

Homewards Care Ltd

Homewards Limited - 48 Leonard Road

Inspection report

48 Leonard Road
Chingford
London
E4 8NE

Date of inspection visit:
15 July 2020

Date of publication:
18 September 2020

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Inspected but not rated
Is the service safe?	Inspected but not rated
Is the service effective?	Inspected but not rated
Is the service responsive?	Inspected but not rated
Is the service well-led?	Inspected but not rated

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Homewards Limited – 48 Leonard Road provides accommodation with personal care for up to four people with learning disabilities or autism spectrum disorder. At the time of this inspection there were three people using the service.

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

We received information following a whistleblowing to the local authority raising concerns about the lack of activities, reporting of accidents and incidents, risk management, safeguarding, staffing and food and nutrition.

Relatives were confident their relative was safe at the service. Staff understood what action to take if they suspected somebody was being harmed or abused. The provider's safeguarding policy was not robust enough, but they took action, updated the policy and sent this to us following the inspection.

Staff knew how to report accidents and incidents. However, we noted incident forms were not always completed when they should be. The management had taken steps to address this prior to the inspection and provided training to staff about appropriate record keeping.

The provider ensured there was infection control guidance in place. Staff confirmed they were provided with adequate amounts of personal protective equipment such as masks and gloves.

People had risk assessments to keep them safe from the risks they may face.

People were offered a varied and nutritious diet.

People had access to a variety of activities.

Relatives and staff spoke positively about the management of the service.

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 inadequate (published 25 October 2019).

Why we inspected

We undertook this targeted inspection to follow up on specific concerns raised by a whistleblower about the service. The inspection was prompted due to concerns raised about lack of activities, reporting of accidents and incidents and food and nutrition.

CQC have introduced targeted inspections to follow up on Warning Notices or to check specific concerns. They do not look at an entire key question, only the part of the key question we are specifically concerned about. Targeted inspections do not change the rating from the previous inspection. This is because they do not assess all areas of a key question.

We found no evidence during this inspection that people were at risk of harm from these concerns.

Please see the safe, effective, responsive and well led sections of this full report.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Homewards Limited - 48 Leonard Road on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

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?

At our last inspection we rated this key question inadequate. We have not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we only looked at the parts of this key question we had specific concerns about.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Inspected but not rated

Is the service effective?

At our last inspection we rated this key question good. We have not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we only looked at the parts of this key question we had specific concerns about.

Details are in our effective findings below.

Inspected but not rated

Is the service responsive?

At our last inspection we rated this key question good. We have not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we only looked at the parts of this key question we had specific concerns about.

Details are in our responsive findings below.

Inspected but not rated

Is the service well-led?

At our last inspection we rated this key question inadequate. We have not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we only looked at the parts of this key question we had specific concerns about.

Details are in our well-Led findings below.

Inspected but not rated

Homewards Limited - 48 Leonard Road

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

This was a targeted inspection to follow up on specific concerns which we had received about the service. The inspection was prompted due to concerns received about lack of activities, reporting of accidents and incidents, risk management, safeguarding, staffing and food and nutrition.

Inspection team

One inspector visited the service and was supported by another inspector to analyse the evidence.

Service and service type

Homewards Limited – 48 Leonard Road is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

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 17 hours' notice. This was because we needed to carry out a risk assessment in relation to the coronavirus pandemic to ensure the safety of the inspector, people using the service and staff.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed the information we had received about the service. This included details of its registration, previous inspection reports and any notifications of significant incidents the provider had sent us. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who worked with the service. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We spoke with one person who used the service. We spoke with the registered manager and the deputy manager.

We reviewed a range of records. This included two people's care records including risk assessments and activities. We looked at four staff files in relation to recruitment. We also looked at three people's activity plans, incident and accident records and policies and procedures.

After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found. The deputy manager sent us documentation we requested including rotas, policies and menus. We spoke with three relatives and three staff as part of the inspection.

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 inadequate. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we only looked at the part of the key question we have specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to check on specific concerns we had in relation to reporting of accidents and incidents, risk management, safeguarding and staffing. As we were in the pandemic we also looked at infection control.

