

J and K Partnership Limited Liability Partnership Meadow House

Inspection Report

27-29 Links Road
Radford
Coventry
West Midlands
CV6 3DQ

Tel: 0247 6271655

Website: www.mhcov.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 01/04/2014

Date of publication: 07/09/2014

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask about services and what we found	3
What people who use the service and those that matter to them say	5

Detailed findings from this inspection

Background to this inspection	6
Findings by main service	7

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Meadow House supports the care and welfare of younger and older adults with a mental health diagnosis and provides mental health rehabilitation services. The service offers both short-term rehabilitation and “slow-stream rehabilitation.” The aims of the service are to enable people to build their independent living skills whilst living in a safe and secure environment. All of the people living at the service at the time of our inspection had long term mental health needs and many of them had been at the service for some time. The service had discharged two people in 2013. Recovery models of care were being used at the service and adapted to meet people’s mental health needs. The majority of people living at the service had been admitted for “slow stream rehabilitation” and may live at the service for some years. The service is located in Coventry. At the time of our inspection there were seven people living at the service.

We found people using the service were receiving safe and effective care which met their individual needs. We found the provider had systems in place to protect people from abuse. The premises people lived in were well maintained and suitable to meet the needs of people using the service. However, we felt that were improvements needed in relation to staff training in the management of challenging behaviour.

People’s health and well-being was being monitored on an on-going basis and people were involved in the

planning and delivery of their care. Staff were adequately trained and supported to deliver safe and appropriate care to people and there were systems in place to support staff.

People were cared for by kind and compassionate staff who understood their individual needs and who treated them with respect and maintained their dignity. People using the service were able to express their views about how the service was being run on a regular basis.

The service had policies and procedures in place in relation to ensuring people’s rights were protected in line with the Mental Capacity Act 2005. The appropriate referrals had been made to professionals in relation to someone who was deemed to lack capacity and ensured that their best interests were being represented. The service had applied the Deprivation of Liberty safeguards as appropriate and nobody was the subject of a Deprivation of Liberty safeguard at the time of our inspection.

There was effective leadership at the service which encouraged an open and inclusive culture. Staff said they were well supported and felt able to express their views about how the service was being run. There were systems in place to ensure that the service learnt from any incidents and we found sufficient numbers of suitably trained staff working at the service. There was a registered manager in post.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

We found that the service was safe for the people who used it. We found that people were treated with respect and that they were encouraged to make decisions for themselves. Staff were very knowledgeable about the needs and preferences of people using the service and we saw staff treat people with dignity and respect throughout the course of our inspection.

Staff had been trained in how to recognise and report abuse and there were clear policies and procedures for staff to follow in relation to protecting vulnerable adults from abuse.

Staff were trained and supported to deliver safe and effective care and people using the service were positive about their care and treatment. However, we found that there was a gap in staff training in relation to challenging behaviour and that staff may need this training due to the potential for people using the service to present this type of behaviour.

We found risk assessments were in place to ensure people's safety whilst encouraging their independence.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 was being appropriately applied at the service.

People lived in a safe, clean and well maintained environment. One area of risk in relation to the decking area of the garden had not yet been addressed by the service. However, regular checks were carried out on the premises and we were assured that the decking was being looked into at the time of our inspection.

Are services effective?

The service was providing care to people effectively. It was monitoring people's health and well-being on an on-going basis and people were involved in this process.

People's needs and preferences were documented by the service and were considered in their care delivery.

Although we found that care plans contained relevant and up-to-date information, these were not always presented in a consistent format and were, at times, difficult to follow.

Are services caring?

People were being cared for by kind and compassionate staff who understood their individual needs and who treated them with respect. We observed very positive interactions between staff and

Summary of findings

people using the service. Staff were very knowledgeable about the needs and preferences of people using the service and we saw staff treat people with dignity and respect throughout the course of our inspection.

People were listened to and equality and diversity was recognised and respected by the service.

Staff understood equality and diversity and had understood the needs of people using the service.

People using the service were able to express their views and opinions about how the service was being run and these were listened to and documented.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

People told us they were happy living at the home and that staff respected their needs and listened to them.

People were supported in the choices they made and were supported to remain independent. They were encouraged to undertake those activities which interested them.

People were involved in their care and treatment and their concerns and views were respected and acted upon where necessary. People were involved in reviews of their care planning and delivery and were able to express their views about how the service was being run.

All concerns and complaints raised by people were recorded and responded to effectively and with respect.

Are services well-led?

We found that there was strong, positive leadership in place which encouraged an open and inclusive culture for staff to work in. There was a registered manager in post.

None of the staff we spoke with had any issues or concerns about how the service was being run and were very positive about the leadership in place, describing to us how the service had improved of late.

