

Potensial Limited

Potensial Limited - 1 Newlands Drive

Inspection report

1 Newlands Drive
Wallasey
Wirral
Merseyside
CH44 2AX

Tel: 01516305404
Website: www.potensial.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
25 May 2017

Date of publication:
03 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

Potensial Limited – 1 Newlands Drive is a residential care home for 12 people with a learning disability. At the last inspection, the service was rated 'good'. At this inspection we found the service remained good. Eleven people lived at the home and another bedroom was used for respite stays.

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. We considered the service to be outstanding in the way that people were encouraged and supported to participate in work and leisure activities, to achieve their goals and follow their dreams.

There were enough staff to meet people's support needs and the staff had good knowledge of the individuals who lived at the home. New staff had been recruited safely and all staff completed a corporate training programme. Staff had regular individual supervision meetings.

The home was clean and a programme of redecoration and refurbishment was continuing. Regular health and safety checks were carried out. People were all registered with a local health centre and had an annual health check.

Menus were planned weekly by the people who lived at the home.

Care files gave details of people's medical history and medication, and information about the person's life and their preferences. A monthly review of all aspects of the person's support was recorded by their keyworker.

The home implemented various methods of monitoring the quality of the service including daily checks, monthly audits, monthly meetings for staff and service users and satisfaction surveys.

Further information is in the detailed findings below.

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.

Potensial Limited - 1 Newlands Drive

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.

The inspection took place on 25 May 2017 and was unannounced. The inspection was carried out by an adult social care inspector. Before the inspection we looked at information CQC had received since our last visit. During our visit we spoke with five people who used the service, a visiting relative, and four members of staff, including the manager and the deputy manager. We looked around the premises and at care plans for two people who used the service, staff records, health and safety records and management records.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

During the inspection we spoke with a visitor who told us they felt their relative was "very safe" at the home. Records we looked at showed that all staff had received training about safeguarding and this was updated annually. Three safeguarding concerns had been reported since our last inspection and the manager told us that these all related to a person who had been having a respite stay at the home.

Risks associated with daily living had been assessed and recorded in people's care notes. Plans were in place to minimise identified risks. An electronic system was used for reporting accidents and untoward incidents.

All areas that we saw were clean and there were no unpleasant smells in the building. The home provided a safe environment for people to live in and records we looked at showed that regular health and safety checks were carried out. A fire evacuation practice was carried out every six months and the manager told us that this was an effective way of identifying which of the people who lived at the home was aware of evacuation procedures and who needed additional support. This was documented in their personal emergency evacuation plans.

The staff rota ensured that staff hours met people's needs both in the house and for one to one support in the community. There were always two staff in the house and they were responsible for supporting people with personal care, cleaning and cooking. Other staff provided one to one support for people either at home or out in the community. Two support workers were on duty at night, with a senior member of staff on call. Additional staff were available from a pool of bank staff employed by Potensial Limited.

There had been three new members of staff since our last inspection and records we looked at showed that robust recruitment procedures had been followed to ensure that the new staff were safe to work with vulnerable people.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

All of the staff team had completed the Potensial mandatory training programme. This included safeguarding, medicines, moving and handling, first aid, fire awareness, food safety, infection control, health and safety, mental capacity and deprivation of liberty, and diet and nutrition. The new members of staff were working towards the Care Certificate.

Records showed that the manager carried out an annual appraisal for each member of staff. All staff had an individual supervision meeting with either the manager or the deputy manager every two months and a monthly staff meeting was held.

Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) had been applied for appropriately for people who were considered unsafe to go out on their own. There were no restrictions on people's movements around the house and doors were not locked during the daytime when staff were around. The deputy manager told us that people who lived at the home had capacity to make decisions about daily living and were able to communicate their decisions.

People who lived at the home were registered with a local health centre and had an annual health check and other visits as and when needed. People's health files recorded visits to medical services including GP, dentist, audiology, optician, podiatrist, psychiatrist, breast screening, and hospital appointments.

