

Sanctuary Care (Wellcare) 2 Limited

Prince Alfred Residential Care Home

Inspection report

Rose Villas
Prince Alfred Road
Liverpool
Merseyside
L15 8HH

Date of inspection visit:
08 July 2019

Date of publication:
28 August 2019

Tel: 01517342587

Website: www.europeancare.co.uk

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good ●
Is the service safe?	Good ●
Is the service effective?	Good ●
Is the service caring?	Outstanding ☆
Is the service responsive?	Good ●
Is the service well-led?	Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Prince Alfred is a residential care service that provides accommodation and personal care for up to fifty people. It accommodates people across two floors, each of which has separate facilities. At the time of our inspection, there were 46 people living at the home.

People's experience of using this service and what we found

People using this service benefitted from an outstandingly caring service and truly felt that Prince Alfred was their home.

We received overwhelmingly positive feedback on how staff were supportive and went above and beyond to get care just right for people. People considered Prince Alfred as, "a very special place" and "a home from home."

People and their relatives had complete confidence in the staff who took care of them. People received care from staff who were exceptionally caring and had developed genuine relationships with the people they were caring for. Staff were kind and compassionate and knew people's individual needs, routines and preferences well.

People were supported in such a way that allowed them maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the home supported this practice.

People participated in activities and pastimes which were meaningful to them, both in the local and wider community. Staff took the time to get to know what people enjoyed doing and were pivotal in the deliverance of individualised activities and pastimes.

People were treated with the utmost dignity and respect. Staff provided support where required but took great care to encourage and maintain people's independence. People's protected characteristics, such as gender, cultural and spiritual needs were both valued and respected.

Feedback about the management of the home from people, their relatives and staff was positive. The registered manager adopted a hands on approach to the deliverance of care, in addition to managing the home. The manager encouraged a culture of person centred and compassionate care, and this was evident throughout every member of the staff team.

Staff were supported in their role with appropriate training and supervision. Most staff had received additional training to meet the specific needs of the people they were caring for.

Regular checks and audits were carried out to determine the quality and safety of the environment and the

care being provided. Risk to people was appropriately assessed and measures were put in place to support people safely, whilst still respecting their freedom.

The registered manager and registered provider had met their legal requirements with the Care Quality Commission (CQC). They promoted a person centred and transparent culture within the service.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Rating at last inspection

At our last inspection, the service was rated "Good." (Report published January 2017).

Why we inspected

This was a planned inspection based on the rating of the last inspection.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

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 was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Details are in our effective findings below.

Is the service caring?

Outstanding ☆

The service was exceptionally caring.

Details are in our caring findings below.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

Details are in our responsive findings below.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

Details are in our well-led findings below.

Prince Alfred Residential Care Home

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out our inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. Our inspection checked whether the provider was 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.

Inspection team

The inspection was completed by one inspector.

Service and service type

Prince Alfred is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The service 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.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return. This is information providers are required to send us with key

information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. This information helps support our inspections. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We spoke with eight people who used the service and two relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with the registered manager, service administrator, a senior care worker and a care worker.

We reviewed a range of records. This included four people's care records and multiple medication records. We looked at three staff files in relation to recruitment and staff supervision. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including policies and procedures were reviewed.

After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found. We spoke with two professionals who regularly visit the service. We also spoke with four relatives and a member of care staff.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People's feedback and their relatives told us they felt the care at Prince Alfred was safe. People told us, "Yes its completely safe" and "I feel safe living here, its very secure." Comments from relatives included, "I have total peace of mind leaving [person] here" and "It's a real safe haven."
- Staff received safeguarding training and had access to a whistleblowing policy. Staff understood how to safeguard people from abuse and how to report any safeguarding concerns.
- The registered manager sent us statutory notifications to inform us of any events that placed people at risk of harm.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Systems were in place for checking the safety of the environment and equipment.
- A fire risk assessment of the building was in place and regular fire safety checks were undertaken.
- Individual risk assessments were carried out for each person and included health, safety and environmental risks. Control measures were in place that provided staff with guidance on how to mitigate any identified risks to people.

