

Canterbury Oast Trust

Old School House

Inspection report

Church Lane
New Romney
Kent
TN28 8ES

Tel: 01797366477
Website: www.c-o-t.org.uk

Date of inspection visit:
08 March 2017

Date of publication:
29 March 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Care service description

Old School House provides accommodation and personal care for up to eight people with a learning disability who may have an autism spectrum disorder. The service accommodates people whose wish is to maybe live more independently and staff work with people to achieve this aim. At the time of the inspection there were eight people living at Old School House and no vacancies. The service is a detached brick built house. It is set in a quiet lane just on the outskirts of New Romney town, but within walking distance to the high street. Each person has a single room, with two situated on the ground floor. In addition there are two bathrooms, a shower/bathroom, two separate toilets, large kitchen/diner, smaller training kitchen, lounge with doors to the garden and smaller upstairs lounge/diner. There is an enclosed garden with a paved seating area, lawn and raised beds and parking area at the back of the house. There is additional parking in the lane.

Rating at last inspection

At the last inspection, the service was rated Good and Requires Improvement in the 'Safe' domain.

Why we inspected

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 26 April 2016. A breach of legal requirements was found relating to managing risks associated with people's care and support. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act Regulated Activities Regulations 2014, Safe care and treatment. We undertook this focused inspection to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Old School House on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Why the service is rated Good.

People told us they felt safe living at Old School House and staff were on hand to help them when they needed support. One person said, "This is a brilliant house".

People received their medicines safely and when they should. There were systems in place to ensure medicines were managed safely.

Risks associated with people's care and support were assessed and staff took steps to keep people safe whilst enabling their independence.

Staff knew how to recognise and respond to abuse. They had received training on how to keep people safe.

People benefited from living in an environment that was spacious and homely and equipment was regularly serviced.

Any accidents and incidents were recorded and appropriate action taken to reduce the risk of further occurrences.

People were protected by safe recruitment procedures. People had their needs met by sufficient numbers of staff and staff rotas were based on people's needs and chosen activities.

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 was safe.

Risks associated with people's care and support had been assessed and steps were taken to minimise risks. People were given their medicines at the right times and safely.

People benefited from living in an environment that was homely and well-maintained. Checks and servicing of the equipment were undertaken to keep people safe.

People were protected by safe recruitment procedures and there were sufficient numbers of staff on duty to meet people's needs and enable them to get out and about into the community.

Old School House

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.

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of Old School House on 8 March 2017. This inspection was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 28 April 2016 inspection had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service Safe? This is because the service was previously not meeting legal requirements. This inspection was carried out by one inspector.

The provider did not complete a Provider Information Return (PIR), because we carried out this inspection before another PIR was required. 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. Prior to the inspection we reviewed other information we held about the service, we looked at the previous inspection report and any notifications received by the Care Quality Commission. A notification is information about important events, which the provider is required to tell us about by law.

During the inspection we reviewed people's records and a variety of documents. These included three people's risk assessments, medicine records, two staff recruitment files, staff rotas and training records, accident and incident reports and servicing and maintenance records.

We spoke with five people who were using the service, the registered manager and two members of staff.

We last inspected this service on 28 April 2016 when one breach in the regulations was identified.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People told us they felt safe living here and staff responded when they needed support. One person told us there was "More than enough staff on duty".

At the last inspection in April 2016 improvements were required to ensure risks associated with people's care and support were managed safely.

The provider wrote to the Commission and told us they had taken action to address the shortfall identified during that inspection and we found during this inspection that to be the case.

At the previous inspection people were not fully protected against the risks associated with their care and support. Not all risks had been assessed and there was not always clear written procedures in place of actions staff should take to keep people safe.

Action had been taken to ensure all risks associated with people's care and support had been assessed and steps were recorded of action staff should take in order to keep people safe and enable independence. For example, one person's risk assessment clearly showed what action staff should take if the person started to choke whilst eating. Risk assessments were in place where people were involved in developing their independence such as, accessing the community and undertaking their laundry or housework.

The provider had a policy on fire safety in place. Records showed that tests were carried out in line with the policy mitigating risks to people. Staff and people knew how to safely evacuate from the building in the event of an emergency and had taken part in fire drills.

People told us they received their medicines safely and when they should. One person said, "The meds are done to time, bang on". There was a clear medicines policy in place. Staff had received training in medicine administration and observations of administration were undertaken to ensure their competency. Medicines were checked by staff on arrival to ensure sufficient quantities. Where medicines were prescribed 'as required' or 'as directed' there was guidance in place to ensure staff handled these consistently and safely. There was a safe procedure in place for medicines to accompany people on visits to families and to return medicines safely to the pharmacist if they were no longer required.

People benefited from living in an environment and using equipment that was well maintained. People told us they were happy with their rooms and everything was in working order. One person said, "It's a nice house". There were records to show that equipment and the premises received regular servicing, such as fire equipment, gas and electrical wiring and electrical items. The maintenance department were available to respond quickly in the event of an emergency. One person had recently had their bedroom redecorated and told us how they had chosen the paint colour and curtains. They were also going to have new flooring.

People had their needs met by sufficient numbers of staff. People and staff felt there were enough staff on duty. During the inspection staff responded when people approached them and were not rushed in their

responses. There was a staffing rota, which was based around people's needs and their chosen activities. In addition to the registered manager there were a minimum of two staff on duty 7.30am to 10.30pm, usually rising to three 8am to 7pm, two members of staff also slept on the premises at night. The registered manager kept staffing levels under review. There was an on-call system covered by management. The service used existing staff and the provider's bank staff to fill any gaps in the rota.

People were protected by robust recruitment procedures. We looked at two recruitment files of the last staff to be recruited. Recruitment records included the required pre-employment checks to make sure staff were suitable and of good character.

Any accidents and incidents involving people were recorded. The registered manager reviewed each accident and incident report, to ensure that appropriate action had been taken following the event, to reduce the risk of further occurrences. Reports were then sent to senior management who monitored for patterns and trends.

People told us they felt safe and would speak with the registered manager or a staff member if they were unhappy. During the inspection the atmosphere was quiet and relaxed. There were good interactions between staff and people. People were relaxed in the company of staff and staff demonstrated a kind and caring approach when supporting people. Staff had received training in safeguarding adults and knew the procedures in place to report any suspicions of abuse or allegations. There was a clear safeguarding and whistle blowing policy in place, which staff knew how to locate. The registered manager was familiar with the process to follow if any abuse was suspected in the service; and knew the local Kent and Medway safeguarding protocols and how to contact the Kent County Council's safeguarding team.