

Consensus Support Services Limited

Weston Villa

Inspection report

179-183 Rockingham Road
Kettering
Northampton
Northamptonshire
NN16 9JA

Tel: 01536519111

Website: www.consensussupport.com

Date of inspection visit:
31 January 2017
01 February 2017

Date of publication:
10 April 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

Weston Villa is a residential service that provides care for up to 9 people with learning disabilities and autistic spectrum disorder. At the time of the inspection there were 4 people living in the home. At the last inspection, in January 2015, the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found that the service remained Good.

People continued to receive safe care. Staff were appropriately recruited and there were enough staff to provide care and support to people to meet their needs. People were consistently protected from the risk of harm and received their prescribed medicines safely.

The care that people received continued to be effective. Staff had access to the support, supervision, training and ongoing professional development that they required to work effectively in their roles. People were supported to maintain good health and nutrition.

Staff continued to support people in a way that was kind, caring and courteous. People's individuality was understood and this enabled staff to work effectively with people to enable them to reach their goals.

Staff were committed to supporting people in a way that focused on responding to areas of people's lives where they faced particular challenges. The staff team was consistent in their approach and staff developed positive relationships with people, which were focussed on enabling people to overcome their individual challenges and meet their aspirations.

People had detailed personalised plans of care in place to enable staff to provide consistent care and support in line with people's personal preferences. These plans were focussed on enabling people to progress and learn new life skills that would enhance their wellbeing and staff worked consistently with people to enable them to reach their goals.

People knew how to raise a concern or make a complaint; the provider had implemented effective systems to manage any complaints that they may receive. The feedback about the home complimented the staff for their understanding of people's needs and consistent approach in helping people to reach their goals.

The service had a positive ethos and an open culture. The registered manager was a visible role model in the home. People, their relatives and staff told us that they had confidence in the manager's ability to provide consistently high quality managerial oversight and leadership to the home.

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 safe.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains effective.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains caring.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains responsive.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains well-led.

Weston Villa

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 was a comprehensive inspection that was completed by one inspector on 31 January and 1 February 2017 and was unannounced.

Before the inspection we asked the provider to send us a 'provider information return' (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and the improvements they plan to make. The provider returned the PIR and we took this into account when we made judgements in this report. We also reviewed other information that we held about the service, including statutory notifications that the provider had sent us. A statutory notification is information about important events which the provider is required to send us by law.

During this inspection people were not able to communicate with us about their experiences of support from the service, but we were able to speak to two people's relatives. We also spoke with the registered manager and four support workers.

We looked at care plan documentation relating to two people, and three staff files. We also looked at other information related to the quality of the service. This included quality assurance audits, training information for care staff, staff duty rotas and arrangements for managing complaints.

We undertook general observations throughout the home, including observing interactions between care staff and people in the communal areas. We also viewed the communal accommodation and facilities used by people.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People were supported in a way that maintained their safety and they told us that they felt safe. People's relatives were confident that their family member was supported in a safe way; one person's relative said "[Name] is definitely safe and well looked after." Recruitment processes ensured that people were safeguarded against the risk of being cared for by unsuitable staff and staffing levels were responsive to people's needs. People's relatives told us that staff were always available when people needed them. One person's relative said "There's always plenty of staff around and they are always ready to help when needed." Our observations supported this view and we saw that staff were visible and available to support people promptly.

Risks to people had been assessed and risk reduction plans were in place to instruct staff how to support people in a safe way. We saw that staff followed these assessments and plans in practice and supported people in a way that maintained their safety. Safeguarding policies and procedures were in place and staff were knowledgeable about the steps to take if they were concerned. One member of staff told us "I would tell the manager and make sure they were following it up, if they didn't I'd contact CQC." Safeguarding notifications had been completed in a timely manner.

People's medicines were safely managed and the medicines management systems in place were clear and consistently followed. Staff had received training and had their competency assessed prior to taking on the responsibility of medicines administration and people consistently received their medicines when they should.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People's needs were met by staff who had the required knowledge and support to provide care appropriately. Staff training was relevant to their role and equipped them with the skills they needed to care for the people living at the home. For example, staff had received specialist training in autism and epilepsy. All staff had regular supervision and appraisal; one member of staff said "Supervision is really helpful, we can talk about any difficulties and anything we're not sure about as well as our goals; for example any extra training we want to do."

People were encouraged to make decisions about their care and their day to day routines and preferences. Staff had a good understanding of service users' rights regarding choice, one member of staff said "We always make sure we ask people before doing things like helping with personal care. We know people well and understand how they express their choices." One person's relative said "They always include [Name] and give them a choice about what they want to do."

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 MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). Detailed assessments had been conducted to determine people's ability to make specific decisions and where appropriate DoLS authorisations had been obtained from the local authority.

