

The Camden Society

# Short Term Breaks - April Cottage

## Inspection report

Ducklington Lane  
Witney  
Oxfordshire  
OX28 4TJ

Tel: 01993773832  
Website: [www.thecamdensociety.co.uk](http://www.thecamdensociety.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
30 March 2017

Date of publication:  
25 April 2017

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Inspected but not rated
---------------------------------	-------------------------

Is the service effective?	Good ●
---------------------------	--------



# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

We inspected this service on 30 March 2017. This was an unannounced inspection. Short Term Breaks - April Cottage is a service offering respite stay. The service is located in Witney and provides care to people in and around Oxfordshire. At the time of this inspection one person was using the service.

There was a registered manager in post. 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 worked closely with the deputy manager and service manager.

On our previous inspection of the service on 17 and 18 June 2016, we asked the provider to take action to make improvements and ensure the registered manager had a clear understanding of their responsibilities in relation to completing mental capacity assessments.

This was a focused inspection to check whether the provider now met the legal requirements. We found the service had taken action to address our concerns. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for Short Term Breaks - April Cottage on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) is required by law to monitor the operation of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) and report on what we find.

The registered manager and staff had a good understanding of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and applied its principles in their work. Where people were thought to lack capacity to make certain decisions, assessments had been completed in line with the principles of MCA. The registered manager and staff understood their responsibilities under the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS); these provide legal safeguards for people who may be deprived of their liberty for their own safety.

Staff received adequate training and support to carry out their roles effectively. People felt supported by competent staff that benefitted from regular supervision (one to one meetings with their line manager) to help them meet the needs of the people they cared for.

People had access to healthcare services and received on going healthcare support to enable them to maintain good health.

People were supported to maintain a balanced diet. There were food choices available and people were involved in preparation of meals. Where people wanted to lose weight, staff were at hand to support them through any weight loss programmes.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Staff had the knowledge and skills to meet people's needs. Staff received training and support to enable them to carry out their roles effectively.

People were supported to have their nutritional needs met.

Staff had good knowledge of the Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. People who were being deprived of their liberty were being cared for in the least restrictive way.

People were supported to access healthcare support when needed.

# Short Term Breaks - April Cottage

## **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 30 March 2017 and was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of one inspector. This inspection was completed to check whether sufficient improvements to meet legal requirements after our comprehensive inspection in June 2016 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: "Is the service effective?". The focus of the inspection was narrowed down to this domain because on the last inspection the service had failed to meet legal requirements only in relation to this question.

Before the inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service and the service provider. We looked at the notifications we had received for this service. Notifications are information about important events the service is required to send us by law.

We looked at three people's care records. We spoke with the registered manager, the deputy manager and one member of care staff. We reviewed records relating to the management of the home which included staff training files.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

When we last inspected Short Term Breaks - April Cottage in June 2016, we found the registered manager did not have a clear understanding of their responsibilities in relation to completing mental capacity assessments. Where people were thought to lack capacity, assessments in relation to their capacity had not been completed in line with the principles of MCA. The registered manager relied on capacity assessments carried out by other health professionals. This was a breach of Regulation 11 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. At this inspection on 30 March 2017 we found improvements had been made.

The registered manager understood their responsibilities in relation to completing mental capacity assessments. The registered manager followed the Mental Capacity Act 2005(MCA) code of practice and made sure that the rights of people who may lack mental capacity to take particular decisions were protected. The 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. The registered manager and staff were knowledgeable about how to ensure the rights of people who were assessed as lacking capacity were protected. For example, one person lacked the capacity to understand risks of not eating well. Staff supported this person by encouraging, monitoring and ensuring they ate. They involved the person in meal preparations to give them more understanding of the importance of eating. The registered manager told us, "Capacity changes overtime when people learn new things. We reassess as necessary".

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 are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty were being met. The provider followed the requirements in the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). Staff had been trained and understood the requirements of the MCA and the specific requirements of the DoLS.

New staff were supported to complete an induction programme before working on their own. This included training for their role and shadowing an experienced member of staff. One member of staff told us, "Induction here is good. We have a trainer who new staff shadow until they are confident".

Staff told us they had the training they needed and were supported to refresh their mandatory training. Staff completed training which included safeguarding, complex needs, manual handling and physical intervention. Staff were supported to attend specific training courses to ensure they had the skills to meet people's needs. One member of staff said, "We have lots of training opportunities and we are well supported with professional development". A senior member of staff commented, "We encourage continuous learning for our staff and give them opportunities to source out any other training opportunities".

People were supported by staff who had regular supervisions (one to one meeting) with their line managers. Staff told us supervisions were carried out regularly and enabled them to discuss any training needs or concerns they had. They said, "We can request supervisions at any time if we feel we need them but otherwise we have them every two months" and "During supervisions we discuss training needs and support needed". Staff were also supported to develop and reflect on practice through annual appraisals.

People were supported to access health professionals when needed. People's care plans showed people had been referred to GPs and other health care professionals when needed. Records showed people were supported to access on-going health care. People had 'hospital passports' to allow information sharing when they were admitted to hospital. This was a prepared document which had all the necessary information ready for any person going into hospital including past medical history, communication and any medicines the person was taking.

People's dietary needs and preferences were documented and known by staff. Staff knew people's dietary needs, likes and dislikes. For example, people having low fat diet and soft foods where choking was a risk. For example, a person's support plan indicated the person was to be supported to have 'low fat diet and staff to cut up food to prevent choking. Another person wanted to lose weight and they signed up to one of the well known slimming programmes. Staff had supported this person to make good food choices. This person had lost weight and they were very pleased.