

Ratecedar Limited

Stoke View Residential Home

Inspection report

72.Albert Road
Plymouth
Devon
PL2 1AF

Tel: 01752211135

Date of inspection visit:
23 February 2019

Date of publication:
21 March 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

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection on 23 February 2019.

Stoke View provides care and accommodation for up to 9 people. On the day of our inspection there were 9 people living at the service. The home provides residential care for people with a learning disability.

People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

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.

At the last inspection on the 6 September 2016, the service was rated 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.

At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

Why the service is rated good:

People were not all able to fully verbalise their views and staff used other methods of communication, for example sign language. One relative said of their relative; "Very happy and content."

People remained safe at the service. People were protected from abuse as staff understood what action they needed to take if they suspected anyone was being abused, mistreated or neglected. Staff were recruited safely and checks carried out with the disclosure and barring service (DBS) ensured they were suitable to work with vulnerable adults. There were adequate numbers of staff to meet people's needs and help to keep them safe.

People's risks were assessed, monitored and managed by staff to help ensure they remained safe. Staff assessed and understood risks associated with people's care and lifestyle. Risks were managed effectively to keep people safe whilst maintaining people's rights and independence.

People had their medicines managed safely, and received their medicines in a way they chose and preferred. Staff undertook regular training and competency checks to test their knowledge and to help

ensure their skills in relation to medicines were up to date and in line with best practice.

People were supported by staff who had received training to meet their needs effectively. Staff meetings, one to one supervision of staff practice, and appraisals of performance were undertaken. Staff completed the Care Certificate (a nationally recognised training course for staff new to care).

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

People's health was monitored by the staff and they had access to a variety of healthcare professionals. The registered manager worked closely with external health and social care professionals to help ensure a coordinate approach to people's care.

People's care and support was based on legislation and best practice guidelines; helping to ensure the best outcomes for people. People's legal rights were upheld and consent to care was sought as much as possible. Care records were person centred and held full details on how people liked their needs to be met; taking into account people's preferences and wishes. Overall, people's individual equality and diversity preferences were known and respected. Information recorded included people's previous medical and social history and people's cultural, religious and spiritual needs.

People were treated with kindness and compassion by the staff who valued them. Staff had built strong relationships with people who lived there. Staff respected people's privacy. People, or their representatives, were involved in decisions about the care and support people received.

The service remained responsive to people's individual needs and provided personalised care and support. People's communication needs were known by staff. The provider had taken account of the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). The AIS is a requirement to help ensure people with a disability or sensory loss are given information they can understand, and the communication support they need.

Staff adapted their communication methods dependent upon people's needs, for example using simple questions. Information for people with cognitive difficulties and information about the service was available in an easy read version for those people who needed it.

People could make choices about their day to day lives. The provider had a complaints policy in place and it was available in an easy read version. Staff knew people well and used this to gauge how people were feeling.

The service continued to be well led. People lived in a service where the provider's values and vision were embedded into the service, staff and culture. Staff told us the registered manager and provider were very approachable and made themselves available. The provider had monitoring systems which enabled them to identify good practices and areas of improvement.

People lived in a service which had been designed and adapted to meet their needs. The service was monitored by the provider to help ensure its ongoing quality and safety. The provider's governance framework, helped monitor the management and leadership of the service, as well as the ongoing quality and safety of the care people were receiving.

The provider worked hard to learn from mistakes and ensure people were safe. The provider and registered manager had an ethos of honesty and transparency. This reflected the requirements of the duty of candour.

The duty of candour is a legal obligation to act in an open and transparent way in relation to care and treatment. The previous rating was displayed in the main entrance.

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 remains Good.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Stoke View Residential Home

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 checked 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.

People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector on 23 February 2019 and was unannounced.

Before the inspection we reviewed information we held about the service. We reviewed notifications of incidents the provider had sent to us since the last inspection. A notification is information about important events, which the service is required to send us by law.

We used information the provider sent us in the Provider Information Return (PIR). This is information we require providers to send us at least annually to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. At our last inspection of the service in September 2016 we did not identify any concerns with the care provided to people.

We met all nine people living in the service. People living at the service had limited communication. Therefore, they were unable to tell us about all their experiences of the services. Others could tell us about their day and things they enjoyed doing. During our inspection we spent time with people observing daily routines and interactions between people and staff supporting them. This helped us gain a better understanding of people and the care they received at Stoke View.

We spoke to the provider, registered manager and two members of staff. We looked at records relating to people's care and the running of the home. These included three peoples' care and support plans and records relating to medication administration. We also looked at quality monitoring of the service, staff recruitment files and staff training records.

Following the inspection, we received feedback from one relative. We asked them about their views and experiences of the service. Their feedback can be found throughout the inspection report.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

The service continued to provide safe care. People who lived in Stoke View were not able to fully express themselves verbally. However, we observed people appeared to be happy, relaxed and comfortable with the staff that were supporting them. Staff agreed that people were safe. People's laughter, body language and interactions told us they felt safe and comfortable with the staff supporting them. People who were able to when asked said they felt safe.

