

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

Hamilton Court

Inspection report

Off Elm Green Lane
Conisbrough
Doncaster
South Yorkshire
DN12 3JD

Tel: 01709865449

Date of inspection visit:
11 July 2019
24 July 2019

Date of publication:
04 October 2019

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

About the service

Hamilton Court is a supported living service. It provides support for people with learning disabilities and autistic spectrum disorder living in the community. Accommodation is based in a small housing complex owned by South Yorkshire Housing Association. At the time of the inspection 16 people were using the service. Three people lived in single occupancy flats, and there were also three houses each providing accommodation to four people who used the service.

Secretary of State has asked the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to conduct a thematic review and to make recommendations about the use of restrictive interventions in settings that provide care for people with or who might have mental health problems, learning disabilities and/or autism. Thematic reviews look in-depth at specific issues concerning quality of care across the health and social care sectors. They expand our understanding of both good and poor practice and of the potential drivers of improvement.

As part of thematic review, we carried out a survey with the registered manager at this inspection. This considered whether the service used any restrictive intervention practices (restraint, seclusion and segregation) when supporting people.

The service used positive behaviour support principles to support people in the least restrictive way. No restrictive intervention practices were used.

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

The service applied the principles and values of Registering the Right Support and other best practice guidance. These ensure that people who use the service can live as full a life as possible and achieve the best possible outcomes that include control, choice and independence.

The outcomes for people using the service reflected the principles and values of Registering the Right Support by promoting choice and control, independence and inclusion. People's support focused on them having as many opportunities as possible for them to gain new skills and become more independent.

The people we visited told us the service had helped them to maintain and improve their independence and confidence. People said they liked and trusted the staff and interactions we saw between people and staff were friendly, supportive and respectful.

People felt safe living at the service and there were enough staff to meet people's needs. Procedures for recruiting new staff made sure that only suitable people were employed in the service. The arrangements for handling medicines were safe and people received their medicines as prescribed.

Care was personalised to people's individual needs and people's care plans were being developed to support this further. People led active lives and engaged in activities as individuals, and with their friends,

partners and peers.

People, those close to them and staff were involved in decisions about the service delivery and development through meetings and surveys. The managers of the service were approachable, responsive to suggestions and well respected by people.

The service worked with a variety of professionals to maintain people's health and wellbeing and people had access to a good range of health care services. Staff encouraged people to eat a healthy diet and people had enough to eat and drink. People were supported to have 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 service supported this practice.

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

Rating at last inspection

The last rating for this service was good (published January 2017).

Why we inspected

This was a planned inspection based on the previous rating.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-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?

Good ●

The service was 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.

Hamilton Court

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Service and service type

Hamilton Court provides care and support to people living in a 'supported living' setting, so that they can live as independently as possible. People's care and housing are provided under separate contractual agreements. CQC does not regulate premises used for supported living; this inspection looked at people's personal care and support.

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was announced. We gave the service short notice of the inspection. This was because it is a small service and we needed to be sure that the registered manager would be in the office to support the inspection.

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 six people who used the service about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with six members of staff including the registered manager, deputy manager, senior care worker, and support workers.

We reviewed a range of records. This included four people's care records, risk assessments and records of medicines. We looked at a variety of records relating to the management of the service, including two staff files, staff training records, audits and safety checks, meeting minutes and survey results.

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 the same. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risks associated with people's care and support were identified and action taken to minimise risks.
- Potential risks to people's health and safety had been assessed on an individual basis. These assessments highlighted potential hazards and explained how these were managed. They were reviewed and updated regularly.

Using medicines safely

- People received their medicines as prescribed and in a safe way.
- People had a medication administration record [MAR] which recorded when they received their medicines. These were completed accurately. This included records of the application of people's topical creams.
- People who required medicines on an 'as and when' required basis [PRN] had protocols in place to assist staff to know when these medicines were required.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- The provider had systems in place to ensure people were protected from the risk of abuse.
- People felt safe living at Hamilton Court. One person said, "I am safe here and I come and go as I please."
- Staff were aware of safeguarding responsibilities and processes and had full confidence in managers to address any concerns.