We found staff to be motivated, caring and trained to an appropriate standard, to meet the needs of people using the service. There was an effective supervision system in place although the record keeping in relation to this needed to be improved.

The service dealt well with complaints and fully investigated and responded to them. Incidents and accidents were all recorded to ensure the safety and welfare of people using the service.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service and those that matter to them say

People using the service were very positive about the care they received at the service. They told us that they felt safe at the service and they were able to take part in activities which interested them. One person said, "I like all the activities, especially the arts and crafts." Another person told us, "I can do what I want. Make tea or sandwiches." People were positive about the staff looking after them and described being cared for by kind and compassionate staff. One person said, "Staff are respectful to me." None of the people using the service had any concerns or issues when we talked with them during the inspection.

We spoke with the relative of someone who had recently joined the service. They were happy with the way their relative had settled into the service and had no concerns about how the service was run. They told us, "They seem nice and his room is nice."

We also spoke with an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate who had been representing someone using the service. They expressed no concerns about the service and thought that the person they had been representing had been appropriately cared for.

Meadow House

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

This service was inspected as part of the first testing phase of the new inspection process we are introducing for adult social care services. 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 regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and to pilot a new inspection process under Wave 1.

We carried out this inspection by visiting the service. The inspection team included an expert by experience who was able to speak with four people about their experiences of using the service. Our expert had a background in mental health care services.

We last inspected this service in May 2013 and found the service to be meeting the regulations we looked at during that inspection.

In order to carry out this inspection we spoke with people who used the service, spoke with the relative of someone using the service and we spoke with staff working at the service, including the registered manager and the provider. Following our inspection we also spoke with an advocate who had represented someone using the service.

We reviewed care records for people and looked at the policies and procedures in place at the service. We observed care being delivered to people and looked at staff records. We looked at how the service recorded incidents and accidents and discussed many aspects of care delivery with the registered manager of the service.

Prior to our inspection we reviewed information we held about safeguarding incidents at the service and reviewed incidents and changes which the provider had informed us about. We contacted the commissioners of the service to obtain their views on the service and how it was currently being run.

Are services safe?

Our findings

At the time of our inspection there were seven people living at the service. We spoke with four people who were willing to talk to us about their experiences of using the service. All of the people we spoke with told us that they felt safe living at the service. One person said, "I feel safe and sound here."

There were clear safeguarding policies and procedures in place at the service and staff had signed to say that they had read and understood these. Staff had a good understanding about safeguarding, could identify different types of abuse and were aware of the safeguarding risks which people using the service could be vulnerable to. Staff knew how to report any safeguarding concerns, both internally within the service, and to appropriate external organisations. There was a clear process in place for the reporting of safeguarding incidents.

Some of the people using the service may have behaviours that challenge. We looked at five care plans as part of our inspection and found that some contained details of these behaviours. Staff told us that no-one at the service had displayed any physically challenging behaviour to date but told us that there was the potential for this to happen in a number of cases. Staff did not have training in relation to dealing with challenging behaviour and, whilst this had not been an area of concern to date, there was a risk of this happening in the future.

We found that risk assessments were detailed, written for the person they concerned, and that they provided detailed guidance for staff on how to minimise identified risks to people, whilst encouraging their independence and autonomy. Staff we spoke with were aware of the potential risks to individuals and took appropriate steps to manage these.

We saw that all accidents and incidents were reported at the service and that a system was in place to monitor any patterns and trends in relation to these. The service was monitoring these incidents to ensure people's safety.

We found that staff had received training in relation to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and in the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. We found that one person using the service had undergone a mental capacity assessment recently and that this person had an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate in place to ensure their best interests were being represented. We found that the registered manager was aware of the requirements of the MCA.

We looked at the premises during our inspection to ensure that these provided a safe environment for people using the service. We looked at all of the communal areas of the service and some people's bedrooms. We found the communal areas to be well maintained and that they offered a pleasant environment for people to spend their time in. People's bedrooms were designed to meet their needs and people had been able to choose how these were decorated. All bedrooms had recently had new carpets and people had chosen the colour of these. There were regular checks on the physical environment people were living in carried out by the registered manager. A recent check had identified a risk with the decking area of the garden at the home. No action had been taken in relation to this risk at the time of our inspection. The provider told us that this would be addressed following our inspection. People we spoke with who used the service described being happy with their home. One person told us, "The building and my room is a nice size. Plenty of room and privacy." None of the people we spoke with had any concerns about the premises they lived in.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

We looked at five care plans as part of our inspection and found evidence that people were involved both in the assessment of their needs and in their care planning on an on-going basis. We found care plans to reflect people's needs and personal preferences in relation to things like food, daily activities and in their care delivery. People's needs and preferences were respected at the service and taken into account in the delivery of their care.

