

# Autism Together

# Nelson's Croft

## Inspection report

71 Church Road  
Bebington  
Wirral  
Merseyside  
CH63 3EA

Tel: 01513347510  
Website: [www.wirral.autistic.org](http://www.wirral.autistic.org)

Date of inspection visit:  
16 August 2016  
19 August 2016

Date of publication:  
15 December 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

This inspection took place on 16 and 19 August 2016. It was announced 24 hours before the initial visit as people who use the service often went out in the day and the staff went with them; we wanted to be sure someone would be in.

We visited Oak House, which is the provider's administrative base, to look at recruitment records, on 16 August 2016 and the service itself later that day and also on 19 August 2016.

Nelson's Croft is a small care home that is part of the range of services provided by Wirral Autistic Society, now also known as 'Autism Together'. The home is registered to provide accommodation and personal care for up to eight people with conditions on the autistic spectrum and other associated conditions. At the time of our inspection, there were seven people living there.

The home requires a registered manager. 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. Nelson's Croft had a registered manager who had been in post for several years.

We looked at information the Care Quality Commission (CQC) had received about the service including notifications received from the registered manager. We checked that we had received these in a timely manner. The provider had submitted a provider information form (PIR) as requested. We also looked at safeguarding referrals, complaints and any other information from members of the public.

We observed the people in the home on the day of our inspection, but most were unable to communicate verbally with us. We saw that people appeared comfortable with the staff who had a good knowledge of their needs.

We saw that people received sufficient quantities of food and drink and had a choice in the meals that they received.

Medication procedures were followed and the medication stored tallied with the records.

The provider had complied with the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards and its associated codes of practice in the delivery of care. We found that the staff had followed the requirements and principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). Staff we spoke with had an understanding of what their role was and what their obligations were in order to maintain people's rights.

We found that the care plans and risk assessment monthly review records were all up to date in the three files we looked at and there was updated information that reflected the changes of people's health.

The home used safe systems for recruiting new staff. These included using the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. New staff had an induction programme in place which included training them to ensure they were competent in the role they were doing at the home. Staff told us they felt supported by the registered manager.

Accidents and incidents were recorded and monitored to ensure that appropriate action was taken to prevent further incidents. Staff knew what to do if any difficulties arose whilst supporting somebody, or if an accident happened.

We looked at records relating to the safety of the premises and its equipment, which were correctly recorded.

## 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.

There were sufficient staff on duty and they had been recruited appropriately and safety.

Medication was stored appropriately and administered safely.

Staff had been trained how to report any issues about safeguarding. People appeared happy with staff.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Staff had received appropriate training and this was kept up-to-date.

Staff had received training in the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the Deprivation of Liberties Safeguards. They had made appropriate referrals for people.

Many of the documents relating to people and posters in the home were 'easy read' format which allowed people to understand more readily what they were about.

### Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

People and staff were seen to be getting on well together and staff demonstrated that they had people's care at the heart of their practice.

We saw that the relationships which people had with friends and family were well maintained.

### Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

The records we saw were person centred and we observed that

staff treated each person as an individual. We saw that people and their relatives had been involved in the creation of their care plan which had been regularly reviewed by them.

People were able to take part in activities of their choice.

The complaints procedure was available in 'easy read' format and we saw records that complaints were dealt with properly.

**Is the service well-led?**

**Good** ●

The service was well led.

The registered manager was approachable and professional and staff told us that they were well supported.

We saw that all the records relating to people who used the service, staff and the running of the home were up-to-date and stored appropriately.

# Nelson's Croft

## 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 16 and 19 August 2016 and was announced. The provider was given 24 hours' notice because the location was a small care home for adults who are often out during the day; we needed to be sure that someone would be in.

One adult social care inspector completed this inspection.

We asked for information from the local authority quality assurance team before the inspection. We checked the 'HealthwatchWirral' internet site.

We toured the building and looked in the communal areas and some of the bedrooms where we were permitted access by the occupants.

We spoke with two people who lived at the home, with the registered manager and two other staff members. We also, throughout the inspection, observed people and their interactions with staff.

We observed care and support in the home, viewed three care files for people living at Nelson's Croft, training records for all the staff, three recruitment files and other records relating to how the home was managed.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

A staff member told us, "Safeguarding is very important and the Society [the provider] treats it very seriously. We are working with vulnerable adults who can't care for their own safety. We have to make sure clients are not abused".

Staff demonstrated that they had an understanding of the arrangements for safeguarding vulnerable adults. There were able to tell us about abuse and how to report it. We saw that the safeguarding policy followed local safeguarding protocols. Staff told us that if they had any concerns about any allegations of abuse or neglect they would report this to the senior person available immediately and staff also knew that they were able to report it to the local authority or to CQC.

