

Walsingham Support Limited

# Walsingham Support - 18- 20 Richmond Close

## Inspection report

Walsingham  
Tamworth  
Staffordshire  
B79 7QS

Tel: 01827311991  
Website: [www.walsingham.com](http://www.walsingham.com)

Date of inspection visit:  
26 February 2016

Date of publication:  
18 March 2016

## 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

We inspected this service on 26 February 2016. This was an unannounced inspection. Our last inspection took place in December 2013 and at that time we found the home was meeting the regulations we looked at.

The service provides support to eight people with a learning disability and two people received personal care support in their own shared home.

There was a registered manager in the service. 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.

People were protected from the risks of abuse because staff understood where harm may be caused and took action when people were at risk of harm. Staff supported people to understand any risks to prevent avoidable harm. Where people were concerned about their safety they knew who to speak with.

People kept their medicines in the bedroom and were helped to understand what their medicines were for and to take responsibility for their medicines. Staff knew why people needed medicines and when these should be taken.

Staffing was organised flexibly to enable people to be involved with activities and do the things they enjoyed. People had opportunities to be involved with a variety of activities and could choose what to be involved with.

People had access to food and drink that they liked and specialist diets were catered for. People's health and wellbeing needs were monitored and they were supported to organise and attend health appointments as required.

People made decisions about their care and staff helped them to understand the information they needed to make informed decisions. Staff sought people's consent before they provided care and they were helped to make decisions which were in their best interests. Where people's liberty was restricted, this had been done lawfully to safeguard them.

People were treated with kindness, compassion and respect and staff promoted people's independence. People liked the staff who supported them and had developed good relationships with them. People maintained relationships with their families and friends who were invited to join in activities with them.

Staff listened to people's views about their care and people were able to influence the development of the service. People knew how to complain about their care and concerns were responded to.

The provider and manager assessed and monitored the quality of care to ensure standards were met and maintained. They understood the requirements of their registration with us informed us of information that we needed to know.

## 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.

People were protected from abuse and avoidable harm. People were supported to understand how to be safe and to take responsible risks. There were sufficient staff to support people to do what they wanted to do and receive support.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Staff knew how to support people and promote their independence and well-being. People received healthcare to keep well and could choose what they wanted to eat and drink. People were supported to make decisions and where they needed help; decisions were made in their best interests with people who were important to them.

### Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

People were treated with respect and their privacy and dignity were promoted. There was a calm, relaxed atmosphere and people had developed positive relationships with people and had a good understanding of how they wanted to be supported.

### Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

People were encouraged to develop and maintain their independence. There were a variety of activities which people could take part in within the home or when out and they could try new activities. People could raise concerns or make a complaint and these were responded to.

### Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

The provider had systems in place to monitor the quality of care

and support in the home. People were able to comment on the quality of the service and where improvements could be made. There was a registered manager in post who was supportive to people and staff.

---

# Walsingham Support - 18-20 Richmond Close

## **Detailed findings**

### Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

This inspection took place on 26 February 2016 and was unannounced. Our inspection team consisted of one inspector.

We checked the information we held about the service and provider. This included the notifications that the provider had sent to us about incidents at the service and information we had received from the public. We used this information to formulate our inspection plan.

On this occasion, we had not asked the provider to send us a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. However, we offered the provider the opportunity to share information they felt was relevant.

We spoke with six people who used the service, three relatives, four members of care staff and the registered manager. We did this to gain people's views about the care and to check that standards of care were being met. We observed how the staff interacted with people who used the service.

We looked at two people's care records to see if their records were accurate and up to date. We also looked at records relating to the management of the service including quality checks. We reviewed the reports carried out by the local authority quality monitoring officers.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People told us they knew how to keep safe in their home and when out. Each person had a copy of an easy read guide which explained how to keep safe and what to do if they were concerned. One person told us, "Abuse means if someone is doing something you don't want them to do or being mean. If somebody did anything then I'd tell my family or staff. The staff ask me if anything has happened and I'd tell them." One person who received personal care support in their home told us, "The staff have helped me to catch the bus to work and keeping safe. I have a new job now and I have to catch two buses and know where to go. I have my phone with all the staff numbers in it and can call them if I am worried."