People were supported to maintain a healthy balanced diet and those at risk of not eating and drinking enough received the support that they required to maintain their nutritional intake. People had regular access to healthcare professionals and staff were vigilant to changes in people's health. Any changes in people's health were recognised quickly by staff and prompt and appropriate referrals were made to healthcare professionals.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People had developed positive relationships with staff and were treated with compassion and respect. One person's relative told us "One of the main things that I like about the home is how friendly the staff are." Another person's relative told us "We really like the staff, they are caring and attentive; can't fault them in any way."

People were relaxed in the company of staff and clearly felt comfortable in their presence. We observed that staff knew people well and used people's preferred methods of communication to engage them in meaningful interaction. For example one person used pictures to communicate their choices and needs to staff and we saw that staff supported and encouraged this. People's choices in relation to their daily routines and activities were respected by staff. Staff were observed speaking to people in a kind manner and offering people choices in their daily lives, for example what activities they wanted to do and what food they wanted to eat. Staff treated people as individuals, listened to them and respected their wishes.

People were treated with dignity and respect and encouraged to be as independent as possible. One person's relative told us "Staff have encouraged [Name] to be so much more independent, particularly with eating and drinking; they are able to do so much more for themselves now." We saw that people were supported calmly and discreetly to manage their behaviour. Staff were aware if people became anxious or unsettled and provided them with support in a consistent and dignified manner. Staff approached people calmly and ensured that they positioned themselves at a comfortable level for the person they were communicating with.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

The people who lived at Weston Villa were not able to communicate their views of the service; however we received consistently positive feedback from the relatives that we spoke to. For example one person's relative said "We feel so lucky that [Name] is living here, the staff have such good knowledge and they make sure that [Name] is included in all the things that go on." Another relative said "[Name] has improved so much since being here, their communication has really improved and they cope better with other people; it's a major change for them."

All of the staff team had an in depth understanding of people's individual care and support needs and worked consistently to ensure that people were encouraged to progress in all areas of their lives. The service was flexible and responsive to people's individual needs and preferences and implemented strategies to enable people to live as full a life as possible. People's care and support was planned proactively in partnership with them and staff used individually focussed ways of involving people so that they felt consulted, empowered, listened to and valued.

Staff knew people very well; they understood each person's background and knew what care and support they needed to enhance their life. They were committed to working with people to develop effective strategies to enable them to live the fullest life possible. Relatives described the positive changes that they had seen in their family members' wellbeing and behaviour since they had moved into the home. For example staff had worked with one person who had found it very difficult to leave the house. Through consistent support and use of objects to promote understanding and confidence the person was now able to transition from inside the house to outside with minimal anxiety. Staff had also continued to work with a person who found it difficult to clean their teeth; this person was now requesting to use a toothbrush following some of their meals. Feedback from the behaviour support team was very positive "The staff team have been extremely competent at encouraging progress whilst ensuring they do not put too much pressure on them."

Staff supported people to learn coping strategies which could be implemented when they found a situation difficult. We observed people employing these strategies to cope with daily events such as taps running. This had enabled one person to cope more effectively with their personal care and enabled them to take part in some household activities with staff support. All people's achievements were valued and staff continued to work with people to enable them to build on their progress.

People were supported to follow their interests and take part in social activities. For example one person was regularly supported to attend horse riding sessions on an "autism friendly" horse, this had a positive therapeutic impact on the person's well being. Each person had an individual activity schedule that was based upon their interests and hobbies and we saw people supported to enjoy a story reading session, a trip out on the bus and to attend a local disco.

People and their relatives knew how to make a complaint if they needed and were confident that their concerns would be carefully considered however none of them had needed to make a complaint. One

person's relative told us "The manager has made it clear that they are available if we have any complaints and I'm confident that they would do the right thing."

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The service had a positive ethos and an open culture. Staff members were passionate about their roles and the people they were supporting. One member of staff said, "This is one of the best places I've worked, the communication and the staffing levels are good; I think they [People] get really great care." The provider had ensured that staff knew how to challenge the management of the service to help drive improvements and staff were prepared to use the whistleblowing procedure if they had any concerns about people's welfare.

Staff members felt that they were part of the service and were able to contribute to its development. A staff member said, "[Registered Manager] is very encouraging and supportive, we are able to go to them with new ideas." There were a number of initiatives to allow staff to provide feedback, including regular team meetings and surveys. During team meetings staff were encouraged to discuss the values and culture of the service and consider how these impacted on people living in the home. People and their relatives were also encouraged to provide feedback as regular surveys of their views were undertaken.

People were positive about the registered manager and felt confident that they would always listen and take account of their views. Staff members felt that they were always friendly and approachable. Quality assurance systems were in place to help drive improvements. These included a number of internal checks and audits as well as a provider audit. These helped to highlight areas where the service was performing well and the areas which required development. This helped the registered manager and provider ensure the service was as effective for people as possible.