People were protected from abuse as staff had completed training and knew what action to take if they suspected someone was being abused, mistreated or neglected. Staff were confident the registered manager would take action.

People had their needs met by sufficient numbers of staff to support them. We saw staff supporting people, meet their needs and spend time socialising with them. Staff were recruited safely and checks carried out with the disclosure and barring service (DBS) ensured they were suitable to work with vulnerable adults.

People did not face discrimination or harassment. People's individual equality and diversity was respected because staff had completed training and put their learning into practice. Staff completed the Care Certificate (a nationally recognised qualification for staff new to care) and this covered equality and diversity and human rights training as part of this ongoing training.

People had the risks associated with their care assessed, monitored and managed by staff to ensure their safety. Completed risk assessments ensured people could receive care and support with minimum risk to themselves and others. There were clear guidelines in place for staff to help manage these risks. People had risk assessments in place regarding their behaviour, which could be seen as challenging to others or themselves. Staff were aware of people's individual needs and the strategies for managing people's behaviours, anxiety and distress were carried out quickly and sensitively.

People's finances were kept safe. People had appointees to manage their money where needed, including family members or advocates. The provider had systems to audit all accidents and incidents which occurred and acted to minimise further risks to people. The provider learnt from incidents and used them to improve practice.

People received their medicines safely from staff who had completed training. Systems were in place to audit medicines practices and records were kept showing when medicines had been administered. People prescribed medicines to be taken when required (PRN), such as pain relief tablets, had records in place to provide information to guide staff in their administration; such as what the medicines were for, symptoms to look for, alternative initial actions to try, the gap needed between doses or the maximum dose.

People lived in an environment which the provider had assessed to ensure it was safe and secure. The fire system was checked with weekly fire tests carried out. People had individual personal emergency evacuation procedures in place (PEEPs). People were protected from the spread of infections. Staff

understood what action to take to minimise the risk of cross infection, such as the use of gloves and aprons and good hand hygiene to protect people.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The service continued to provide effective care and support to people. Staff were competent in their roles and had a very good knowledge of the individuals they supported which meant they could effectively meet their needs.

People were supported by staff who had completed training to meet their needs effectively. The provider had ensured staff undertook training they had deemed as 'mandatory'. All staff completed the Care Certificate that covered Equality and Diversity and Human Rights training. Staff confirmed they had completed an induction which also introduced them to the provider's ethos, policies and procedures. Staff felt supported, received regular supervision and attended team meetings to keep them updated with current good practice models and guidance for caring for people.

People's computerised care records held information on how each person communicated and how staff could effectively support individuals. People had a "Hospital Passport" in place which would be taken to hospital in an emergency and provided details on people's health care need and how people communicated. Staff demonstrated they knew how people communicated and encouraged choice whenever possible in their everyday lives. Pictorial images were displayed, for example on menu boards, to help ensure it was in a suitable format for everyone.

People were supported to eat a nutritious diet and were encouraged to drink enough to keep them hydrated. People identified at risk through health conditions or choking had been referred to appropriate health care professionals. For example, speech and language therapists. Their advice was clearly documented, followed by the staff and suitable food choices provided.

People were encouraged to remain fit and healthy, for example people were supported to go for daily walks. People's health was monitored to help ensure they were seen by appropriate healthcare professionals so their ongoing health and wellbeing was assured. People's care records detailed that a variety of external healthcare professionals were involved in their care.

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA), whether any restrictions on people's liberty had been authorised and whether any conditions on such authorisations were being met. Currently no one in the service had any restrictions in place.

Staff encouraged and supported people to make day to day decisions. Where decisions had been made in a person's best interests these were fully recorded in care plans.

People were able to give their verbal consent to care. People lived in a service which had been designed and adapted to meet their needs. Specialist equipment, for example chair lifts meant people could access all areas.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Staff continued to provide a caring service to all. People were provided care by staff who valued them. People appeared relaxed and comfortable with the staff. There was a happy atmosphere in the service. Many people had lived at the service for a number of years and had built strong relationships with the staff team.

People were supported by staff who were both kind and caring and we observed staff treated people with patience and compassion. People were seen chatting with staff and the conversations were positive and we heard and saw plenty of laughter and smiles. Staff were attentive to people's needs and understood when people needed reassurance and guidance.

Staff showed concern for people's wellbeing. People with any long-term health conditions were observed to be well cared for by staff. The care people received was clearly documented and detailed.

People had decisions about their care made with the involvement of their relatives or representatives. People's needs were reviewed and where needed, updated, regularly with staff who knew people well attending these reviews. People could access independent advocacy services if required. This would help ensure the views and needs of people were considered and documented when care was planned.