We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- Relatives told us they felt their relative was safe at the service. One relative said, "[Person using the service] has been there over 20 years. I know [person using the service] is being looked after." Another relative told us, "If there are any decisions, they always get hold of me."
- Staff were knowledgeable about the actions to take if they suspected somebody was being harmed or abused. One staff member told us, "I don't accept any form of abuse and first I will report to the manager. If nothing is changed, I will report to the local authority or to you [CQC]."
- The service had a pictorial safeguarding policy. However this policy did not contain contact details for the local safeguarding team and CQC. Following the inspection, the provider sent us an updated safeguarding policy and complaints policy which did contain these details.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- People had risk assessments to reduce the risks of harm they may face.
- Risks assessed included medicines, behaviour management, personal care, infection control, eating and drinking, abuse from others, physical environment, mobility and falls.
- We saw one person had clear guidelines in place for managing their medical condition, and associated risks in relation to diet and footcare.
- Staff completed charts for people's behaviour incidents. This information was shared with the community learning disability team who supported staff to manage people's behaviour.
- The provider had a system of recording accidents and incidents.
- Staff knew what action to take if there was an accident or incident. One staff member said, "We fill in ABC [behaviour] charts. If it is something major, we fill in an incident form, inform the manager, the local authority and if any injury we call the GP or 111."

Staffing and recruitment

- Our inspection was prompted partly due to concerns relating to staffing levels. This had been an issue at our previous inspection when we had found evidence of insufficient staff to meet people's needs. At this inspection we found this had improved and there were enough staff.
- Relatives told us there were enough staff to meet people's needs.

- The registered manager, deputy manager and staff told us staff absences were covered by regular agency staff.
- Staff confirmed on the whole there were enough staff on duty to meet people's needs. Staff told us they had enough breaks and time off during and in between shifts.
- There were adequate recruitment processes. The provider carried out various checks to ensure staff were suitable to work with vulnerable people. This included criminal record checks of new staff and regular criminal record checks to confirm continued suitability of all staff.

Preventing and controlling infection

- Staff demonstrated they knew what action to take to prevent the spread of infection. One staff member said, "We are wearing gloves and aprons, using masks, sanitising hands and disinfecting everything."
- Staff confirmed they had access to an adequate amount of personal protective equipment such as gloves and aprons.
- The premises were clean and free from malodour. There was personal protective equipment [PPE] such as gloves and masks with associated guidance in a file near the front door.
- However, during our visit, we observed a staff member wearing a mask underneath their chin which meant the mask could be contaminated. We raised this with the registered manager and deputy manager who told us they would remind all staff of the correct way to wear PPE.

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. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we only looked at the part of the key question we have specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to check on specific concerns we had in relation to food and nutrition.

We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

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

- Our inspection was prompted partly due to concerns about people's nutrition. We found evidence that people's nutrition and hydration needs were being met.
- Relatives told us they were happy with the food their relative was given. One relative explained staff had helped improve their relative's medical condition through dietary changes.
- Staff told us how they ensured people had enough to eat and drink. One staff member told us, "I ensure there is enough shopping to cook for them. I ask them if they want more [to eat]. I offer them drinks throughout the day. Every two hours I make sure I am giving water to them."
- Care plans contained details of the support people needed with their nutrition.
- The kitchen was stocked with a variety of fresh food.
- The menu was varied and nutritious and included healthy eating options.

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. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we only looked at the part of the key question we have specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to check on specific concerns we had in relation to adequate and suitable activities being offered to people using the service.

We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

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

- Relatives told us they thought their relative was able to participate in activities they enjoyed. One relative said during the pandemic when people were not able to access their usual activities, staff had bought activities that could be carried out at home to keep people occupied.
- Staff described the different activities that were offered to people every day which included learning exercises at home such as sums.
- People's activity planners showed a variety of activities were offered which included attending, prior to the pandemic, classes in pottery, art and music. Other activities included going for car rides, a walk to the shops or park, puzzle solving, indoor exercise, games and garden activities.
- Records showed people were supported to maintain links with their family.

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 inadequate. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we only looked at the part of the key question we have specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to check on specific concerns we had in relation to management oversight of record keeping.

We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people; Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements;

- Relatives told us they felt the management and staff at the service were approachable and they were kept informed about accidents, incidents or issues as they arose.
- Staff also spoke positively about the management in the service. One staff member told us, "Everyday, [registered manager] asks us if we have any concerns. [Deputy manager] is the same, gives me time and listens to me."
- We noted an issue with record-keeping. Incident forms were not always completed for one person following completion of behaviour charts or when 'as needed' medicine for behaviour management was administered.
- We discussed this with the registered manager and the deputy manager who explained this had been identified as an issue and staff had received training shortly before the inspection visit about when to complete incident forms. They told us moving forward this should improve and quality audits would pick up on any ongoing issues.