

Cheshire East Council

# Cheshire East Short Breaks

## Inspection report

9 Warwick Mews  
Warwick Road  
Macclesfield  
Cheshire  
SK11 8SW

Tel: 01625378280

Website: [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
11 December 2018

Date of publication:  
07 January 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?	Requires Improvement ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

Cheshire East Short Breaks is run by Cheshire East Council. The service provides respite care services including accommodation and personal care for up to four adults with learning disabilities at number 9 Warwick Mews, Macclesfield, Cheshire. On the first day of our inspection there was one person using the service however, they were out and not present during our site visit.

The care service had not originally been developed and designed in line with the values that underpin the Registering the Right Support and other best practice guidance. These values include choice, promotion of independence and inclusion. People with learning disabilities and autism using the service can live as ordinary a life as any citizen. However, we found that people were given choice, their independence was promoted and there was the service had an inclusive culture.

At our last inspection we rated the service Good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of Good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

People continued to receive a safe service and were protected from harm, discrimination and abuse. Accidents and incidents were recorded and where appropriate actions taken to mitigate the risk of recurrence. Risks were assessed and measures implemented to manage, risk assessments were reviewed and monitored when people's needs changed. Medicines were managed and administered safely and we saw that robust procedures were in place. There were sufficient staff to meet people's needs and recruitment procedures were safe. The premises were well maintained and checks were carried out to ensure they were safe. Staff had access to personal protective equipment (gloves and aprons).

People continued to receive an effective service. An assessment of people's needs was carried out before they came to stay at Cheshire East Short Breaks and staff sought information about any changes before people returned. Staff had received a wide range of health and social care related training and also specialist training for specific health needs including epilepsy. Regular staff supervisions, appraisals and direct observation of staff practice were carried out. The service could source relief staff from the provider's other locations. This enabled the registered manager to be confident that relief staff were fully aware of policies and procedures and had received the same level of training as permanent staff. People were supported to have choice and were supported in the least restrictive way. The principles of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) were followed.

People continued to receive care from staff who were kind and compassionate. We saw that people's individual communication needs were considered. People's views were sought during and following each visit. People's privacy, dignity and independence were promoted and they were treated fairly and without discrimination.

People continued to receive a responsive service. People's preferences, likes and dislikes were clearly recorded in their personal support plan. The service was homely and person-centred. People were supported to develop their independence. Assistive technology such as door alarms, pendants and pagers were used to support people's individual needs. Several documents were available in easy read formats.

People continued to receive a service which was well-led. Audits were carried out to assess and monitor the quality of the service and where actions had been identified these were had been completed. We found information which we had not been informed about. We could see from the records available that the registered manager had dealt with these incidents robustly and that they had been reported to other agencies as required. The provider confirmed that procedures had been improved with additional quality assurance checks implemented. The rating from our last inspection was clearly displayed.

Further information is in the detailed findings below.

## 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 remained safe.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remained effective.

### Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remained caring.

### Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remained responsive.

### Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement ●

The service had deteriorated to requires improvement because we had not always been informed about events as required.

# Cheshire East Short Breaks

## **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 comprehensive inspection took place on 11 and 12 December 2018 and was unannounced on day one. The inspection was carried out by an adult social care inspector and an assistant inspector.

Prior to the inspection we checked information we held about the service including whether we had received any statutory notifications. A statutory notification is information about significant events which the service is required to send us by law. The provider had completed 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 any improvements they plan to make. We used all of this information to plan how the inspection should be conducted.

We visited Cheshire East Short Breaks premises on 11 December and contacted staff members and relatives of people who have stayed at Cheshire East Short Breaks by telephone on 12 December 2018. During the inspection we spoke with the nominated individual, registered manager a senior support worker and a support worker in person and by telephone with four relatives and one staff member.

We looked at care records belonging to three people who use the service, three staff recruitment files, a sample of medication administration records and other documents relating to the operation of the service.