Staff had a good understanding of how to protect people and told us they knew people well and would be confident in addressing potential abuse or harm. Staff told us they would speak to senior staff or the manager if they had any concerns. The staff knew the action to be taken to escalate concerns and knew about the whistleblowing procedure and how to use this. There was a dedicated whistleblowing telephone service where staff could speak confidentially and gain advice on how to act. One member of staff told us, "The manager reminds us of this number and we know we can call. I wouldn't have a problem raising any concern though as I know it would be dealt with."

People were supported to take responsible risks and staff helped them with living skills. People were encouraged to be independent and one person told us, "The staff showed me how to wash my clothes and now I do it all myself." One member of staff told us, "This is different for everyone. Some people are quite independent and we may just need to prompt them, other people need our full support." We saw people making their breakfast and completing laundry tasks.

Some people were responsible for managing their own daily finances and they had a safe in the bedroom to store money and personal belongings securely. One person showed us their safe and told us they visited their bank on a weekly basis to withdraw the money they needed. They told us they wanted to be responsible for their money and had a wallet which they used when they went out. Where people needed support with their finances, we saw money was held securely in the home and a daily audit was completed to ensure that all monies were accounted for.

People were supported by staff who they knew well. The staff told us that agency staff was not used and all support was provided from within the existing staff team. One member of staff told us, "It's not fair if agency staff support people here, as they don't know them." We saw there were sufficient staff on duty to meet people's needs. The staffing levels were monitored and reviewed regularly to ensure people received the support they needed. Two members of staff provided personal care to people in their own home to ensure consistency. One person told us, "The staff are really good and have really helped me. They come every day and if I'm going out I need to tell them. The staff always say, 'These are your support hours' and I pay for them so I am responsible for sorting them out."

The staff told us that recruitment checks were in place to ensure they were suitable to work and included requesting and checking references of the staffs' characters and their suitability to work with the people who

used the service. Interviews were taking place in the home and one person who used the service was part of the interview panel. They told us, "I asked them how they would help me and I liked them. I wanted to make sure the staff were as good as the staff already here. I really enjoyed it and want to do it again."

People stored their medicines in their bedroom and were supported by staff to take these. One person showed us their personal medicine cabinet and told us, "I have my tablets in here." They showed us their medication administration records which included photographs of the medicines they took and details of what they were for. One other person told us, "I pop the tablets out and the staff help me to take them. I have tablets because of my epilepsy and if I have a headache I ask the staff and they will let me take a tablet for the pain." There was a record of when people had their medicines. Two members of staff supported the administration of the medicines. One member of staff told us, "One person gives the tablets and the other checks. This means there shouldn't be any errors and makes it a safer system."



# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

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. The application procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

We checked whether the provider was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty were being met. People confirmed that staff sought their consent before they provided support and people had the ability to make everyday decisions about their care and support. We saw where people lacked capacity to make decisions; assessments and best interest decisions had been completed. One member of staff told us, "The whole team was involved with the assessment and DoLS. We know it's about making sure they are safe and it's not really a restriction, it protects their rights."

Where people had restrictions placed upon them and could not leave the home without support, we saw applications to lawfully restrict their movements had been applied for and DoLS orders had been authorised. One member of staff told us, "This is there to make sure they are safeguarded. It doesn't restrict them in any way; it's there so they can check we are doing things right and they are safe." We saw these people were still supported to have as much choice and control as they were able to in all other areas of their daily life.

People felt that staff had the necessary skills to support them. One person told us, "The staff help me and know what they are doing. I trust them." One person completed training in sign language with a member of staff. The staff member told us, "We had private training sessions here so we learnt how to do it together and we got a certificate when we completed it. We've now done a booklet and DVD which shows staff how [person who used the service] does the signs and what it means." Another staff member told us, "This person's communication is so much better now since they did the training. The DVD is really great as they have adapted some of the signs and do it in their own way so this helps us all to understand." The member of staff had been helped to train other staff within the organisation. The member of staff told us, "It's been good development for me and if it helps other people then that's even better." We saw people communicated well with staff and staff had an understanding of people's different communication styles, which helped them to express themselves.

