

Clover

Clover

Inspection report

116 Foundry Lane
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP4 1DJ

Tel: 07780654367

Date of inspection visit:
25 August 2017

Date of publication:
14 September 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

Clover provides a personal care service for two people living with a learning disability in their own home. At the time of this announced inspection of 25 August 2017 there were two people who used the service. We gave the service 48 hours' notice of our inspection to make sure that someone was available.

At our last inspection of 30 April and 28 May 2015 the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

There was a registered manager in post. 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.

The service continued to provide a safe service to people. This included systems designed to minimise the risks to people, including from abuse and with their medicines. There were enough support workers to ensure that people received the planned care and support that they required to meet their needs. The support workers in the service had worked there since our last inspection where we found that recruitment was done safely.

Support workers were trained and supported to meet people's needs. The management and support workers in the service understood the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and support workers cared for them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice. Systems were in place to support people to eat and drink enough, where they required support. People were supported to maintain good health where and have access to health professionals where needed.

Support workers had good relationships with people who used the service. People's views and preferences were listened to and acted on about how they wanted to be cared for and supported.

People received care and support which was planned and delivered to meet their individual needs. A complaints procedure was in place.

The service continued to have an open and empowering culture and quality assurance systems in place were appropriate. As a result the quality of the service continued to improve.

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?

The service remains good.

Good ●

Is the service effective?

The service remains good.

Good ●

Is the service caring?

The service remains good.

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

The service remains good.

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

The service remains good.

Good ●

Clover

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.

This announced comprehensive inspection was carried out by one inspector on 25 August 2017. We gave the service 48 hours' notice of our inspection to make sure that someone was available.

We looked at information we held about the service including previous inspection reports. We also reviewed information received from stakeholders.

We met one person who used the service, who declined to speak with us. We observed the interactions between support workers and this person in the short time they were present. We spoke briefly with one person's relative. We spoke with the registered manager, who also worked as a support worker and one other support worker.

We reviewed the care records of two people who used the service and records relating to the management of the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our last inspection of 30 April and 28 May 2015 the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

Risks to people's safety continued to be managed well. People's care records included risk assessments which identified how risks were minimised, this included risks associated with going out in the community, and in their homes, such as using cooking equipment.

People continued to be protected from the systems in place designed to keep people safe from abuse. People received care from support workers who were trained and understood how to recognise and report abuse.

The registered manager and a support worker told us that the staffing levels continued to be appropriate to ensure that there were enough support workers to meet people's needs safely. Records confirmed what we had been told. There was the registered manager and two support workers who worked in the service. They were flexible and worked together to ensure that people received the care and support they required. The service continued to maintain recruitment procedures to check that prospective support workers were of good character and suitable to work in the service. We did not look at the recruitment records during this inspection because there had been no new support workers employed since our last inspection.

Medicines continued to be administered safely. Support workers were trained in the safe management of medicines. Records included the support that each person required with their medicines and that medicines were given to people when they needed them. Audits allowed the support workers to identify any issues and take action to address them.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our last inspection of 30 April and 28 May 2015 the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

The service continued to provide support workers with training and support to meet people's needs effectively. One support worker spoken with told us that the training provided them with the information they required to meet people's needs. Records showed that training provided included safeguarding, infection control, health and safety and medicines. There was a plan in place to provide training to ensure that support workers knowledge was kept up to date.

Records and discussions with the registered manager and a support worker showed that support workers continued to receive one to one supervision and annual appraisal meetings. These provided support workers with the opportunity to discuss their work, receive feedback on their practice and identify any further training needs they had.

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. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA. People's care records identified their capacity to make decisions and included signed documents to show that they consented to the care provided in the service. Support workers had been trained in the MCA and understood the MCA and how this applied to the people they supported.

The service continued to support people to maintain a healthy diet and/or with the preparation of meals and drinks, where required. Records and discussions with the registered manager and a support worker demonstrated that people were provided with the support they needed in this area.

People continued to be supported to maintain good health and had access to health professionals where required. People's records included information about treatment received from health professionals and any recommendations made to improve their health were incorporated into care plans.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At our last inspection of 30 April and 28 May 2015 the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

The registered manager and support workers continued to speak about people in a compassionate manner. They understood why it was important to respect people's dignity, independence, privacy and choices. We saw an interaction between the registered manager, support worker and person, which was caring and the person's choices were listened to and respected. For example, the person declined to speak with us and this was respected.

Records and discussions with the registered manager and a support worker demonstrated that people continued to make decisions about their care and that staff listened to what they said. People's care records clearly identified that they had been involved throughout their care planning. This included their choices about how they wanted to be cared for and supported. They had signed documents to show that they agreed with the contents.

Records included information about how people's independence was respected and encouraged. The records identified how people's dignity was respected, this included the positive provision of care which focussed on their abilities and choices.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At our last inspection of 30 April and 28 May 2015 the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

The service continued to provide a responsive service which met people's individual and diverse needs. One person's relative told us that they were, "Very Happy," with the service provided to the person.

The service continued to ensure that people's care was personalised and care records identified how the service assessed, planned and delivered person centred care. The records provided support workers with information about how to meet people's specific needs and preferences. Care plans were written in a positive way which identified people's strengths, abilities and usual routines. The records and discussions with the registered manager and a support worker demonstrated that people received care and support which was tailor made to their needs and preferences.

People's daily records included information about the care and support provided to people each day and their wellbeing. The registered manager and a support worker had worked with the people using the service for many years and clearly knew people well. They were committed to providing good quality care to people.

There was a complaints procedure in place. There had been no complaints received in the last 12 months. The registered manager told us that there was a book which people and relatives could write in if they had a concern about the service. There were no entries.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At our last inspection of 30 April and 28 May 2015 the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

The registered manager continued to promote an open culture where people and support workers were asked for their views of the service provided. Where comments from people were received the service continued to address them. This included with the choices that they made about what they wanted to do in their lives in care reviews and house meetings. House meetings were attended by support workers and people using the service. The minutes of these demonstrated that all attendees were asked for suggestions and views about the service provided and they were acted upon. For example, where a person had made a suggestion about accessing an activity in the community this was supported. This showed that people's views were valued and acted on.

A support worker told us that they felt supported by the service's registered manager and colleague and they could go to them if they were concerned about anything. They were committed to the service's aims and objectives and providing people with good quality care at all times. The registered manager and a support worker told us how they kept their knowledge updated and researched any changes in the care industry to ensure that they were up to date.

The service continued to carry out a programme of audits to assess the quality of the service and identify issues. These included audits on medicines management, health and safety and the care provided to people. We saw that these audits and checks supported the registered manager in identifying shortfalls which needed to be addressed. This meant that the service continued to improve.