We observed staff responding to people's individual requests and found that this was done to ensure people's individual needs and wishes were being catered for. People could choose how and where they spent their time and were being cared for by staff who knew their needs and respected their wishes. Staff we spoke with understood the importance of involving people in their care and told us that people's needs and wishes were met wherever possible. One support worker told us, "It's a homely place to work. Staff and service users have a trusting relationship. It's very unique."

None of the people we spoke with who used the service expressed any concerns about how their care was delivered to them. They spoke positively about living at the service and described being able to make their own decisions and express their views. One person said, "I can do what I want, make tea or sandwiches." We saw that people were encouraged to remain independent and carry out those tasks they were able to. We observed people preparing meals and doing their washing during our inspection.

We saw evidence that people's health was being monitored on an on-going basis to ensure their well-being. This was documented in their care plans. Numerous health professionals were involved in people's care and the service liaised with them as appropriate. People were involved in the administration of their medication and were given enough information about what their medication was and when they needed to take these. People's plans of care and treatment were regularly reviewed by the registered manager at the service and were updated as and when needed. We saw that people were involved in this care plan evaluation process. The registered manager had a system of care plan audits to ensure that these contained appropriate and up-to-date information.

We spoke with staff working at the service and they all told us that they felt supported and that they felt adequately trained to carry out their roles. One staff member told us that they felt the service had improved in recent months, saying: "You can see it improving all the time." They went on to comment that they were encouraged to express their views and opinions, they told us: "Staff are listened to and you can express your views." We found that staff received regular supervisions and that any training gaps were identified and addressed through this process. We found that the service held accurate and up-to-date training records for staff which showed that staff had been trained in key areas of delivering safe and effective care to people, although there was a gap in training around challenging behaviour. The registered manager and the provider told us that this would be looked at following our inspection.

Are services caring?

Our findings

People we spoke with during our inspection were happy living at the service. They all told us they were treated with respect by staff who cared about them. One person told us: "Staff are respectful to me." People described having the freedom to live their lives as they wished, carrying out activities which interested them and being able to move around the service as they wanted to. People were all very positive about the care they received.

We observed staff and people using the service communicating well and saw that people were treated with respect. Staff knew and understood people's needs and preferences.

Staff we spoke with knew the needs of people using the service and understood their personal preferences. Staff were familiar with the things people enjoyed doing. We observed staff treating people with kindness, compassion and respect whilst maintaining their dignity. Staff were able to offer advice and care whilst still allowing people their independence and respecting their right to make their own decisions. One person using the service was outside at the time of the visit and a staff member suggested they may want to put on more clothes as it was cold. The staff member did this respectfully and did not impose their views or opinions on the person. They made a suggestion, allowing the person to make the decision for themselves.

There were a number of policies in place at the service to guide staff on treating people who used the service with respect. There was a bullying and harassment policy which outlined how the service protected people from abuse and highlighted the importance of treating people with respect. There was also a policy in place about protecting people's rights and this, again, demonstrated how the service was

respecting people's right to privacy, dignity and independence. These policies were being applied in practice and this was evident in the interactions we observed between staff and people using the service. We also found evidence of this approach in people's plans of care and treatment.

We found that the service had policies in place in relation to equality and diversity and we saw that people's cultural needs, religious beliefs and practices, were respected and catered for at the service. One person using the service was a practising Muslim and we found that the service were mindful of this and that his religious and cultural needs were acknowledged and supported at the service. People took part in activities which reflected their cultural and religious needs. We found there was a diversity in care policy in place at the service which provided guidance to staff about respecting people's diversity in an anti-discriminatory way.

People using the service were regularly consulted about their care and their views and opinions were listened to by staff working at the service and by the registered manager. People were involved in reviewing their plan of care and treatment and were involved in the delivery of their care on a daily basis. We saw evidence that regular meetings were held for people using the service and records from these meetings showed that people were encouraged to express their views and that these were being listened to.

During our inspection people using the service came to the registered manager on numerous occasions to ask for help and advice or to simply let them know of their plans. People were listened to and the registered manager demonstrated that they treated people with respect and that they understood their individual needs and preferences.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

We spoke with four people using the service, a relative of someone using the service and an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate (IMCA) who had represented someone living at the home. People using the service were being supported to express their views about how the service was run through regular meetings, involvement in reviews of their care plans and through their daily interactions with staff. We saw evidence that the relatives of people using the service were involved in care planning and delivery and that their views were regularly sought. The relative of someone using the service told us that they had been very happy with the care provided at the home so far and that their relative had settled in well. People were given a recovery plan in order to encourage them to become more independent and to aid with their mental health rehabilitation.

