

Livability

New Court Place

Inspection report

99 Whitehouse Avenue
Borehamwood
Hertfordshire
WD6 1HB

Tel: 02082386990
Website: www.livability.org.uk

Date of inspection visit:
05 July 2017
06 July 2017

Date of publication:
19 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

New Court Place provides accommodation and Nursing care for up to 24 people with physical disabilities and or a learning disability.

At the last inspection in May 2015 the service was rated Good.

At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

People told us they felt safe living in New Court Place. Risks to people were appropriately assessed and managed.

People told us there were enough staff with the skills and experience to provide them with appropriate care and support when they needed it.

Staff had received appropriate training, and support to help them to carry out their roles effectively.

People received appropriate support to eat and drink sufficient amount to help them stay healthy and hydrated.

People were asked for their consent and the service was meeting the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). People were supported to make choices about how they lived their lives and staff supported them to remain as independent as possible.

People told us and we observed that people were cared for by staff who were kind and caring in their approach and who respected their privacy and maintained their dignity.

People were asked to provide feedback about their experience of the service and their feedback and suggestions were taken into account.

People received personalised care that met their individual needs. People were given appropriate support and encouragement to access meaningful activities and participate in things that they were interested in.

People told us they knew how to complain and were confident they would be listened to if they wished to make a complaint.

The managers and staff operated in an open, transparent and inclusive way. Feedback from people visitors and staff was all positive.

There were quality assurance systems in place including regular audits and checks to make sure if any shortfalls were identified they were quickly addressed to improve the service.

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 remained good.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remained good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remained good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remained good.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remained good.

New Court Place

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.

This inspection took place on the 05 & 06 July 2017 by one inspector. The inspection was unannounced.

Before our inspection we reviewed information we held about the service including statutory notifications that had been submitted. Statutory notifications include information about important events which the provider is required to send us. We also reviewed the provider information return (PIR) submitted to us. This is information that the provider is required to send to us, which gives us some key information about the service and tells us what the service does well and any improvements they plan to make.

During the inspection we observed how staff supported people who used the service. We spoke with two people who used the service, four relatives to obtain their feedback on how people were supported to live their lives. We also spoke with the chef, three members of staff, including laundry and cleaning staff, the registered manager the deputy manager and administration staff.

We also used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). SOFI is a way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us.

We reviewed care records relating to three people who used the service, four recruitment files and other documents relevant to people's health and well-being. These included staff training records, medication records and quality monitoring audits.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People told us they felt safe living at New Court Place. One person said, "I have no concerns at all about my safety here." Another person told us, "I do feel safe living here." A relative commented, "We are very confident that [person`s name] is kept safe. There have never been any concerns about safety."

People were supported by staff who knew how to keep people safe. Staff received safeguarding training and knew how to report concerns internally and externally to local safeguarding authorities.

People had their individual risks assessed and measures were in place where possible to mitigate the identified risks and these were kept under regular review. For example staff were provided with detailed risk assessments in relation to moving and handling people safely.

People told us and we observed that there were enough staff to meet their needs in a timely way. One person told us, "I think there are enough staff, I never have to wait too long to be assisted." A visiting family member confirmed, "There always seems to be enough staff on duty when we visit." The deputy manager told us staffing levels were defined by people`s needs and were kept under review by the registered manager to ensure there were enough staff to meet people's changing needs at all times.

People were cared for by staff who had been recruited through a robust process which ensured pre-employment checks had been completed, taking up of references and a disclosure and barring check (DBS).

People received their medicines in accordance with the prescriber`s instructions. We saw there were suitable arrangements for the safe storage, management and disposal of medicines and people were supported to take their medicines by trained staff. People told us that they received their medicines regularly. We checked a random sample of boxed medicines and found that the stocks agreed with the records maintained.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People told us they received care and support that was effective and met their needs. One person told us, "I know the staff have training, some staff are here today for training." Another person said, "I have no concerns about the staff`s skills and abilities, they know what they are doing for sure."

Staff told us that they had received training in various topics relevant to their roles and that they were supported by their managers to carry out their roles effectively. Staff confirmed they had access to regular updates and refresher training.