People got together as a group on a Sunday night to decide the dinner menu for the following week. This was displayed on a white board in the dining room. Breakfast and lunch were prepared on an individual basis and people could have whatever they wanted at a time to suit them. Food and drinks were available 24 hours a day and people could make themselves a meal or a snack. People's weights were recorded monthly and a malnutrition screening tool was available to use if there were any concerns. Picture menus had been introduced since our last inspection.

The property was in good order and a programme of refurbishment was on-going. Since our last inspection a new wet room had been provided, and a new kitchen which had a five star food hygiene rating.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

One person told us that she was moving to live at another service owned by the same provider. The staff had supported her with this and she had been spending two nights a week at the new service. She told us she thought she would be happy there as it is a smaller, quieter service but she would keep visiting Newlands Drive to see her friends. She told us "The staff have all been really helpful. They've invited me to come back to the barbeque."

Some people had limited verbal communication, however we saw that the staff were able to understand their needs and choices. One person we met made very effective use of sign language to let the staff know what they wanted. Detailed communication plans were included in people's care files.

We observed that staff were caring, kind and good-humoured. They gave people time to make decisions for themselves and treated them with respect. Each person had a keyworker who they could talk to about personal matters. Some people regularly spent time with their families.

People's bedrooms were furnished and decorated to their taste and had personal belongings including keepsakes, pictures, DVDs and CDs. People were responsible for keeping their own rooms clean and tidy with support from staff as needed. Each person had their own laundry basket in their room. There were locks on the bedroom doors that people could use if they wished to.

A service users' meeting was held monthly and most people attended. Records showed that people were involved in discussing and choosing meals, activities and re-decoration.

Written information concerning people who used the service was kept confidentially in the office.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

We considered the service to be outstanding in the way that people were encouraged and supported to participate in work and leisure activities, to achieve their goals and follow their dreams. During our visit, people were keen to tell us about their social activities and outings. Two people were looking forward to going to a wedding and to buying new clothes for the wedding. Another person was going to London for a holiday. A third person said he had really enjoyed going to watch Tranmere Rovers playing at Wembley.

Activities were person-centred, two people had booked to go to concerts to see their favourite pop stars. Other activities people enjoyed included bowling, arts and crafts, going to the cinema and the pub, and going to watch football. People all had bus passes and used taxis. In the house, people enjoyed activities including pamper nights, Bingo, cookery and Karaoke.

People were able to decide their own daily routines and this was recorded in their support plans. Most people had time allocated each week for one to one support. One person worked on a farm and regularly attended church and a social club. Other people attended day centres. Some people enjoyed being involved in doing the home's shopping. One person had achieved the Mencap 'Gateway Gold Award', which is a programme for people with learning disabilities based on the Duke of Edinburgh Award, and two other people were working towards this award. Another person had expressed an interest in working with children at a day nursery and staff were making arrangements for this to happen.

We looked at a sample of care records. Since our last inspection the records had been streamlined to make them more easily accessible. Each person had a health file that could be taken with them to any medical appointments. Care records identified people's support needs and how the staff should meet individual needs. Care plans were written in the first person and included details about the person's interests and hobbies and their life history. A monthly key worker report reviewed every aspect of the person's support.

The CQC has received no concerns or complaints about this service. Corporate complaints policies and procedures were in place and were discussed at service user meetings. No complaints had been recorded since our last inspection.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The home 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.

Since our last inspection, the manager had taken on responsibility for another small care home close by and divided her time between the two services. The provider had appointed a full-time deputy manager and a senior support worker. The manager told us that she had felt able to take responsibility for another service because she had every confidence in her deputy.

During our visit we observed that there was an open culture within the service and people were encouraged and supported to express their views. Monthly meetings were held for staff and for people who used the service. A satisfaction survey carried out in 2016 returned very positive feedback.

Daily and monthly health and safety checks included water temperatures, fire equipment, fire exits, fire panel, fridge and freezer temperatures, food temperatures, medicines administration records, and service users' money. The manager carried out monthly audits that included medicines, service users' money and care plans. There was also a six-monthly infection control audit. The area manager visited at least once a month and carried out audits that included care plans, medicines, money, training, health and safety, complaints, safeguarding and notifications. These ensured that any areas for improvement were identified and actioned.