

# Consensus Support Services Limited

# 31 King Edwards Grove

## Inspection report

31 King Edwards Grove  
Teddington  
Middlesex  
TW11 9LY

Date of inspection visit:  
27 July 2016

Date of publication:  
19 August 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

31 King Edwards Grove provides accommodation and personal care for up to eight adults with a learning disability and/ or autistic spectrum disorder. At the time of our inspection eight people were living in the home. The inspection took place on 27 July 2016 and was unannounced. At the previous inspection, held in June 2014 we found that the service was meeting the required standards.

The home was presented as an ordinary detached house over two floors with access to the first floor via stairs. People had single rooms. Communal space consisted of a lounge area and dining room. There was a private garden at the rear of the property.

There was a manager in post who was in the process of becoming registered by the Care Quality Commission (CQC), and they were at the home at the time of our inspection. 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 home was well decorated and adapted to meet people's needs. The home had a homely feel and reflected the interests and lives of the people who lived there, with photos of people and staff.

People who were able to communicate with us gave us positive feedback about the home and the caring nature of staff. Other people were able to demonstrate in other ways that they felt safe and cared for at the home, for example through their interaction with staff.

There were sufficient numbers of staff to meet the needs and preferences of the people that lived there. Staff understood their duty should they suspect abuse was taking place, including the agencies that needed to be notified, such as the local authority safeguarding team or the police. Risks of harm to people had been identified and clear plans and guidelines were in place to minimise these risks, without restricting people's freedom. Staff ensured that people were involved in these decisions by speaking with people and making sure care plans were personalised and easy to read.

People were offered choices, supported to feel involved and staff knew how to communicate effectively with each individual according to their needs. People were relaxed and comfortable in the company of staff. Staff supported people in a way which was kind, caring, and respectful.

Staff helped people to keep healthy and well, they supported people to attend appointments with GP's and other healthcare professionals when they needed to. Medicines were stored safely, and people received their medicines as prescribed. People were involved in their food and drink choices and meals were prepared taking account of people's health, cultural and religious needs.

Where people did not have the capacity to understand or consent to a decision the provider had followed the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (2005). An appropriate assessment of people's ability to make decisions for themselves had been completed. Where people's liberty may have been restricted to keep them safe, the provider had followed the requirements of the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) to ensure the person's rights were protected.

The provider regularly sought people's and staff's views about how the care and support they received could be improved. There were systems in place to monitor the safety and quality of the service that people experienced.

## 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.

The provider had an effective staff recruitment and selection process in place and there were enough staff on duty to meet people's needs.

Staff knew people's needs and were aware of any risks and what they needed to do to make sure people were safe.

There were arrangements in place to protect people from the risk of abuse and harm and staff knew about their responsibility to protect people.

Medicines were managed and administered safely.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective

People received care from staff who were supported and who had access to training to enable them to care for the people that lived there.

People's rights under the Mental Capacity Act were met. Where people's freedom was restricted to keep them safe the requirements of the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards were met.

People were protected from the risks of poor nutrition and dehydration by having a balanced diet and support to eat healthily. Where nutritional risks were identified, people received the necessary support.

People had good access to health care professionals for routine check-ups, or if they felt unwell. People's health was seen to improve as a result of the care and support they received.

### Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

Staff were caring and friendly and interacted with people in a

respectful manner.

People were involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support. The care records we viewed contained information about what was important to people and how they wanted to be supported.

People's privacy was respected.

### **Is the service responsive?**

**Good** ●

The service was responsive.

Care plans were person centred and gave detail about the support needs of people. People were involved in their care plans, and their reviews.

People had good access to the local community, and could take part in activities that interested them, and promoted their independence.

There was a clear complaints procedure in place. Staff understood their responsibilities should a complaint be received.

### **Is the service well-led?**

**Good** ●

People, their relatives and staff were involved in improving the service.

Regular staff meetings helped share learning and best practice so staff understood what was expected of them at all levels. The service encouraged feedback about the service through regular audits.

Systems were in place to regularly monitor the safety and quality of the service people received and results were used to improve the service.

# 31 King Edwards Grove

## **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 27 July 2016 and was unannounced. The inspection was carried out by an adult social care inspector.

Before the inspection we reviewed records held by CQC which included notifications, complaints and any safeguarding concerns. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law. This enabled us to ensure we were addressing potential areas of concern at the inspection.

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 improvements they plan to make.

We spoke with four people who lived at the home, and spent time with the other people. We also spoke with the registered manager, four members of staff, two relatives of people who lived at the home and one visiting professional.

We reviewed care and other records within the home. These included four care plans and associated records, medicine administration records, five staff files, and the records of quality assurance checks carried out in the home.

## Is the service safe?

### Our findings

People told us that they felt safe living at 31 King Edwards Grove. One person said, "Staff are nice. They help me do things."

Observation of the interaction between people and staff throughout the day demonstrated that people felt very comfortable and relaxed in staff presence. The home also had clear policies and procedures with regard to safeguarding and guidance was available for people in easy read posters.

Staff were clear on their obligations towards people and demonstrated a clear understanding of what constituted a safeguarding matter and how to report this. One member of staff told us, "We all work together to keep people safe. Of course I would report and discuss anything I wasn't happy with about a colleague's treatment of people."

There was a Whistle blowing Policy as well as a grievance procedure for staff which was accessible and which was made available to new staff on day one of their induction.