We observed the premises and facilities available for people using the service. At the time of the inspection there was one person staying at Cheshire East Short Breaks however, they were not present during the inspection. Therefore, we were unable to observe the delivery of care people received directly. However, we saw feedback recorded about people's stay at the service.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

We asked family members of people who had regularly stayed at Cheshire East Short Breaks if they felt their relative was safe and well supported. They told us, "Yes, [Relative] is very happy there" and "Yes, well [Relative] tells me that they are very happy going".

People were protected from the risk of harm because there were processes in place to minimise the risk of abuse and accidents/incidents. Staff received training in these areas of care and support. Policies and procedures were in place providing guidance to staff of the steps they should follow should an accident or safeguarding incident occur. We saw that accidents/incidents and safeguarding referrals had been recorded and dealt with appropriately, including details of any follow up actions required to prevent recurrence.

Risk assessments were completed to keep people safe and checked to ensure they remained up to date.

We looked at recruitment records for three members of staff. We found that appropriate pre-employment checks had been carried out including Disclosure and Barring Service checks (DBS). DBS checks include a criminal record check and an additional check to see if the person has been placed on a list for people who are barred from working with vulnerable adults. These checks support safe recruitment decisions.

Staffing levels were adjusted to meet occupancy and the needs of people staying at Cheshire East Short Breaks. Family members we spoke with told us that there were sufficient staff to meet people's needs. Comments included, "Always seems to be. It always seems to be well staffed when [Name] stops there" and "Yes, I think so, no complaints". Staff also told us that there were sufficient staff to meet people's needs. Staff were available on site when there were no people staying so that the service was available for emergency admissions.

We saw that there was a policy and procedure in place to ensure the safe management and administration of medicines and we saw that these procedures were robust. We did not observe administration of medicines during the inspection, however, we discussed this with a member of staff and they were able to explain the procedure they would follow. We looked at a sample of medicine administration records (MAR) and found that these were completed appropriately. We also checked a sample of medicine stocks which were correct.

The premises were well maintained, clean and tidy. We saw that personal protective equipment (gloves and aprons) were readily available to control and prevent the spread of infection. A staff member told us, "We have policies and risk assessments on everything, we sign them and follow the protocols."

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

We asked family members if they felt staff knew their relative well. They told us, "Oh, yes definitely" and "Oh yes, [Relative] knows them all too".

An assessment of people's needs was carried out before they came to stay at Cheshire East Short Breaks to ensure that the service could provide the level of support they needed. Meetings took place with involvement of the individual, their family, social worker and the service staff. From the records reviewed we saw that people received personalised support which was tailored to their needs. We saw staff consulted with people and family members about the support that would be required and this was recorded in a personalised support plan.

Staff contacted family members prior to people returning to the service in order to assess whether there are any changes to support requirements. A family member told us, "They ring me every time before [Relative] goes to see if there are any changes."

We checked that staff were familiar with the Mental Capacity Act 2005. Consent was sought before care and support were provided. People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

New staff completed a robust induction which included observing an experienced member of staff before working independently. Staff received training in a range of health and social care topics including health and safety, medication, mental capacity, safeguarding and fire safety. Specialist training was also provided regarding specific health conditions such as epilepsy.

Staff supervisions, appraisals and direct observations of staff practice were carried out regularly. We saw that detailed records were retained of supervisions which evidenced an emphasis on the individual's well-being. The service did not use external agency staff as they were able to source relief support from the provider's other locations. This enabled the service to be confident that relief staff were fully aware of the service's policies, procedures and had received the same level of training as permanent staff.

Meals were prepared in a well-equipped homely kitchen area. People's likes and dislikes were clearly recorded in their support plans. We were not able to make any direct observations of the mealtime experience. However, from the records reviewed and from comments from family members spoken with we saw that people staying at the service had enjoyed the meals with no concern raised about food quality.