Throughout our inspection we observed staff supporting people to make their own choices about how they spent their time. People were being encouraged to remain independent wherever possible and were being supported to carry out the activities they wished to undertake. People were able to make choices on a day to day basis about how they spent their time and staff accommodated people's requests to be taken into the community as and when they wished. We observed this to be the case during our inspection. One person using the service told us, "I can choose if I want to do something." Staff actively encouraged people to remain as independent as possible and supported them in doing this. We saw evidence of this by observing staff interactions during our inspection and from looking at the risk assessments in place for people using the service.

One person using the service had an IMCA representing them as they had been assessed as lacking the mental capacity to make decisions in a number of areas. We spoke to this advocate who told us that the person was happy living at the home. The advocate had no concerns about the care and treatment offered at the service and felt that the person's best interests were being met. We observed this person carrying out the daily activities they enjoyed and found them to be supported by staff who listened to their views.

We found care plans to reflect people's personal preferences. People's likes and dislikes in relation to food,

activities and care delivery were detailed in the plans we looked at. Where people had needs related to their religious and cultural beliefs these were detailed in their care plans and put into practice at the service. Care plans were individualised and reflected the objective of supporting people to remain independent.

People had activity schedules in place which provided evidence that they regularly went out into the local community. Many people using the service saw their friends and families on a regular basis and this formed part of their activity schedules. We observed people going out to local services within the community during our inspection and people appeared to have very fulfilling, busy social lives. If people chose not to go out into the community this was supported by adequate staff being on duty at the service. Staff were flexible and able to accommodate requests from people to go out, as and when they wanted, wherever possible. The home had a number of communal rooms where people could access craft materials, games, computer systems and games consoles. This provided an opportunity for people using the service to interact with one another and undertake activities they enjoyed. There were systems in place to protect people from social isolation. People were being encouraged to remain independent to support their recovery and to assist them in becoming more independent in order to consider eventually moving on from the service.

We found that there was a complaints policy and procedure in place at the service. This outlined a very clear procedure for people to follow should they need to complain. The procedure gave information on how people could complain, timeframes for how and when these complaints would be responded to and gave information to people on where they could go if they were not happy with the response from the service. The complaints procedure was displayed in the communal hallway at the home and this information was readily available to people using the service. We looked at the record of complaints received by the service over the last 12 months. We found that two complaints had been received from people using the service. We saw that these complaints had been handled in line with the policy and procedures in place. People's complaints had been acknowledged in a timely

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

manner and their concerns had been dealt with appropriately and with respect. People's views had been listened to and their concerns were investigated and responded to.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

We found during our inspection that the newly appointed registered manager had made some significant improvements at the service since being in post. Staff reported to have seen the service implement a number of changes which had improved things both for the staff team and for people using the service. One staff member said: “Since (the registered manager) has been here it’s been much better. It’s a nice place to work.” The provider told us: “The manager has so much respect from people. We really value her.”

We found that staff regularly had the opportunity to express their views during staff meetings, through staff surveys and through regular supervisions with the manager at the service. Staff reported that they felt listened to and that they were able to raise any concerns or issues they had. We found that staff were supported in developing within their roles and that they were encouraged to progress in their careers at the service. We saw training records which reflected staff development within the organisation.

Staff described working in a supportive and open environment. They were positive about the leadership at the service and told us that they received training and support to carry out their roles effectively. One staff member told us, “It’s nice here. The clients have the freedom to do what they want.” Another staff member said, “It’s good. It’s a nice environment for the service users.”

There were policies and procedures in place in relation to treating people with respect, compassion and dignity. Staff understood these values and we observed people being treated with respect during our inspection. There was an open culture at the service which encouraged staff to be positive in the way they interacted with people who used the service and with one another.

Incident, accidents and complaints were all being recorded at the service. We saw records of these and found that analysis took place to monitor these for any patterns or trends. The service dealt well with complaints and fully investigated and responded to them. Incidents and accidents were all recorded to ensure the safety and welfare of people using the service.

We found there were sufficient numbers of staff on duty to adequately meet the needs of people using the service. Staff training records showed that staff received training in delivering safe and appropriate care to people. However, staff training records were held individually for each staff member which meant that there was no overview of staff training. We highlighted this to the provider who told us that this would be addressed following our inspection. We found that staff had regular supervisions to support them in their roles and to address any training needs they may have. The registered manager struggled to find some of these records when we requested them. The service did not have a robust system in place for collating and storing these supervision records. However, once they were found and provided to us we did see that effective and thorough supervisions took place for staff at the service.

We found that individual evacuation plans were in place for people using the service and that the service also had plans in place to deal with any foreseeable emergencies which may affect the running of the service. These were in place to ensure people’s safety.

We found that there was strong, positive leadership in place at the service which encouraged an open and inclusive culture for staff to work in. None of the staff we spoke with had any issues or concerns about how the service was being run and were very positive about the leadership in place, describing to us how the service had improved of late.