There was a flexible and relaxed approach to meal times and people chose what they wanted to eat at each meal time. People told us and we saw that they were able to have food and drinks at any time and accessed the kitchen independently. One person told us, "I like to cook and once a week I invite my family here and we eat together." Staff understood the dietary needs of people who used the service and how to prepare meals accordingly. Some people needed a softened diet. The speech and language therapist had been

involved to ensure staff knew how to prepare foods and to keep people well. One member of staff told us, "Even though their food needs to be specially prepared, we still make sure it looks like everybody else's food. They used to love take away burgers and can't eat these anymore; but they still go there and have a thick milkshake instead."

People felt informed about and involved with their healthcare. One person told us, "I had a problem with my feet. It will be better when they are sorted so I can walk better" They told us how they had been supported to receive specialist healthcare so they could walk without pain or discomfort. The care records included information about this health care and the concerns the person had raised. Other people received support from the occupational therapist and speech and language therapist. Support plans had been developed which included the professional's advice. The staff understood people's health care needs and could describe to us the support they provided to support people to keep well.

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

People were happy and liked to live in their home. They told us the staff were kind and caring and were always happy to help. People were recognised and valued as adults and staff showed a passionate commitment to enabling people. We saw staff used adult language when speaking with people and recognised their achievements. One person had a shave and showed staff what they had done. The member of staff commented "You look very handsome." One relative told us, They treat [person who used the service] with respect and dignity. They are a valued person and the staff's attitude is excellent."

People were supported to maintain relationships with family and friends. One person told us, "My family is really important to me. I told the staff I want them involved with everything and they always let them know what's happening." A relative told us, "It's lovely that they are live near and we can continue being so involved."

The staff were motivated and were kind and compassionate in their approach to care. People were given time to consider their options before making a decision and encouraged people to express their views and listened to their responses. For example, we heard people choosing where to go later in the day and what activities to be involved in. We saw one person spending a long time to choose what activity to be involved with. The staff patiently explained what each activity involved so the person had all the information they needed to make a decision. Staff respected people's decisions and supported them to do the things they wanted to do.

People told us their privacy and dignity was respected and they had facilities in their room to keep personal items safe. One person showed us their personal safe and they had a key to keep their property secure. People also had a key to their bedroom and we saw they kept their rooms locked. One person told us, "The staff only go into my room if I say they can." One person who received personal care in the community told us, "I gave the staff a key to my home but they know they can only use it if there is an emergency." When we spoke with people, staff enabled us to speak with people in private and only provided support where people requested this in relation to communication.

People had a keyworker who was responsible for overseeing the care they received and liaising with other professionals involved in their life. One person told us, "My key worker is lovely. They look after me and make sure I have everything I need and I am happy." Staff told us they enjoyed working as a key worker and were committed to ensuring that people received the care that they wanted. One member of staff told us, "I am proud to work here and proud to be a key worker for [person who used the service]. I have a special relationship with them and its been lovely watching them mature and being involved in their life." Key worker meetings took place each month and one person told us, "I talk to my key worker about how I keep safe and if I'm worried about anything. It's nice that we can just talk about anything I want to."

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

People chose where to go and how to spend their time and we saw people were asked what they wanted to do that day. The staffing was organised against the agreed support plan and we saw this enabled people to spend quality time with staff on an individual and group basis. We saw staff were available to provide support throughout the day and spent time with people to meet all their support needs, and keep them safe. We saw staff were not rushed and where people wanted their attention this was given and staff took their time when engaging with all activities. Where activities were planned, staff worked flexibly to ensure people had opportunities to do the things they liked.

People were supported to follow their interests and take part in social activities. People spoke enthusiastically about how they spent their time and were supported by staff. One person told us, "I go to choir and drama." People also had opportunities to work or attend organised classes. One person who received personal care told us, "I have a new job and the staff helped me to know what buses to catch. I like going to work." The staff told us that where people expressed an interest they worked with them to find out where they could participate in any associated activity. One member of staff told us, "We try to do things that are real and not tokenistic. It's not about what looks good on paper; it's about what people want."