Staff knew people well and understood people's verbal or nonverbal communication. Staff could explain each person's communication needs by the expressions or sign language they used to communicate if they were happy or sad.

The values of the organisation ensured the staff team demonstrated genuine care and affection for people. This was evidenced through our conversations with the staff. People received their care from some staff who had worked at the service for many years. This consistency helped meet people's behavioural needs and gave staff a better understanding of people's communication needs. It supported relationships to be developed with people so they felt they mattered.

People's independence was respected. For example, staff encouraged people who were able to, to participate in everyday household tasks. People were supported by staff at people's own pace. Staff were seen to be patient and gave people plenty of time while supporting them. Staff understood people's individual needs and how to meet those needs. They knew about people's lifestyle choices and how to help promote their independence.

People's privacy and dignity was promoted. Staff knocked on people's doors prior to entering their rooms. Staff used their knowledge of equality, diversity and human rights to help support people with their privacy and dignity in a person-centred way. People were not discriminated against in respect of their sexuality. Staff spoke to us about how people would be treated and cared for equally regardless of their sexual orientation, culture or religion. The provider and staff said everyone would be treated as individuals, according to their needs.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

The service continued to be responsive. People were supported by a staff team who were responsive to their needs. People's care plans were person-centred and detailed their social and medical history, as well as any cultural, religious and spiritual needs. Staff monitored and responded to changes in people's needs. For example, any decreases in people's general health due to age, specialist advice was sought.

We saw people and staff being treated fairly and equally. The provider told us they had policies and procedures in place to ensure they met their responsibilities under the Equality Act.

People's care plan described the person's skills, goals and support needed by staff and/or other agencies. The plans were personalised and detailed how the person needed and preferred care and support to be delivered. People's daily routines were documented and understood by staff. Staff told us how they encouraged people to make choices including visual items to help.

People's care records were personalised to each person and held information to assist staff to provide care and support along with information on people's likes and dislikes. Staff had good knowledge of people they cared for and could tell us how they responded to people and supported them in different situations.

People received personalised care. People's communication needs were effectively assessed and met by staff. Staff told us how they adapted their approach to help ensure people received this individualised support. For example, picture or visual choices to assist people choose.

A complaints procedure was available and in an easy read version. The provider's policy set out how the service would handle complaints. The policy said they would act in an open and transparent manner, apologise and use the complaint as an opportunity to learn. Some people currently living in the service would not fully understand the procedure due to the level of their learning disability. Staff told us that due to people's nonverbal communication they knew people well, worked closely with them and monitored any changes in behaviour. They would then act to try and find out what was wrong and address this. This showed us the provider would take action and review the policy to ensure it was in line with the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). People could have the support of advocates when needed to ensure people who were unable to effectively communicate, had their voices heard.

Though staff had completed end of life training no one currently living in the service was considered to need end of life support.

People took part in a wide range of social activities. People's family/friends were encouraged to visit and speak by telephone. Staff recognised the importance of people's relationships with their family and friends and promoted and supported these contacts when appropriate.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The service remains well-led. People lived in a service whereby the provider's caring values were embedded into the leadership, culture and staff practice. Staff and a relative spoke highly of the provider who visited the home most days, and the registered manager. Staff said; "Excellent both of them. I can contact them at any time."

The registered manager confirmed attendance at the Leadership and Management course funded by the local council. They promote a positive culture and a person-centred approach. The provider ensured these visions were embedded into the culture and practice within the service and incorporated into staff training. Because of this, people looked happy, content and well cared for.

The provider provided clear leadership and governance; ensuring the service was overseen to maintain quality. The provider's governance framework helped monitor the management and leadership of the service, as well as the ongoing quality and safety of the care people were receiving. For example, systems and process were in place such as monitoring of accidents and incidents, environmental checks plus care planning and nutrition audits. These helped to promptly highlight when improvements were required. When improvements were identified, prompt action was taken; for example, during the inspection additional audits were put in place to monitor people's money.

The provider and registered manager were respected by the staff team and said they were very approachable and offered support and guidance whenever they needed it. The provider, who was in the service most days, was open and transparent and was very committed to the service and the staff, but mostly the people who lived there. They felt the recruitment process was an essential part of maintaining the culture of the service. People benefited from a provider and registered manager who worked with external agencies in an open and transparent way and there were positive relationships fostered.

Staff were motivated and hardworking. They shared the philosophy of the management team. Shift handovers, supervision, appraisals and meetings were an opportunity to look at and improve current practice. Staff spoke positively about the management team.

Staff spoke fondly of the people they cared for and stated they were happy working for the provider but mostly with the people they supported. Management monitored the culture, quality and safety of the service by visiting to speak with people and staff to make sure they were happy.

People lived in a service which was continuously and positively adapting to changes in practice and legislation. For example, the management team were aware and were looking at how the Accessible Information Standard would benefit the service and the people who lived in it. This was to ensure the service fully met people's information and communication needs, in line with the Health and Social Care Act.