Staffing and recruitment

- There were enough numbers of staff to provide people with safe and, consistent care and support.
- People received care and support from staff who were familiar with their needs and routines. Wherever possible, any sickness or absences were covered by permanent members of staff, including the registered manager. This ensured continuity of care. One person told us, "Having staff that know you is absolutely vital."
- Full pre-employment checks were completed to help ensure staff members were safe to work with vulnerable people.

Using medicines safely

- Medicines were stored and managed safely. Medication was administered by staff who were trained and competent to do so.
- Staff took time with people and were respectful in how they supported people to take their medicines.
- Peoples independence to manage their own medicines was maintained as long as safe to do so.

Preventing and controlling infection

- Staff received training in infection prevention and control and followed good practice guidance.
- The home was clean and well maintained.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Incidents and accidents were reviewed by the registered manager to identify any themes and trends.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained good. This meant people's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law

- People's needs, and choices were assessed, and they received care and support in line with standards, guidance and the law.
- Care records evidenced the involvement of people and relevant others such as relatives. Records contained details about people's backgrounds and life history. This helped build up a picture of the person. One relative told us, "I was fully involved in helping to complete [person's] care plan, this was important to me and [person], as it helped staff get to know all their little ways."
- Records were individualised and contained details of people's preferred routines and preferences. People were involved in setting their own goals and aspirations.
- Daily notes were recorded by staff which detailed all care and intervention carried out. People's care records were regularly reviewed with the person, so that any changes in support needs could be implemented.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- Staff had the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to perform their roles. Staff were supported through inductions, supervisions and appraisals.
- Most staff had undergone additional training to help meet the specific needs of people.
- Staff were competent, knowledgeable and skilled and felt supported by managers to develop further.

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet

- People gave positive feedback about the food. People had a direct input in planning the menus and so enjoyed nutritious foods which were familiar to them.
- Care records contained information on how staff were to support people with any dietary needs and maintain a balanced diet.

Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care; Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- People received the care and support they needed, and were referred to external healthcare professionals where appropriate.
- Staff supported people to attend external appointments where required, this was important for people who wanted an advocate to act on their behalf. People had a choice in what member of staff they preferred to support them.

Adapting service, design, decoration to meet people's needs

- Each person had their own room and were able to personalise their room to their own taste. At the time of our inspection, the home was in the process of refurbishment. This included bathrooms, corridors and some communal areas. People had been consulted about the colour and design and had a say in how they wanted their home to look.

Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance

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.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA.

In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

- Applications for DoLS had been made for some people living at the home. Staff had received training in mental capacity and assumed people had the capacity to make decisions, unless assessed otherwise.
- Staff ensured people were involved in decisions about their care and support. We found recorded evidence of people's consent to care documented in their support files. Staff asked and explained to people before giving care and support.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has now improved to outstanding. This meant people were truly respected and valued as individuals; and empowered as partners in their care in an exceptional service.

Supporting people to express their views and be involved in making decisions about their care

- People's communication needs and any assistance they needed was recorded in their care plan.
- Staff took every opportunity to ensure people were supported to make decisions and choices about their care. There were no set routines in the home. People were given the autonomy and independence to live their lives, and their needs and choices dictated how the day went. People were completely involved in their care and support from whether they wanted a bath or shower in the morning to what time they wanted to go to bed at night. We observed and people told us the impact this had on their lives. People felt in control, independent and empowered and that the home was truly 'their home.'
- People were given the opportunity to express their views and opinions through regular meetings. Menus had been discussed at one such meeting and had been solely devised based on people's feedback. This meant people had a say in the running of the home. One person told us, "It makes it feel like my home as I have a say." People told us they could have their say and approach staff at any time.
- For people who had no family or friends to speak on their behalf, the service had details of an independent advocacy service. An advocate helps to ensure that the views and wishes of the person are conveyed.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; respecting equality and diversity

