

Sanctuary Home Care Limited

# Sanctuary Supported Living - Studfield Court

## Inspection report

17A Studfield Crescent  
Sheffield  
South Yorkshire  
S6 4SP

Tel: 01142853563

Date of inspection visit:  
19 March 2019

Date of publication:  
01 April 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:

Sanctuary Supported Living - Studfield Court is a support living service that is registered to provide personal care to people with learning disabilities who have low to medium support needs and who live in supported living arrangements. Studfield Court comprises of eight fully furnished self-contained flats (four of which are on the ground floor with wheelchair access). The service is situated in a quiet residential area close to local amenities and public transport links. The service provides support to people to live in their accommodation, with their own tenancy agreements. The aim of the service is to provide people with support they need to live as independently as possible. The service is not staffed overnight but people can access a telephone contact for emergency support at all times. At the time of inspection two people were receiving a regulated service.

People's experience of using this service:

The service met the characteristics of a good service in all areas we reviewed.

The outcomes:

The service promoted choice, control and independence.

Each person had a bespoke living environment complete with bedroom, individual living space and cooking facilities. This helped ensure the service was very person centred. People had maximum control over all aspects of daily life. This included their routines, activities and meals. People's support focused on increasing their opportunities and providing them with skills to become more independent.

Risks to people's health and safety were assessed and appropriate risk assessment documents were in place which were subject to regular review. People received their medicines safely and as prescribed, with people encouraged to be involved in the management of their own medicines.

There were enough staff deployed to ensure people's needs were met. Staff were recruited safely and only worked with people following training and if they were deemed competent.

Staff were kind and compassionate and treated people well. People were listened to and supported. People were involved in care and support planning.

The registered manager was away from the service at the time of inspection. However, the area manager and deputy was supporting the service. They had good oversight of the service and ensured it operated to a high standard.

Rating at last inspection: The service was last inspected 30 September 2016 and rated Good. At this inspection we found the service had maintained its rating of Good.

Why we inspected: This was a planned inspection which took place to re-assess the quality of the service provided as we had not visited since 2016.

## 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.

# Sanctuary Supported Living - Studfield 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. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Service and service type: Sanctuary Supported Living - Studfield Court is a supported living service that is registered to provide personal care to people with learning disabilities who have low to medium support needs and who live in supported living arrangements. The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. A registered manager 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:

The inspection was announced. We gave the service 24 hours' notice of our inspection to ensure a manager was present to assist us.

What we did:

Before this inspection we reviewed information we held about the service. The registered manager had completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). The PIR is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We also reviewed notifications submitted to us by the service. Providers are required by law to notify us of certain events, such as when a person who uses the service suffers a serious injury. We took this information into account when we inspected the service.

During the inspection we spoke with the area manager, deputy manager and two support staff. We spoke with two people and observed staff interacting with them. We reviewed two people's care records and medication records. We also reviewed records and audits relating to the management of the service.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

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

People were safe and protected from avoidable harm. Legal requirements were met. Both people receiving support told us they felt safe. One person told us, "I am safe here yes, they look after me when I need support."

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- The provider had appropriate systems in place to safeguard people from abuse.
- Staff had been trained in their responsibilities for safeguarding adults. They knew what action to take if they witnessed or suspected abuse and they were confident the registered manager would address any concerns they raised.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Systems were in place to identify and reduce risks to people.
- People's care records included assessments of specific risks posed to them, such as managing medication and finance. Care records contained appropriate guidance for staff about how to support people to reduce the risk of avoidable harm.
- Regular checks of the building and the equipment were carried out to keep people safe and the building was well maintained.

Staffing and recruitment

- The service provided one to one support to promote independent living skills, according to people's commissioned care needs. Outside of these hours, the two-people living at the home lived independently. A telephone and emergency contact number was available to them. Both people said they were happy with the staffing arrangements.
- We found a team of support staff worked at the home and covered for each other to make sure support staff were available for agreed hours.
- People receiving support and staff were happy with the staffing arrangements.
- Suitable recruitment checks were completed before staff were employed to work at the service, to help make sure the staff were assessed as suitable to work at the service.

Using medicines safely

- Medicines were administered in accordance with people's identified support needs. One person self-administered their medicine.
- People were receiving their medicines as prescribed by their GP.
- People told us they were happy with the support they received with their medicines.
- Medicines were obtained, stored and disposed of safely by staff.
- The provider had a policy in place regarding medicines administration. This provided guidance to staff to help ensure people received their medicines safely.

### Preventing and controlling infection

- People kept their flats clean with support from staff.
- Staff followed cleaning schedules and had access to personal protective equipment such as gloves and aprons.

### Learning lessons when things go wrong

- The provider had a system in place to learn from any accidents or incidents. This reduced the risk of them reoccurring. The provider was keen to learn from these events. They shared any learning across all their locations to improve safety in each of the services.
- The registered manager analysed accident and incident records to identify any trends and common causes.

# 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

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 were assessed before they moved in to check the service was suitable for them. A detailed support plan was then written for each person which guided staff in how to support them without restrictions.
- People receiving support were involved in this process. They were asked to provide important information about their likes, dislikes and life history, so support could be provided in accordance with their needs and preferences.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- Staff were competent, knowledgeable and skilled. They carried out their roles effectively. People told us, "They [staff] help here, they are great. I get the support I need."
- Staff completed a training programme and regularly refreshed their knowledge of different subjects. Both staff confirmed they had received relevant induction and refresher training.
- Staff received regular supervision from their line manager and annual appraisals. Staff told us they felt supported to carry out their roles effectively.