People were supported to practice their faith and two people went to their own Church and one person helped in the café following the service. One person told us, "It's really important for me to go to Church. The staff take me but I can stay there on my own with my friends. I'm going to Church next week on mother's day and I shall go and visit my mother's grave afterwards." Staff told us that people discussed their future care and if they had any specific arrangements they wanted staff and family to carry out in the event of their death. One person told us, "I've told everyone what I want and the staff helped me to write it down." Another person told us they were supported to visit family graves and told us, "I like to visit them and take flowers. It's important to me."

People had a support plan and discussed this with staff to ensure it met their current support needs. One person showed us their plan, which included photographs and had been written in a style and manner that the person understood. They told us, "This is all about me and what I want. I talk to the staff every month about what I want to do next." The person showed us how they had achieved personal goals and confirmed that staff supported them in the way they wanted to be supported. Another person told us, "My family comes to my reviews because I want them there." We saw people's support plan included reviews and support needed to work towards independence and staff were knowledgeable about people's individual support. One person had their medicines reviewed to ensure they could take them at a time that suited them. One member of staff said, "They used to have them in the morning but that didn't suit them as they didn't want to be woken up for them. We went to the doctor and they agreed a change of times and this works so much better."

People told us they knew how to complain if they needed to and each person had an easy read guide informing them of how to complain. One person told us, "I'd tell the staff or my family if I wasn't happy. The staff are always asking me if I'm alright." A relative told us, "I cannot praise the staff enough. If there was

anything that I was unhappy about, I'd speak to any of the staff and I have every confidence that they'd sort things out. [Person who used the service] has never been happier here though." We saw where formal complaints, these had been investigated the person had been informed of the outcome. A member of staff told us, "We know we are never going to get everything right but we do not have a blame culture here. If something goes wrong we put our hands up to this and make things right."

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

People were supported to be involved with the development of the service as they attended a national conference and were asked about the future of the service. One person told us, "I went to a conference and they asked me about what the staff did well and what I wanted. I really enjoyed going there and I'm going to London soon and doing it again." A staff member told us, "People were also asked about what dignity meant to them and asked what they wanted from staff. The provider spoke with people on each table and we've been really pleased how committed they are with involving people in the company's development." The provider had organised a People's Involvement and Participation Conference (PIP) and people had been invited to help make decisions to shape the future of the organisation. People gave their feedback about the quality of care each month during their support plan review and their views had also been sought in the form of a satisfaction questionnaire. Where possible people were supported by external professionals to complete these forms. People told us they were happy with how they received this information and confident that any improvements would be made.

The service had a registered manager. The staff told us that the manager provided leadership, guidance and the support they needed to provide good care to people who used the service. A member of staff told us that the manager was approachable and provided support when they needed it. One member of staff told us, "The reason most of us have been here so long is because we are so well supported. We work so well as a team and we all have our own strengths and recognise where we might need some support. It really is fantastic and I have great pleasure in working here."

We saw the registered manager and staff's values were based on respect for each other and putting people at the heart of the service. Staff demonstrated they focused on supporting people to develop and promote their skills towards independence.

The registered manager assessed and monitored the staffs learning and development needs through regular meetings with the staff and appraisals. Staff competency checks were also completed that ensured staff were providing care and support effectively and safely. One member of staff told us, "We also have an annual appraisal which is very honest and the manager and I both do a report about how we think I am doing. The manager is so supportive and we talk all the time. The appraisal isn't about surprises but it's an honest frank discussion about how well we are doing here and making sure we support people properly."

The provider carried out quality checks on how the service was managed. These included checks on personal support plans, medicines management, health and safety and care records. Where concerns with quality were identified, action was taken to improve quality and the action plan and improvements were monitored and reviewed. The registered manager told us, "We are very honest here. If something isn't in place we record it isn't then put things right. There's no benefit in putting it right and recording everything is okay. Audits highlight where we can make improvements and we are all committed to doing things better."

The service had been visited by the local authority quality monitoring team. We saw improvements were required within some records. On the following visit, the provider had made the required improvements with

the records which demonstrated they had responded in a timely manner.

The provider and manager understood the responsibilities of their registration with us. They reported significant events to us, such as safety incidents, in accordance with the requirements of their registration.