Most safeguarding incidents had been reported to both the local authority safeguarding team and to CQC. However, we noted that several instances had not been identified as a safeguarding issue and we discussed this with the registered manager. These had been minor incidents which had resulted in no harm and which the manager felt did not meet the local authority's threshold for reporting. Best practice is to let the safeguarding authority make the decision about whether incidents reach the threshold. The registered manager assured us that all incidents would be reported in future. Overall, however, we felt that the service managed safeguarding appropriately.

The staff were aware of the whistleblowing policy and told us they would have no hesitation to use it if required.

We looked at the staff rotas for the previous two weeks, which showed that there were always sufficient staff on duty. Depending on what the people were doing each day there may be one or two staff in the home during the day and other staff would accompany people to their activities. Appropriate numbers of staff were rostered for night duty.

The training records we reviewed showed that the staff were regularly updated with safeguarding training and able to tell us about abuse and how to report it. We saw notices in the home about safeguarding which gave the telephone numbers to contact, if there were any concerns. These were also available as 'easy read' posters for the people living in the home to use. Easy read documents are those which make written information easier to understand and which often includes pictures, for people who have a condition on the autism spectrum and those with learning disabilities.

We saw that staff had been recruited according to the legal requirements. All staff had been checked for criminal records, qualifications, right to work in the UK and all had at least two references. Staff had not been allowed to work until these requirements have been met and a satisfactory interview had taken place. We saw records of application forms, interview notes and the other documents in the staff recruitment files. A health and social care professional had recorded, 'I am impressed with the calibre of the new staff member'.

The provider had various policies relating to employment, such as disciplinary and grievance procedures. This meant that there was clear guidance about the relationship, expectations and requirements between the employer and employees.

In the care files we saw that risk assessments had been completed on the various aspects of the individual's lives, such as using transport, using money and going on holiday. Staff also had risk assessments completed for aspects of their work such as moving equipment and dealing with chemicals.

The medication cabinet was kept in the sleep over room which was locked along with the medication administration record (MAR) sheets. We saw that the medicines stocks stored in the cabinet and the MAR sheets, tallied. The carried forward figure did not appear on the MAR sheets and this made it difficult to follow and accurately audit. All the drugs were in date and we saw records stock had been checked in properly, stored correctly, and administered appropriately.

There was a countersigning sheet for incoming medication and we saw that one blister pack from the pharmacy had been found to be incorrect. This information had been relayed to the pharmacy dispensing the medication and this showed that the process for checking medications had proved to be effective.

One person needed a medication which was a controlled drug. Controlled drugs are required to have a separate register for their use and storage and this is specifically required to be in a bound controlled drugs register, which has numbered and pre-printed pages similar to a diary or a bookkeeping book. The controlled drugs had been recorded in a loose leaf file, but had not been recorded in such a book. We discussed this with the registered manager who immediately ordered the bound controlled register book and assured us that this would be used in future.

Nobody in the home was receiving any of their medication covertly, which is where it is hidden in drinks, food or syrup, for example. PRN (as required) medication and homely remedies were recorded in a similar way. Again the stocks tallied with the record.

The temperature of the room where the medication cabinet was situated was normally checked twice a day in the morning and evening and had been recorded as being below the required 25C. We discussed with the registered manager taking the recordings at the hottest part of the day and they agreed to implement this.

There were smoke and fire detectors throughout the home, with the necessary fire fighting equipment placed around the building. We saw that this equipment had been recently checked and serviced. Regular checks of the alarm system were carried out. We saw records that fire drills involving the people who used the home, happened monthly.

There were appropriate fire evacuation plans, should there be an emergency. We saw that individual personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) had been recorded for staff to use in an emergency. These plans were on a poster in the office and there was a 'grab bag' for staff to use, near the front door, in the event of an emergency. The grab bag contained important information about individuals in the home. We also saw that accidents, incidents and complaints were all dealt with appropriately and responded to quickly. There were policies relating to each of these.

The cleanliness and hygiene of the premises was good; all of the areas were seen to be clean on the day of the inspection. There were sufficient soap dispensers and paper towels in the communal toilets for staff and visitors to have the opportunity to disinfect and dry their hands appropriately. The routine safety checks and certification had been completed on the building as required, such as fire safety, fire alarms, electric, gas



and water systems and legionella checks and testing.

The kitchen was clean and tidy and the fridges and freezers had the temperatures checked daily. Hot food was also temperature checked. All were within safe limits, apart from a slight issue with a fridge which was adjusted to achieve the correct temperature, whilst we were there.

## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

A staff member told us that their understanding of the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards was, "Anything which is a restriction on human rights and activities".

All the staff had induction training at the beginning of their employment and we were given the schedule of this. Staff went through a probationary period of six months during which time they had to achieve certain standards and have training in various aspects of their work, such as medication training, person centred care, mental capacity, safeguarding and whistleblowing. Staff also undertook more specialist autism spectrum condition training which included supporting people to manage their behaviour.

Staff told us they continued to be updated with their training and records showed that staff were regularly updated with their training. Staff were encouraged to take further qualifications or other training opportunities for their own benefit or if they want to progress through the organisation. We saw the training matrix that showed that training was provided throughout the year. A staff member told us "They [the provider] always encourage you to achieve higher qualifications".

We noted that there were records of supervision which occurred about every two months. Each member of staff had a yearly appraisal. Staff told us that they attended supervision regularly and that it was a two-way process. Notes were made and both the member of staff being supervised and the supervisor kept a copy. Staff were able to meet regularly at staff meetings. These meetings were structured and usually had a training aspect to part of the meeting. Policies and procedures, issues around the home and planning for activities for the people living there, were often discussed. We saw that some staff had received awards or commendations for their attendance in any one year, which showed that the Wirral Autistic Society (WAS), known as 'Autism Together', valued them.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) is required by law to monitor the operation of Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. 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 was 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 service was working within the principles of the MCA and whether any authorisations or conditions to deprive a person of their liberty, were being met. The service had followed the principles of the MCA and DoLS and we noted that four people had been deemed to have capacity in all aspects of their lives, applications for DoLS had been made for the remainder of the people and at the time of our inspection, the service had received three authorisations back from the local authority.

The staff members and the manager we talked with were able to tell us about the MCA and DoLS. The

registered manager demonstrated to us that there was a clear procedure with records in place, which showed what actions had been taken in relation to the MCA.

We saw that staff were trained in this subject and were regularly updated. One staff member told us, "The [DoLS] authorisations are usually for six or twelve months".

Many of the documents in the care plans and the posters on the notice boards were in 'easy read' format. There was a 'picture exchange communication system' (PECS) in place and staff had been trained to use this. The goal of this was to learn communication and find the motivators for people with a view to them becoming more independent. Most of the people were able to communicate with staff using spoken language as well as using signs and gestures. Body language was also observed, respected and used by the people and staff, during our inspection.

The kitchen/dining room was large and was of domestic style. People were encouraged to participate in menu planning food preparation and cooking where they could or wanted to.

There was discussion between the people living in the home and the staff about the menus. The staff told us that they tried to promote healthy eating but sometimes this proved difficult as people made other choices and decisions about their diet. People were free to choose alternatives if they wished, on the day. We saw people had access to drinks outside of mealtimes.

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

A health and social care professional had written in a compliment form, 'Please thank them [staff members] both, again for me. They are a credit to you, Nelson's Croft and the society'.

One staff member told us, "Everyone has a good rapport".

Another staff member said, "This is a step closer to supported living. We can really help, but we try not to over support people. We try to encourage people's independence".

We saw that staff interacted and supported people with care and patience. We noted that staff communicated and supported the people living in the home in a friendly, informative, caring but professional way. There were jokes and laughter between staff who showed people respect. We saw that there was on-going support with individual choices on how people wished to spend their time.

During our inspection, two people intervened in our discussion and were given time and attention by the staff.

Many of the people living at Nelson's Croft were receiving 'one to one' care and support from staff; however, we saw that there was opportunity for people spend time in private if they were able to.

We noted that the records relating to the individual people living at the home were kept confidentially and that they were only accessible by the staff.

The information in the care plans showed that assessments and reviews had been done involving people and their families. The information that was within them was readable by both families and the person they were about. Much of the information was either in large type or in 'plain English', or was in an 'easy read' format.

'Easy read' refers to the presentation of text in an accessible, easy to understand format. It is often useful for people with learning disabilities and may also be beneficial for people with other conditions affecting how they process information. The information also informed the professionals involved in people's care, as it showed how they needed to be supported by everyone involved in their care.

We saw that people were able to express their views and preferences. Much of this was documented in the care files and other information was evident when we observed the relationship and interactions between the people living there and the staff.

We saw that the relationships which people had with friends and family were well maintained. They were encouraged and enabled to visit friends and family and to keep in touch.

There was information available on the noticeboard about advocacy services. We saw in the care files that

all of the people living in the home had relatives who supported them.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

One person told us, "I follow the football". They also told us they wanted to know about the activities of shipping traffic in the Mersey river. A staff member told us they made a phone call on behalf of the person, to the relevant people, each day, so they could update this person about their interest.