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

- People were supported to maintain a balanced and varied diet that met their nutritional requirements.
- People were involved in meal planning, food shopping and food preparation. We saw plentiful supplies of food available for people in their own flats. One person told us they liked to go out for meals and went out a few times a week.

Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care

- People told us they were happy with their care. One person told us they were working with staff and outside professionals to move to somewhere with more room.

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

- The premises had sufficient amenities such as a bathroom, kitchen, individual flats and communal areas to ensure people could receive the support they required.
- A maintenance programme was in place to make sure a safe environment was maintained.

Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- Staff worked closely with other organisations to deliver effective care and support to people. Staff regularly

sought advice from community health professionals such as the GP and opticians. This process supported staff to achieve good outcomes for people and to help people maintain their health.

- People were positive about the support they received to maintain their health. One person said, "They come with me to my appointments if I want them to."

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 with appropriate legal authority. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA).
- Staff developed support plans in consultation with people living in the service. People had signed consent forms to demonstrate they consented to the care and support described in their support plan.
- We observed staff seek consent and agreement from people throughout the day before providing any support, such as going in their flats, or making plans, such as when to go food shopping or to the gym.

# 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

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

- Through talking to staff and reviewing people's care records, we were satisfied care and support was delivered in a non-discriminatory way and the rights of people with a protected characteristic were respected. Protected characteristics are a set of nine characteristics that are protected by law to prevent discrimination.
- Staff treated people as individuals and their choices and preferences were respected. Staff demonstrated a good knowledge of people's personalities, individual needs and what was important to them.
- People were positive about the way in which staff supported them when they needed it saying and staff were always kind and caring. Comments included, "I didn't do anything before I came here." And "They [staff] treat me with respect. They don't tell me what to do, they ask me."

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

- People were involved in reviews of their care. People told us they attended care reviews to highlight their needs, wishes and choices so they could be recorded in their care plan. One person said, "We sit down and talk about it [support plan]."
- People were afforded choice and control in their day to day lives. We observed staff asking them what they wanted to do during the day and where they would prefer to spend their time.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- Staff were respectful of people's privacy and dignity. All staff had received training in dignity and we observed staff to be respectful throughout this inspection.
- Staff supported people to be as independent as possible, to promote their wellbeing. One person told us they received support to go visit family.

# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

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

People's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to meet people's needs, preferences, interests and give them choice and control

- People's care records were detailed, person-centred and accurately described what support they needed from staff. They were reviewed monthly or sooner, if a person's needs changed. This helped to ensure they were accurate and up to date.
- Care records clearly documented people's likes, dislikes and social histories. This supported staff to get to know people well and provide a personalised service.
- People were supported and encouraged to access a range of leisure opportunities in line with their interests. People told us they often went into the town centre to shop, went for walks and visited local restaurants. People chose what to do with their time. One person told us they were going to the coast.
- Staff displayed a good understanding of the physical and psychological benefits of activities on people's wellbeing.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- The provider had an appropriate complaints policy and procedure in place. It explained how people and their relatives could complain about the service and how any complaints would be dealt with.
- The service had not received any complaints.
- The area manager confirmed they would keep a record of any complaints which would allow them to easily identify any themes or trends which they could act upon to improve the service.
- People told us they could confidently raise any concerns with the staff or registered manager and they were sure they would be addressed.
- We saw many compliments about the service. Comments included, 'Thank you for all the support you gave to [name of person]'. And 'Thank you for taking us to different places like the coast'.

End of life care and support

- The area manager informed us, if end of life support was needed, they would liaise with relevant health professionals to provide appropriate support at that time. One person had arranged their funeral plan and paid for this. Another person had discussed their wishes and had all this documented down in detail.

# 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

The service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Planning and promoting person-centred, high-quality care and support with openness; and how the provider understands and acts on their duty of candour responsibility

- At the time of our inspection there was a registered manager in post, however they were not at the service on the day of inspection. The area manager and deputy manager were in the service.
- Staff spoke positively about the management team. They told us managers were approachable and active in the running of the service.
- Everyone we spoke with was complementary about how the service was run. One person said, "I can speak to any of them here; they are all really nice."

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

- The service was well-run. Staff understood their roles and responsibilities.
- Staff were supported to carry out quality assurance checks on the service in addition to the audits completed by the registered manager and provider. The registered manager maintained an oversight of the quality assurance system to ensure the service met the regulatory requirements.

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

- People told us they were regularly asked their views about the service.
- People completed surveys which asked for their views of the service. The results were analysed by the registered manager and used to continuously improve the service. Without exception, everyone was happy with the care, support and staff at the service.
- Staff and service user meetings took place so any issues about the service could be discussed and people's views obtained. People took it in turns to chair the meeting.
- Staff meetings took place and staff were also given the opportunity to raise any ideas or concerns about the service during their supervision meetings.

Continuous learning and improving care

- The registered manager and provider were keen to promote the provision of high-quality, person-centred care. We observed a positive, welcoming and inclusive culture within the service which was driven by the management team. They were keen to achieve good outcomes for people.
- The registered manager monitored the quality of the service and acted when issues were identified. Each

month they completed a range of checks on the service. For example, they audited the care plans every month and completed an audit of the medication administration system. Where audits identified something could be improved, the registered manager created an action plan. We saw the auditing process was comprehensive and where things had been picked up by the area manager these were addressed straight away.

Working in partnership with others

- The registered manager welcomed community organisations and visiting professionals into the service which enabled them to work in partnership.