

Happy Futures Support Specialists Ltd

Kellys Place

Inspection report

11 Burnside
Eastfield
Scarborough
YO11 3LH

Date of inspection visit:
17 June 2019
18 June 2019

Date of publication:
06 August 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

Kellys Place provides care and support for people who may be living with a learning disability or autistic spectrum disorder. The service is registered to support up to two people for short-term periods of respite (up to 28 days at a time) to give their families or carers a break from their caring roles.

The service has been developed and designed in line with the principles and values that underpin Registering the Right Support and other best practice guidance. This ensures that people who use the service can live as full a life as possible and achieve the best possible outcomes. The principles reflect the need for people with learning disabilities and autism to live meaningful lives that include control, choice, and independence. People using the service receive planned and co-ordinated person-centred support that is appropriate and inclusive for them.

People's experience of using this service and what we found

People received safe and effective care and support in a service which had been specifically designed and organised to meet their needs.

People's needs were assessed and staff worked hard to provide person-centred care to help people feel comfortable and at home at the service during their respite stays.

People had a dedicated team of staff who had been trained to meet their needs. Staff understood how to identify risks and safeguarding concerns and respond to these to keep people safe and prevent avoidable harm.

Medicines were managed safely; management took very positive steps to make sure lessons were learnt and improvements made if things went wrong.

People staying at the service were encouraged and supported to take part in activities and to do the things they enjoyed. Staff worked closely with people's families to make sure they understood and could meet people's needs; they shared information to help people move between their home and the respite service.

Staff were caring. They treated people with dignity and respected their privacy. Staff understood people's communication needs and used accessible information to help make sure people's wishes and views were known.

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

The service applied the principles and values of Registering the Right Support and other best practice

guidance. These ensure that people who use the service can live as full a life as possible and achieve the best possible outcomes that include control, choice and independence.

The provider and registered manager were committed to providing high-quality and person-centred care. They were responsive to feedback and used audits to continually monitor and improve the service. Staff praised the communication, leadership and support they received.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the Care Quality Commission's (CQC) website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Rating at last inspection

This service was registered with us on 18 June 2018 and this was the first inspection.

Why we inspected

This was a planned inspection based on when the service was registered.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

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.

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 was caring.

Details are in our Caring findings below.

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

Details are in our Responsive findings below.

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

Details are in our Well-Led findings below.

Good ●

Kellys Place

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act, 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 carried out by one inspector.

Service and service type

Kellys Place is a residential 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as single package under one contractual agreement. 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 CQC. 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

We gave five days' notice of the inspection. This was because it is a small service and we needed to be sure that the registered manager would be available to support the inspection. Inspection activity started on 17 June 2019 and we visited the location on 18 June 2019.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. The provider was not asked to complete a provider information return before this inspection. This 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 took this into account when we inspected the service and made the judgements in this report.

During the inspection

We spoke with one person who used the service, two people's relatives and two professionals about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with the registered manager, operations manager and two members of care staff.

We looked at two people's care records. This included medication administration records and people's daily notes. We looked at two staff's recruitment, induction, training and supervision records as well as other records relating to the management of the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

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

At this inspection this key question was rated Good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Staffing and recruitment

- People were supported by staff who had been safely recruited; appropriate checks helped make sure suitable staff were employed.
- Staffing levels were arranged to meet people's assessed needs; management made sure enough trained staff were deployed for each new respite stay.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People were protected from abuse and avoidable harm by staff trained to recognise and respond to any safeguarding concerns.
- The registered manager worked with the local authority to report, investigate and address any safeguarding issues to help keep people safe.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- People received support to meet their needs and help keep them safe; staff understood people's needs, the risks to their safety and how to provide support in a safe way.
- Assessments completed before people stayed at the service helped to identify risks, and were used to develop support plans to guide staff on how to support them.
- Staff had been trained and plans were in place to support people who might become anxious or upset and need reassurance or support to stay safe.
- People were supported in a safe environment; robust and regular checks helped make sure the home was safely maintained and risks reduced.

Using medicines safely

- People received safe support to take prescribed medicines; staff had been trained and the registered manager checked to make sure they followed good practice guidance.
- Staff followed a safe process to check medicines brought into the service and return unused medicines when people's respite stay ended.
- Staff accurately recorded the support provided with people's medicines; we suggested including more guidance for staff on when to administer medicines prescribed to be taken only when needed.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Incidents were investigated to make sure lessons were learnt; management had taken very thorough and proactive steps to investigate a medication error and make changes to improve the safety of the service.
- Staff were supported to reflect on their practice to help understand and share learning from mistakes.
- Any accidents or incident reports were checked by management to make sure appropriate action had been

taken to keep people safe.

Preventing and controlling infection

- The home was clean and well maintained; staff regularly cleaned and deep cleaned the service including after each respite stay and before a new person arrived.
- Staff had been trained in infection prevention and control, and personal protective equipment, such as gloves and aprons, were available to help prevent the spread of healthcare related infections.

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.

At this inspection this key question was rated Good. This meant people's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People received effective support from staff who were chosen and trained to meet their individual needs. People told us, "The staff are absolutely fantastic, very supportive and understanding" and "They are very efficient and friendly."
- Staff regularly updated their training and the provider encouraged staff to continually learn and develop their skills. A member of staff explained, "The training is spot on, and if there is a certain training course you want to do, they put you in for it."
- Supervision meetings and annual appraisals were used to monitor staff's wellbeing and set goals; the registered manager explained plans to make sure supervisions were completed more regularly in future.

Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law; Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support; Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care

- People received effective care to meet their needs; staff sought medical advice and guidance to maintain people's health and wellbeing whilst at the service.
- Assessments completed before people's respite stays helped identify what support was needed and guided staff on how best to meet their needs.
- People and their families were involved in the assessment process to help make sure the support met their needs. A relative explained, "They did an assessment, before setting up the respite, there was a detailed visit by the manager covering all the important aspects of their needs."
- Careful thought and planning went into helping people get used to the service and to feel comfortable whilst staying there.

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 when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. In care homes, 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 and were being met.

- People were supported to be involved in decisions about their care wherever possible; mental capacity assessments and best interest decisions showed people's rights were protected.
- An application had been made when necessary to deprive a person of their liberty and action had been taken to meet the conditions of this authorisation.

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

- People benefited from a warm, welcoming and homely environment; people told us, "The environment is lovely and homely" and "There has been no expenses spared, they have made it a home from home."
- Careful thought had gone into designing and decorating a service which could meet people's needs; appropriate equipment and adaptations were in place. A professional explained, "They have been mindful of developing the service in partnership with people, and with the people who were going to use the service in mind."

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

- People received effective care to make sure they had enough to eat and drink. Staff gathered information about people's likes, dislikes and allergies and worked hard to provide the things they liked to help them feel at home during their respite stay.
- Staff had taken proactive steps to encourage people to eat a healthy, balanced diet; they monitored what people ate and drink to make sure their needs were met.

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.

At this inspection this key question was rated Good. This meant people were 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 benefited from the kind and caring support staff provided; feedback included, "The staff are absolutely fantastic, very supportive and understanding" and, "The staff are lovely, they remember [Name] and they are pleased to see them. They are very caring."
- People were supported by staff who had been matched to them and trained to meet their needs; this consistency helped people get to know the staff and feel more comfortable returning to the service.
- Staff respected people's equality and diversity; they recognised what was important to people and treated them as individuals when meeting their diverse needs.

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

- People were supported to have choice and control over their care and support; staff had a good understanding of people's needs and how they communicated.
- Care plans recorded information about how people communicated and provided guidance for staff on how to understand and ensure their wishes and views were understood.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People were supported in a way which maintained their privacy and dignity; staff spoke about people in a respectful way and described how they supported people to maintain their privacy and dignity.
- Staff encouraged people to maintain their independence; care plans recognised what people did for themselves and reinforced the importance of encouraging and supporting with this.
- People benefited from an environment which had been designed to maximise their independence.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

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

At this inspection this key question was rated Good. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to ensure people have choice and control and to meet their needs and preferences

- People received person-centred care from staff who were responsive to their needs; feedback included, "The staff do their utmost to cater for people's individual needs."
- People were supported by staff who understood their needs and what was important to them; care plans contained detailed information about people's likes, dislikes and preferences.
- Staff recorded important information about the care and support provided to monitor and make sure people's holistic needs were met.

Meeting people's communication needs

Since 2016 onwards all organisations that provide publicly funded adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). The standard was introduced to make sure people are given information in a way they can understand. The standard applies to all people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss and in some circumstances to their carers.

- Staff understood people's communication needs and how best to share information in a way they would understand.
- People had access to accessible information where needed; for example, to help make meal choices or to make a complaint.

Supporting people to develop and maintain relationships to avoid social isolation; support to follow interests and to take part in activities that are socially and culturally relevant to them

- People were supported to do the things they enjoyed during their respite stay at Kelly's Place; an activities folder with photographs of local attractions helped people make decisions about what they wanted to do.
- Staff kept a record and took photographs to share with people's families to commemorate their stay and the things they had done.
- People staying for respite had access to a skills centre which offered a wide range of activities and opportunities to socialise which people used and enjoyed.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- People felt confident speaking with staff or management if they needed to complain. A relative told us, "They are approachable and things are dealt with quickly."
- There had been no formal complaints about the service, but people felt confident the provider and registered manager would respond to their concerns. A professional told us, "If there are any issues they are dealt with, if people have concerns they are listened to."
- Minor issues were resolved in close communication with people's families and professionals.

End of life care and support

- The service had not provided respite support for people approaching the end of their life.
- Although the service was not intended to provide this type of support, the provider had a policy and procedure relating to end of life care and had introduced a workbook to support staff to explore and record people's wishes and views regarding end of life care.

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.

At this inspection this key question was rated Good. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- People received person-centred care and praised the effective high-quality support provided. Feedback included, "It is so homely and welcoming it is like going to stay with family" and "They are an excellent firm. Nothing is too much trouble if you say [Name] likes something then they get it."
- The registered manager was very open, transparent and responsive to suggestions to improve the service. A professional said, "They come across as being very passionate about providing a good service."
- The provider's nominated individual had been recognised in a national award for going above and beyond for the individuals they supported; they promoted a person-centred culture and were committed to continually developing the service.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements; Continuous learning and improving care

- There were robust systems in place to monitor the quality and safety of the service, and to ensure the home environment was safe and well-maintained.
- Regular audits helped identify where changes or improvements could be made and were used to support continual improvement.
- The provider had set wide ranging goals for the future and was committed to continually improving the service and providing high-quality care.
- Staff praised the support they received from management; they told us they had the training, information and resources needed to provide good care and support.

How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong

- The registered manager was open and transparent; they understood their responsibility to apologise to people and give feedback if things went wrong.

Working in partnership with others; Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- Staff, the registered manager and provider worked in partnership with people, their families and other professionals to develop the service. A professional told us, "It's a wonderful service, which has been designed in partnership with people's family, and they have had service users in mind in the design and set up of the service."
- Staff shared effective working relationships with professionals and worked collaboratively to meet people's

needs. A professional explained, "They listen to what you say, take it back, and act on it. They are a very open and transparent provider, who have a good relationship with professionals."