People were asked to consent to their care and support before staff assisted them. 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 (MCA). The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). People using the service had their capacity to make decisions and consent to their care assessed appropriately under the MCA. DoLS applications had been made to the local authority and were pending authorisations.

Staff demonstrated that they understood MCA and DoLS and how this applied to the people they supported. Staff encouraged people to make decisions independently based on their ability. Where people were unable to verbally communicate, we observed staff using other methods to enable them to make decisions. For example, we observed people using a touch pad to help aid communication.

People told us that the food at New Court Place was really good. One person told us, "[Name of the chef] is a really good cook and makes lots of different types of food which we really enjoy." A visitor told us, "The food is varied and everyone gets a choice, if they don't like the main menu choices the chef asks them [people] what they would like to eat." Staff told us they catered for specialist dietary requirements as well as for preferences for different cultures.

People were supported to access healthcare professionals to help maintain their physical and mental health. In addition to healthcare professionals visiting the service people were supported to attend appointments such as dental or opticians when required.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People told us and we observed that staff were kind and caring towards them. One person told us, "I get on really well with the staff here, they are all lovely and I know them very well." A family member told us, "I feel very lucky that [person`s name] lives here, the staff take such good care and make sure all the little things are done like [person`s] hair always looks so pretty."

We observed staff interacting with people positively and often saw them laughing and joking with people in a respectful way. For example, we saw staff explaining our presence and role to reassure people. We also observed people sitting outside in communal areas enjoying the sunshine. Staff developed various methods of communication with people. they communicated with people effectively at the person`s own pace. This helped people feeling included and listened.

People told us that they were involved in making decisions about their care. One person told us, "I have a keyworker and every so often we sit together and go through my care plan." We saw that care plans were detailed and personalised and provided staff with sufficient information to support them in a way which respected their privacy and maintained their dignity. For example detailing how people wished to be supported encouraging their independence.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People told us that they felt the service provided was flexible and responsive when their needs changed. It was clear from our observations that staff knew people well. One person told us, "They know me very well, on a personal level." Another person told us, "I have lived here for many years now. I think I have been one of the longest living here. I know the staff pretty well and they know me." Staff confirmed that people's needs were kept under regular review and when things changed they put actions in place to accommodate them. For example people could choose to be supported at any time that suited them and equally could eat and drink whenever they wished.

A staff member told us, "We always respect that people have different needs and wishes and provide a flexible service." Care plans had detailed personal information including a profile about people's likes and dislikes as well as hobbies and interests. One person showed us some lovely poetry work they had written. Another person told us, "We can access the WIFI anywhere so if I want to play games in my room I can do so."

People were asked to provide feedback about the quality of the service in a variety of ways. One person told us, "I am the representative for activities, religious needs and culture. I attend regular meetings and we discuss anything that we want to." They went on to say they felt staff and managers were responsive when they raised any concerns and these were addressed. People could also leave comments in a suggestion box and were asked to complete an annual survey about their experience of the service.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

People who lived at New Court Place, their relatives and staff were all positive about how the service operated and managed. People told us, "I can always speak to the [registered] manager or [Staff`s name] if I have anything I need to discuss. They are all very good and do take you serious." One relative told us, "The [registered] manager and all the staff are fantastic they are very approachable, and are always friendly. We feel very lucky and are always warmly welcomed."

Staff were well supported through regular supervision and team meetings which provided an opportunity to discuss any topics or concerns as well as their personal development.

The registered manager was not at the service on the day of our inspection however we spoke to them throughout the day by phone and the deputy manager demonstrated they were knowledgeable about the people who used the service, their different needs, personal circumstances and relationships.

Staff understood their roles; they were clear about their responsibilities and what was expected of them and told us they worked well as a team.

Quality monitoring systems were in place and audits completed included medicines and infection control. We identified that in some of the communal areas paint was chipped and the flooring was stained. We spoke to the registered manager about this and were told they were aware that the home needed some refurbishment and a meeting had been scheduled for September 2017 to discuss the plans for re-decoration.