The premises were fully adapted to meet the needs of the people who used the service which included specialist bathing and hoist equipment. We saw evidence that service contracts and safety checks were completed as required, for example, electric, gas and fire safety.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

From our conversations with staff and family members we found that the people using the service were treated with kindness and compassion.

Family members told us that their relative enjoyed their stays at Cheshire East Short Breaks. Their comments included, "[Relative] loves it there", "[Relative] asks when they are going away" and that staff were "Friendly, can't fault them".

We saw that people and family members were involved in decisions about the care and support. People's communication needs were clearly recorded. Staff told us that they had time to listen to people and their comments demonstrated a genuine passion for providing high quality care. They told us that people staying at the service "Like their time with you [Staff]"; they "Enjoyed meeting the different age groups" and "I have always enjoyed supporting people".

We also asked if staff would be happy for a relative of theirs to receive care and support from the service and comments included, "Yes, because I know people will be treated as you want to be treated" and "Wouldn't have any qualms. It's very well organised, staff are very caring and we always work to do the best for the customers".

We saw that people's views were sought following each visit. A questionnaire in an easy read format was completed so that the person could express their view on all elements of their stay. Those reviewed all contained positive views about their experience at Cheshire East Short Breaks and that they were keen to return. Comments recorded included, "I can't wait to come back"; "I have loved my stay and am looking forward to coming again" and "I liked my stay at short breaks, enjoy meeting all the staff, I would like to stay again".

People's privacy, dignity and independence were promoted. People were encouraged to join in with tasks as far as they were able, for example with food preparation and their laundry. We saw from one person's feedback form that they had enjoyed being able to do their laundry with support from staff.

Staff received training which ensured people were treated fairly and without discrimination.



## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

People's personal preferences, likes and dislikes were clearly recorded in their support plan. The registered manager told us that they were proud of the person-centred approach and homely atmosphere that the service provided. This was also a view that came across strongly from staff and relatives and people who used the service during conversations and from records we reviewed during the inspection.

Staff told us that some people were supported to develop their independence and that their ability to carry out day to day tasks was developed in preparation for supported living accommodation. Also, how they had supported someone who was at risk of self-neglect to recover and move to their own home.

There was a policy and procedure in place to handle and respond to complaints and this was available in an easy read format. Relatives we spoke with told us that they had no concerns about the service. We saw that one person had raised a concern and that the registered manager had provided reassurance in a detailed response.

We saw that the provider had plans in place to ensure that the service could continue in the event of an emergency and that this was regularly reviewed. A 'Winter Preparedness Plan' had also been developed to support the service and the people who use the service to deal with winter pressures.

Assistive technology such as door alarms, pendants and pagers were used to support people's individual needs. We saw that several documents were available in easy read formats, including about a person's medication, feedback forms and complaint policy. In addition, we saw that the registered manager had written a pictorial letter to people who used the service to apologise for a problem which had occurred with the boiler. This demonstrated an open, transparent and inclusive approach.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

There was a registered manger. 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.

The registered manager and registered provider carried out audits to assess and monitor the quality of the service. We saw that when actions had been required these had been completed. During a review of the records we found information which we had not been informed about. We could see from the records available that the registered manager had dealt with these incidents robustly and that they had been reported to other agencies as required. Following our discussions, the registered provider confirmed that procedures had been improved with additional quality assurance checks implemented.

There was a clear vision and person-centred culture shared by managers and staff and we could see that this achieved positive outcomes for people who used the service.

Relatives we spoke with felt that the service was well-led and this view was shared by the staff we spoke with who told us that the registered manager was fair, supportive and approachable. A staff member told us, "I know if I need back up [Manager] or senior manager is there." Staff meetings were held regularly and staff told us they could make suggestions and were listened to.

The latest CQC rating was on display. The display of the rating is a legal requirement, to inform people and those seeking information about the service and visitors about our judgements.

People who used the service were supported to continue to attend their usual support services, for example, attending college and day care. People were also supported with transition to other services, such as supported living accommodation.