- Staff were motivated and passionate about ensuring people were well treated and supported. Many staff were long standing employees of the service and knew people's needs and routines exceptionally well. It was evident that staff cared deeply about the people they supported, and had developed strong relationships both with them and their relatives. One member of staff told us, "We know people better than we know our own families, we do everything we possibly can to ensure people are happy, if they are happy, we are happy."
- Our observations showed people displayed positive signs of well-being. People were keen to tell us how they considered Prince Alfred a home from home. There was a joyous and friendly atmosphere to the day's events. People were truly engaged and had a real sense of purpose to their lives. A relative told us, "It's not like a care home here, its like I am visiting [person] in their own home."
- People and their relatives told us they were extremely satisfied with the care they received. People told us, "Staff are brilliant, the quality of care is great, I've landed on my feet," "Staff know me well, I see the same staff. Staff are courteous, well trained and know exactly what they're doing," and " [Staff] are so kind and stop just to ask how I am." Comments from relatives included, "It's exceptional here, I don't believe there is any other place like it," "Staff are truly genuine, caring and dedicated, they understand [person], they make time for us. [Person] truly feels at home here," "It's outstanding and genuine care here, it's a vocation, not a job for the staff, the continuity of staff here is exceptional, most [staff] have been here for many years, that

says a lot," and "The level of care is beyond my expectations. I feel reassured [person] is here, the care is in a different league altogether."

- Relatives told us about how the home celebrated people's birthdays. Staff set up the 'family lounge' with decorations and a feast so the person could celebrate their birthday in style, with their family and friends around them. One relative told us, "The time and trouble staff go to, to celebrate not just people's birthdays but events such as Christmas and Easter is truly remarkable. Everywhere is exquisitely decorated and its like celebrating back at [person's] home, its really wonderful."
- Staff displayed a natural and familiar way with people. Staff were consistently polite, courteous and engaged, and were genuinely pleased to be at work. People were treated respectfully and in a dignified way. Staff went out of their way to make time for people. They constantly chatted to people as they went about their work. One person told us, "[Staff] always stop and ask if I'm OK and if I need anything, its those things that makes such a difference."
- Staff were truly passionate about their roles and were keen to involve themselves with the running of the service. One way staff did this was to take responsibly for finding out what people most enjoyed doing, and engage that person in that activity or on a day out. People had a say in which staff member they wished to support them with this, this meant that staff often came in on their days off to ensure these activities were facilitated.
- People's human rights were upheld. People's personal relationships, sexuality, cultural and spiritual needs were valued and respected. Staff accompanied people to attend external religious services. The home actively supported married couples to remain together. A relative told us this meant a great deal to the couple and gave them great comfort.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People were encouraged to be as independent as possible. We observed the delivery of care throughout the day. Where assistance was required, staff were considerate and offered assistance in a discreet and dignified manner. Staff explained what they were about to do before any kind of intervention.
- Staff took the time to maintain people's independence at every opportunity. One member of staff told us, "We support people to remain independent and respect their dignity. It's all about their choices."
- People appeared well cared for, groomed and appropriately dressed. Staff ensured people were dressed in clothes they were most comfortable in. One relative told us, "The home is always unbelievably clean, it's like a top hotel, the people here are always immaculate and well turned out."
- People's right to privacy and confidentiality was respected. People's privacy and dignity were maintained. People were treated as individuals. One person told us, "Staff keep me dignified and respect my privacy at all times."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the service met people's needs.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained good. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Supporting people to develop and maintain relationships to avoid social isolation; support to follow interests and to take part in activities that are socially and culturally relevant to them

- Unique ways were utilised to engage people in activities which were truly person-centred, individualised and meaningful to them.
- Each member of staff was set a 'Staff Challenge' to find out what people preferred and wanted to do. The staff member then had to organise the event or activity by working together with the people who wished to take part. Staff would willingly support events within their own time as they were passionate about their roles and the people they supported.
- Activities were then analysed for their 'success' and either repeated or amended in accordance with people's feedback. Past 'challenges' had included taking a small group of people on a Beate's tour, followed by a tour of both local football clubs, finished off with a pint in the pub. People had thoroughly enjoyed the trip, so much so, that each person who had participated had a group photograph of the day in their room. Another member of staff was in the process of putting together a song that was memorable or sentimental to each person onto a CD which could be played throughout the day.
- Every member of staff was involved in the 'Staff Challenge' including the maintenance person who had organised a DIY and gardening club, so that people with those interests could participate in the maintenance of their home and grounds.