Staffing and recruitment

- People received a service from staff who were recruited safely.
- There were enough staff to keep people safe and meet their needs. The management team told us they would only offer a service if they were sure there were staff available to meet the person's needs.
- People told us there was always someone around to help them and they did not have to wait long to be helped.
- The service continued to recruit new staff using appropriate safe employment checks.

Preventing and controlling infection

- People were protected from the risk and spread of infection.
- Staff supported people to keep their homes clean and encouraged people's responsibility and independence in this.
- Staff used personal protective equipment, such as gloves and aprons when appropriate.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- The service used lessons learned to improve and to minimise the risk of accidents and incidents occurring.
- Accidents and incidents were recorded and analysed to show any trends and patterns.
- The registered manager ensured that any action to minimise risks had been taken to keep people safe.

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 the same. 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 had an initial assessment of needs on which their care and support plans were based.
- People were involved in their assessment to ensure any care and support provided was done so in a person-centred way.
- Care plan documentation was developed to ensure people's preferences and diverse needs were met in all areas of their support. Protected characteristics under the Equalities Act 2010 such as age, culture, religion and disability, were recorded or taken into consideration.
- When a reassessment was needed, the service worked with other professionals to complete this. This also involved identifying if people required a different type or level of support.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People were supported by staff who had the skills and knowledge to care for them effectively.
- Staff felt well supported and received regular supervision and training.
- Staff induction included the care certificate, which is a recognised set of standards for those working in health and social care.
- Staff had completed or were enrolled to complete national vocational qualifications.

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

- People were supported to receive a balanced diet where needed. This took in to consideration their preferences and dietary requirements.
- People told us the food was good and there was enough to eat and drink. People were offered choices of meals. One person said, "I choose what I want to eat and staff help me prepare my meals."
- Staff were knowledgeable about people's different nutritional needs and made relevant adjustments.

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

- The service worked together with a variety of professionals to promote and maintain people's health and wellbeing. The manager described these partnerships with other professionals as very positive.
- People were supported to see their GP or other professional when they needed them. One person told us, "When I wasn't very well, [staff member] helped me and phoned the doctor."
- Some information in health care related plans needed to be clearer to help staff identify certain signs and symptoms linked to people's specific conditions.

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.

Where people may need to be deprived of their liberty in order to receive care and treatment in their own homes, the DoLS cannot be used. Instead, an application can be made to the Court of Protection who can authorise deprivations of liberty.

- The service ensured they worked in line with the MCA. People were supported to make their own choices.
- Where people did not have the capacity to make their own choices, decisions were made in the person's best interest.

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 remained the same. This meant people were supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

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

- People told us staff treated them with kindness and respect and we observed this.
- The managers and staff we spoke with were committed to a person-centred approach. This helped to make sure equality, diversity and human rights were at the forefront of how people's care was provided.
- People's individual and diverse needs, including their cultural needs were assessed when their care packages were devised. Records showed people's rights were considered when their care and support was being assessed and planned.
- Most staff had worked at Hamilton Court for a long time. They knew people well and people knew them. This was clear from the warm, personalised way they spoke and laughed with each other.

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

- People were involved in decisions about their care and support.
- People's feedback was sought on a regular basis, and their views were incorporated into their care plans so they were involved in decisions about the way their care was provided
- People told us their views were part of how their care was assessed, planned, and delivered. One person said, "Staff ask me what I like and what I want to do."

One social worker told us, "It is quite clear there?? are exceptionally good relationships between workers and service users. Increasingly, service users are being much more involved in their care and support planning particularly day time activities."

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- We saw staff treating people with dignity, ensuring their privacy, while encouraging them to do as much as possible for themselves.
- People we spoke with felt their privacy and dignity were maintained. One person said, "I like the staff. They're all nice."
- Staff could explain how they maintained people's privacy, dignity and independence. Staff told us they involved people in their care and ensured the support provided was in line with their current needs and preferences.
- The service maintained their responsibilities in line with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). GDPR is a legal framework that sets guidelines for the collection and handling of people's personal information. People's confidential records were stored safely which maintained people's confidentiality and prevented unauthorised access.