One relative had written in the complaints and compliments log, 'There was a mismatch of service users to staff, but this has now been addressed'.

Another relative had written, 'Thanks for listening to our concerns and for your reassurances that you will do something about them'.

The care files that we saw were easily readable, understandable and person centred. They were comprehensive accounts of people's needs and demonstrated that each person and their family had been involved in the creation of their care file. Understanding and comprehension of their files have been facilitated by the use of 'easy read' documents. These care files contained personalised information about the person, such as their background and family history, health, emotional, cultural and spiritual needs. A staff member told us, "It [the service] is autism specific and person centred. We always try to look at the individual and research how to fulfil their needs".

People's needs had been assessed and care plans developed to inform staff what care to provide. The records informed staff about the person's emotional wellbeing and what activities they enjoyed. The plans were effective; staff were knowledgeable about all of the people living at the home and what they liked to do.

Staff completed a daily record for all the support and activities completed and the entries we looked at were very detailed. The registered manager told us that staff would discuss immediately any changes in people's health with her or the deputy manager. The staff we spoke with confirmed this procedure.

The care files were reviewed regularly or as required and people and their relatives were invited to the reviews. One relative commented in a compliments log, 'The review was a very practical and personal meeting-a very good review'. Another relative recorded, 'Thanks to all the staff involved in [Name's] recent review. It was a really positive afternoon which I really enjoyed. We are thrilled with [Name's] progress'.

Activity plans were recorded in people's care files and showed that where possible, people had made their own decisions about how to spend their time.

We observed that each person was treated as an individual. Each was enabled to choose the décor of their rooms to some extent and what they wanted to do with their time each day. People's activities and interests had been tailored to them.

We saw that people were involved in activities such as media, dance, drama, music and outdoor activities

such as the plant nursery landscaping. A relative had written in the compliments file, 'Really pleased that [Name] is doing things at CVS (community and vocational services). She seems happier'.

The complaints policy and procedure was up-to-date and recently reviewed. It was displayed on the noticeboard in full and also in poster form. We saw a poster on a noticeboard, entitled 'It's okay to complain'. This was a visual, 'easy read' poster which enabled people to easily understand how to complain. No recent complaints had been recorded and we saw that there had been a record that all complaints had been investigated and that the complainant had been informed of the outcome.

We saw documentation in the care plans which showed us that there had been effective communication between the home staff and other professionals involved in people's care and support. Residents' meetings were held regularly and relatives were informed of any issues or changes.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

One staff member told us, "We do our best to make sure the standards are met".

The registered manager told us they had a good team working at Nelson's Croft. It was apparent that staff respected the manager and worked well together and to the policies and procedures of the provider.

A staff member also told us, "We have a good relationship with the parents. If they have any concerns we always try to make it right".

The registered manager was available during our inspection. The staff on duty appeared to have a good rapport with them and were friendly but respectful. The registered manager was equally so, to them. . Staff confirmed that they had a good relationship with the registered manager who supported them well. They told us they were able to talk to the registered manager about any issue or concern.

We saw that the leadership was transparent, informed and open and that staff did not have any hesitation in talking with the registered manager. The registered manager and the staff demonstrated to us that the care, comfort and safety of the people at Nelson's Croft were their prime concern.

The registered manager told us that they kept up-to-date with current policies, procedures and good practice by attending training sessions and attending various national conferences.

We saw that all the documentation relating to the people living at Nelson's Croft, the staff, the environment, health and safety and other records relating to the running of the home had been completed properly and in a timely manner.

Services which provide health and social care to people are required to inform the CQC of important events that happen in the service so that we could check that appropriate action had been taken.

The registered manager of the home had informed the CQC of significant events in a timely way. The home and the registered manager met the registration requirements. They had generally made appropriate referrals to either the local social services or local healthcare providers, as necessary.

It was clear from the care plans that there was good partnership working between staff at Nelson's Croft and other professionals involved in the care of people living there.

Policies and procedures were up-to-date and other documentation such as medication records; fire and other health and safety checks had been regularly completed and updated with action plans where necessary.

The home had systems in place to assess the quality of the service provided to the people who lived there. This included weekly medication audits, health and safety incident, accident and falls audits. We saw the



previous two months audits and noted that they were up-to-date and any issues noted have been included in an action plan with the dated time for completion.

All the documentation was stored appropriately and safely in various locked cupboards within the home and locked staffroom.

Some of the activities provided by Wirral Autistic Society to the people living in Nelson's Croft included gardening and landscaping services and growing vegetables and garden plants from the small farm on one of their sites. This provided the opportunity for people from the home to interact with the community.