Another person commented, "The staff are very good and look after you well."

The home was staffed appropriately and consistently. Staff could explain each person's care needs and how they communicated these needs. People told us that staff had the skills and approach needed to ensure they were receiving the right care.

Care was organised, so any risks were assessed and plans put in place to maximise people's independence whilst help ensure people's safety.

The staff we spoke with described how they would recognise abuse and the action they would take to ensure actual or potential harm was reported.

Arrangements were in place for checking the environment to ensure it was safe. We found the environment safe and well maintained.

Staff sought consent from people before providing support. When people were unable to consent, the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 were followed.

We saw people's dietary needs were managed with reference to individual needs and choice. Meal times

provided a good social occasion.

The registered manager could evidence a series of quality assurance processes and audits carried out internally and externally by staff and from visiting senior managers for the provider. These were effective in managing the home and were based on getting feedback from the people living there.

Rating at last inspection:

This service had previously been inspected in November 2016 and rated as good. The report was published on 21 December 2016.

Why we inspected:

This was a planned comprehensive inspection. There were no previous concerns about the service. The service continued to be rated as providing Good care.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

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 continued to be safe.
Details are in our Safe findings below.

Good ●

Is the service effective?

The service was Effective.
Details are in our Effective findings below.

Good ●

Is the service caring?

The service continued to be caring.
Details are in our Caring findings below.

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

The service continued to be Responsive.
Details are in our Responsive findings below.

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

The service continued to be Well led.
Details are in our Well led findings below.

Good ●

Dovecote Manor

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The 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.

Inspection team:

The inspection was undertaken by an adult social care inspector and an Expert by Experience. An Expert by Experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

Service and service type:

Dovecote Manor is a 'care home'. 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 service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.'

Notice of inspection:

This was an unannounced inspection which took place over two days on 29 and 30 April 2019.

What we did:

Our planning considered information the provider sent us since the last inspection. We also considered information about incidents the provider must notify us about, such as abuse or other concerns. We obtained information from the local authority commissioners and safeguarding team and other professionals who work with the service.

We assessed the Provider Information Return [PIR] which is information we require providers to send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We used all this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection, we spoke with eight people using the service and two family members to ask about their experience of care. We also spoke with the registered manager and five members of staff. We received feedback from a visiting professional.

We looked at four people's care records and a selection of other records including quality monitoring records, training records, staff records and records of checks carried out on the premises and equipment.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm

People continued to be safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse; assessing risk, safety monitoring and management:

- People receiving support and family members told us they felt the service was safe. People told us they enjoyed living at the home and felt supported by staff. One person told us, "I do feel safe here and the staff are part of it – they're lovely. I feel safe in their hands and I can talk to any of them." Another person commented, "I could talk to the staff if I was worried about anything."
- Individual risks to people and the environment had been assessed and were managed appropriately. Care records provided information around identified risks for staff to keep people safe from avoidable harm. There were regular checks made around environmental risk such as fire safety.
- Staff had received safeguarding training and had access to relevant information and guidance when required. Staff understood what was meant by abuse and they were confident about how to report safeguarding concerns.

Using medicines safely:

- Medicines were managed safely by suitably trained staff. People got their medicines at the right time and medicines were reviewed ongoing.

Preventing and controlling infection:

- Staff had received training around preventing and controlling infection and access to relevant guidance and information. Routine cleaning was carried out and the home was seen to be clean and hygienic.

Staffing and Recruitment:

- Sufficient numbers of suitably qualified and trained staff were deployed to meet people's needs.
- People were supported by the same staff who they were familiar with and who had a good understanding of how to meet their needs and keep them safe.
- The provider had a recruitment policy that helped ensure staff were recruited appropriately and were safe to work with vulnerable people. More recently, people living at Dovecote had been consulted and included in the recruitment process.

Learning lessons when things go wrong:

- The service kept a record of any incidents or accidents that occurred. Individual accident / incident records contained good detail and a review of risk had been carried out, with the person's care plan updated to reduce any further risk. There were good management processes to identify any patterns or trends if incidents occurred.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence.

People's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes, promoted a good quality of life and was based on best available evidence. People's outcomes were consistently good, and feedback we were given confirmed this.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience:

- At the last inspection this domain was rated 'Requires Improvement' because the provided need to introduce better induction training for staff. This had now been implemented.
- People and family members told us they felt staff had the skills and knowledge to provide the right support. One person commented, "Most of [the staff] I do think know what they're doing. I get the help I need when I need it."
- Staff were competent, knowledgeable and skilled and carried out their roles effectively. Training received was appropriate to people's needs and the requirement of the role. Staff had formal qualifications in care such as NVQ or Diploma qualifications to underpin their care practice. Staff felt supported in their role by the registered manager.

Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law:

- Care and support was planned, delivered and monitored in line with people's individual assessed needs.
- Assessments were completed in good detail and included expected outcomes for people based on their needs and choices. Assessments were obtained from social care professionals and used to help plan effective care for people.
- Staff applied learning effectively in line with best practice, which led to good outcomes for people and supported a good quality of life. Staff knew people well and how best to meet their needs.

Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance:

- 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, whether any restrictions on people's liberty had been authorised and whether any conditions on such authorisations were being met.

- People being supported who were subject to DoLS authorisations were being effectively monitored.

- Staff understood how some decisions were made in people's best interest if they lacked the capacity to fully understand or consent.
- People told us they were always offered choice and control over the care they received. One person commented, "I can have a shower as and when I want. Nobody makes you; they always ask, they don't tell."