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 the same. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

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

- People received person centred care which met their needs and people's choices were respected,
- People's care plans were individualised and detailed. They included people's likes and dislikes, as well as information about people's daily routines, including the tasks they could do independently and where they needed support.
- People told us they were involved in planning their care and supported to meet their goals. They said their choices were respected.
- Work was being undertaken to further develop people's plans with the aim to make them more person centred and accessible. This was to support people's involvement and engagement with their care planning and reviews.

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

- People's preferred social activities and interests were included in their care plans. It was evident that people led very full lives. People we visited told us of many social activities and holidays they engaged in, showing us the photos and keepsakes they had collected.
- People were supported to maintain their relationships with friends, partners and family members.

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.

- The provider worked within the guidance of AIS and information was provided in formats which people could understand.
- We saw positive relationships between people and the staff supporting them. Staff had a good understanding of people's individual communication needs and effectively interpreted what people liked and wanted.
- Each person's plans included information about their communication needs and this helped make sure staff were familiar with methods of communication and how to provide information to them. This enabled effective communication with people.
- Most written information was made available in easy read formats. This helped to promote meaningful engagement in the service.

End of life care and support

- At the time of our inspection the service was not supporting anyone who was receiving end of life care.
- The registered manager told us they asked people for their wishes in relation to their end of life care and recorded any details within their care documents.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- The provider had a system in place to monitor and respond to complaints.
- People we spoke with did not raise any complaints or concerns about the care and support they received. They told us they would talk to the managers or staff if they had a complaint.
- The registered manager told us complaints would be used to develop the service.
- Complaints were discussed at service user meetings where people were asked if they had any concerns and informed of the process.

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 the same. 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 provider, Doncaster Council had a clear vision and set of values that the service worked towards. This involved treating people with dignity and respect and enabling people who used the service to be independent while ensuring their rights and choices were maintained.
- All managers and staff we spoke with were keen to ensure people received person-centred care and support.
- The culture at Hamilton Court was open, welcoming and inclusive of people's unique needs and diversity. People and staff told us about a good team that worked together well.
- We received positive feedback about the management and provision of the service from the local authority commissioners.

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

- Staff worked well together. The members of the staff team we spoke with were clear about their roles and responsibilities and were professional and open when speaking with us.
- A registered manager was in post and statutory notifications had been sent to the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in line with legal obligation. Ratings from our last inspection had been displayed as required.
- The management team were committed in providing high quality care and understood their duty of candour.

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

- People and those close to them were actively encouraged to give feedback about the quality of the service. We saw the outcome from the most recent service user and friends and family surveys, which were very positive overall. The management team had addressed areas identified for improvement.
- People had regular meetings where they were encouraged to raise concerns and to talk about how they wanted the service to support them.
- Staff were involved in the development of the service through regular meetings. Everyone we spoke with told us that the communication within the service was good.

Continuous learning and improving care

- The management team recognised the importance of learning when things went wrong and sharing that learning with others.
- There was a positive culture in the service and a staff team who were committed to achieve the best outcomes for people.
- Feedback from people about the management of the service was very positive. For instance, one person said, "[The managers and staff] are nice and friendly. They help me when I need help and we have nice here."
- The registered manager conducted a range of audits to ensure the service maintained the standard expected from the provider. These included audits in relation to finances, health and safety and medication.
- Managers worked alongside staff to ensure they received the support they required.

Working in partnership with others

- Staff in the service had developed positive working relationships with commissioners, other social care staff, advocates and health care professionals.
- Health care professionals were involved when needed and staff followed the advice they gave to meet people's needs.
- Feedback we received from other professionals was positive. One social worker commented, "Hamilton Court is a really great place to live. There is a good, supportive management team. The quality of support work which underpins everything is particularly good. Nothing is ever too much trouble."