Planning personalised care to ensure people have choice and control and to meet their needs and preferences

- People received care and support from staff who were familiar to them. This helped to ensure consistency and continuity wherever possible. People told us this was extremely important to them.
- Care records contained detailed information about people's preferences in relation to their support and treatment. Staff used this knowledge to care and support people in the way they preferred.
- A re-assessment of people's needs was regularly undertaken to ensure that any changes in their needs and goals were identified and planned for.
- People were fully involved in making decisions and choices and to have as much independence as possible.
- People's protected characteristics were recorded such as their religion, culture and sexual orientation.

Meeting people's communication needs

Since 2016 onwards all organisations that provide publicly funded adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). The standard was introduced to make sure people are given information in a way they can understand. The standard applies to all people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss and in some circumstances to their carers.

- Staff supported people who required assistance with reading or completing paperwork in relation to their care and support. Guidance on how best to communicate with the person was recorded in their care plan.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- There was an appropriate complaints management system in place.
- At the time of our inspection the service had not received any complaints. People told us they knew how to raise any concerns if needed.
- The registered manager analysed any complaints received and used them as opportunities to further improve the service.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained good. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- The culture of the service was caring with kindness and focused on ensuring people received person centred care that met their needs and preferences. The registered manager both planned and promoted individualised, high-quality care and this achieved good outcomes for the people living at Prince Alfred. The manager demonstrated good leadership on a daily basis, and it was evident every member of staff put these values into practice.
- Individualised care and kindness were the cornerstones of the home. The registered manager truly led by example. They spent the first few hours of every day supporting staff by getting involved in the day to day care of people such as bathing and showering, to ensure all residents needs were met. One relative told us, "[Manager] is truly remarkable, they are here morning, noon and night, just so they can personally look after people, they are exceptional."
- The service had an effective system to monitor the safety and quality of the service. For example, any incidents were analysed to establish patterns. Measures were put in place to help stop incidents reoccurring.
- Audits identified actions required to ensure full compliance with the provider's objectives and regulations.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- People were empowered to put their opinions and views forward. This included daily interaction with them to assess their well-being and ongoing support needs.
- In addition to an open-door policy, the registered manager also held regular resident and relative meetings as an additional way of obtaining people's feedback. Such meetings had been instrumental in bringing about change. People had decided on menu changes and refurbishment designs as a direct result of these meetings. One person told us, "We helped to choose the decoration, we are really pleased with it."
- The registered manager held regular staff meetings. They encouraged good communication between staff. Staff told us they felt comfortable to raise any issues or suggestions they had, not just at meetings but at any time. Staff told us they felt completely supported and motivated by the registered manager. One told us, "We are not just carers here, we get involved in putting into place all we can to ensure people are doing what they want to do and are happy."

Continuous learning and improving care

- Through the supervision process, the registered manager identified any areas in which staff wished to develop. Measures were then put into place to enable staff to further develop their skills.

- The registered manager was continually reviewing and learning where possible. Recent developments included the introduction of an electronic care planning system.

Working in partnership with others

- The service worked in partnership with others such as commissioners, safeguarding teams, health and social care professionals and community groups. The service actively promoted the development of intergenerational bonds and had good links with the local school. Children from the school would regularly visit to sing or read with people.
- The service had formed a particularly close working relationship with the GP and community matron, so that people received care from professionals who knew them well. Comments from health professionals included, "This is a place I would recommend" and "There are very good staff at Prince Alfred who genuinely care."

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- The registered manager promoted transparency and honesty in the running of the service, and was well respected by people, relatives and staff alike. They were described as being, "approachable," "supportive," "hands on", "one of a kind," "remarkably efficient" and "a miracle worker."
- The prior inspection rating was displayed within the service's premises in accordance with regulatory requirements.

How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong

- The management team held regular meetings and discussed any accidents and incidents. This helped to further drive the quality of the service.
- The registered manager submitted any required notifications to CQC in a timely way.