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet:

- Care records documented when people required support with their diet. People and family members told us, and observations confirmed, that staff supported people when needed at meals times. Meal time was a very sociable occasion. We had varied comments regarding the food, but most people commented positively.

Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support:

- People received additional support from healthcare professionals and this was recorded within their care records. The registered manager and staff were aware of the processes they should follow if a person required support from any health care professionals.
- Professionals who visited the home were surveyed as part of the homes quality processes. The feedback from these were wholly positive. A visiting health care professional told us, "The [staff] are always organised and aware of when appointments are. It's a good home."

Adapting service, design, decoration to meet people's needs:

- People told us the general environment of the home was pleasing, well maintained and comfortable. We saw all areas were well decorated and homely.
- There were adaptations to shared bathrooms and toilets for people with disabilities to make them easier to use. For example, walk in shower facilities.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

People continued to be supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; respecting equality and diversity:

- People were treated with kindness and were positive about the caring attitudes of staff. All the feedback we received about the service was positive. One person told us, "We are well looked-after here; the staff are wonderful – so kind to everyone." A family member was also positive and said, "[Person] is really settled. Staff look after [person] very well."
- Staff knew people well and displayed positive, warm and familiar relationships with the people they interacted with. We observed staff had a good rapport with people and trusted staff in their daily interactions. One person said, "I've got to say, the staff are wonderful – their attitude, helpfulness, and their concern."
- Staff understood and supported people's communication needs and choices. Care records specified how people communicate their wishes. Care records included information about people's life history, likes, dislikes and preferences. Staff used this information as well as positive interaction, to get to know people and engage them in conversations. Dovecote Manor had been involved in a local project 'Lost Voices' where people living with dementia could have their life experiences recorded.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence:

- Staff treated people with dignity and respect whilst providing care and support.
- People's individuality and diversity was nurtured, and people were treated with equal respect and warmth. Staff involved people in all shared activity and supported them to contribute at their own pace. One person said, "There's never any issue [with privacy or dignity]. Everything is done respectfully so you never feel awkward about anything."

Supporting people to express their views and be involved in making decisions about their care:

- People were supported to communicate their views and were involved in planning their activities and daily life. We saw that three-monthly reviews of care were undertaken which included people's input and involvement.
- People and family members were encouraged to share their views about the care they received with regular meetings and surveys.
- People and family members told us they were confident in expressing their views about the care and support provided by staff and that staff always responded positively.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the service met people's needs

People's needs continued to be met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to meet people's needs, preferences, interests and give them choice and control:

- People's individual care needs had been identified. Care plans had been developed and regularly reviewed with the involvement of the person and their family members where appropriate.
- The service recorded and shared information relating to people's communication needs as required by the Accessible Information Standards; for example, where people had needs around understanding information this was supplied in various easy read formats with pictorial guidance. During the inspection, the registered manager produced an easy read version of the complaints procedure which could be displayed.
- The activities coordinator for the home was involved with people in the shared downstairs areas throughout the days of the inspection. In the morning, they played board games with small groups of people, which one person told us helped them to "keep our minds sharp."
- People said they felt there was enough for them to do and to keep them occupied. Several people had formed friendships with others, and chose to spend their time with them, chatting or taking part in activities.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns:

- People and family members knew how to provide feedback to the registered manager about their experiences of care; the service provided a range of ways to do this through care review meetings and regular surveys.
- Staff, people and family members were given information about how to make a complaint and were confident that any complaints they made would be listened to and acted upon in an open and transparent way.

End of life care and support:

- There were no current or recent examples for the service of people receiving this support. The registered manager could discuss the concept of end of life care within a care home setting and understood the principals involved. The registered manager and staff had attended training and linked in for professional support when required.
- Policies and good practice guidance were available.
- There were examples of people making advance decisions regarding their wishes following death.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-Led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

The service continued to be consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Continuous learning and improving care:

- Quality assurance arrangements set out by the registered provider were used effectively to identify concerns and areas for improvement. The registered manager continuously worked to make and sustain improvements to the service.
- Staff felt confident they would be supported with any learning or development needs or wishes and described a culture of ongoing learning.
- The registered manager had links with external organisations to ensure they remained up to date with new procedures and information to ensure the care and support being provided was based on current evidence-based guidance, legislation, standards and best practice.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements:

- Managers and staff were clear about their roles, and understood quality performance, risks, regulatory requirements and leadership and management.
- Risks were identified through the quality assurance systems and mitigated in a timely way.
- The registered manager and staff understood their roles and responsibilities. People and family members were confident in the leadership of the service. One person told us, "The manager is lovely and if I wanted to say anything, I know they would listen and help me."

Planning and promoting person-centred, high-quality care and support with openness; and how the provider understands and acts on their duty of candour responsibility:

- The registered manager promoted a culture of person-centred care by engaging with everyone using the service and their family members. People and family members felt listened to and involved in the care provided.
- The comments received from people, family members and staff were positive and showed good outcomes for people's lives.
- Staff understood the service's vision and felt respected, valued and well supported. They told us they felt valued and trusted by the registered manager and provider.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics:

- The service involved people and their families through regular reviews and conversations to allow them to put forward their views about the service. Staff were encouraged to share their views about the service through regular meetings.

- The homes 'Mission Statement' had been written in collaboration with the people living in the home.

Working in partnership with others:

- The registered manager was aware of the need to work closely with other agencies to ensure good outcomes for people. This included working with health and social care professionals as well as external agencies who supported best practice.