We saw that people's needs were assessed before they moved into the service. This pre-admission assessment involved input from people, relatives and professionals where appropriate and identified if the service could meet the person's needs. Risk assessments clearly identified risks and provided staff with clear guidance on how to address these risks. Examples included health-related issues, behavioural challenges, participation in household tasks, mobility and safety awareness. Assessments meant that staff were able to support people in a safe way whilst supporting them in activities or interests of their choice. Risk assessments were reviewed at regular intervals or in response to incidents or changes in behaviour.

There were sufficient numbers of staff deployed to keep people safe and support the health and welfare needs of people. In addition to the registered manager there were five support staff on throughout the waking day. At night there were one waking staff and one sleeping in staff.

Staff told us, and records confirmed that there was a robust recruitment procedure in place which included application with two references, criminal records checks, interview and probationary period.

The service completed a handover between each shift. The staff in charge of the previous shift discussed relevant issues and made staff aware of the planned arrangements and appointments for the next shift. This meant staff were up to date and well informed about people they cared for.

There were effective Infection control procedures in place. These included Food Hygiene procedures (e.g. checking of food temperatures, labelling of food kept in fridge and colour coded chopping boards), laundry protocols and guidance, hand washing facilities with anti-bacterial rubs and disposable hand towels and cleaning mops. There were in-house COSHH and environmental risk assessments. All accident and incidents were recorded and notified to senior management and the CQC.

People's medicines were managed and given safely, and people were involved in the process. One person

managed their own medicines. Staff who administered medicines to people received appropriate training, which was regularly updated. Staff who supported people with medicines were able to describe what the medicine was for to ensure people were safe when taking it. The manager was in the process of ensuring that descriptions of each person's medicine, what it was for and any risks associated with not taking it were visible in people's medicines files in clear and plain English.

There were no gaps in the medicine administration records (MARs) so it was clear when people had been given their medicines. Medicines were stored in locked cabinets to keep them safe when not in use.

## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

People were cared for by staff who had the knowledge and skills they needed to deliver safe and effective care.

Staff told us they regularly attended training relevant to their roles and this was confirmed in records we examined. We examined a training matrix which identified courses the service considered necessary to support their staff to deliver safe and appropriate care and treatment. These included subject areas such as safeguarding, mental capacity, moving and handling, first aid, fire safety and infection control.

Staff skills were also monitored and supported by the service through regular one-to-one supervisions. Staff confirmed that they received supervision. We looked at staff records and discussed supervision with the registered manager. We saw that formal personal supervision sessions took place approximately every two months.

In addition to personal supervision there were daily handovers and regular monthly staff meetings as well as a general open door culture at the home where the registered manager was accessible at all times. There were annual appraisals in place for staff. One member of staff commented, "The support and training here is really good, and the new manager has been brilliant."

The service had a record of training for all staff as well as details of planned refresher training covering all basic mandatory training as well as training specifically relevant to supporting people in the home, such as managing behaviour which challenges the service, person centred care and speech and language awareness.

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.

We saw that where people lacked capacity any assessments and decisions were based on specific situations rather than a blanket assessment of a person's understanding. People could then be assured that decisions would be made for them in their best interests only in the areas they could not understand.

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 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 conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty were being met. The manager and staff had completed training in these areas and understood the principles. We saw entries in care records about mental capacity and assessments. Where appropriate relatives were involved and if required the service could access

independent mental capacity advocates to support people and ensure their best interests. When required, the manager had submitted application for DoLS authorisations. At the time of inspection five applications had been made under DoLS and four had been approved.

We observed staff interaction with people and looked at the way people were supported throughout the day. We saw that staff understood the support needs of people well, and that they also understood people's preferred method of communicating their needs. Staff supported people in a respectful manner, and always ensured that where possible, people were given the time to voice their opinion and give consent to whatever activity or tasks they were being invited to participate in.

Each person had their own key worker who supported them with all aspects of their day to day living and who ensured that support plans with associated risks were implemented and reviewed with support from the manager. Keyworkers also ensured that monthly reviews were held as well as preparing for the service users annual reviews with funding authorities.

There was positive feedback from relatives who told us that they were happy with the skills and experience of the staff team. One person told us, "I have no complaints whatsoever about this service. They have provided a really stable environment for [my relative] to develop and grow.

People had enough to eat and drink to keep them healthy and had good quality, quantity and choice of food and drinks available to them. One person said, "The meals here are very, very good". Menus were planned with the involvement of people, with people's preferences being incorporated into the overall menu for each week. People's special dietary needs were met and their preferences for food were identified in their support plans. Where a specific need had been identified, such as food needing to be prepared in a particular way to aid swallowing this was done. For one person who required percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) feeding, staff had been trained in how to do this effectively.

There were records of health appointments, health action plans and contacts of relevant professionals in place for everyone. The service had developed strong working relationships with a range of professionals from the local Community team, including social services, psychologists, community nurses and the local GP surgery.

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

The staff at the home developed positive, caring relationships with people. Everyone we spoke with spoke positively about the home as if it were their own and demonstrated this through the way they made use of the homes facilities and enjoyed unrestricted access to communal areas and staff offices.

People also told us that they liked the staff and the manager. One person said "The staff look after us. They are nice."

Care was delivered by staff in a patient, friendly and sensitive manner. We observed and listened to interactions between people and staff throughout the duration of our inspection. We saw numerous examples of positive and caring interactions, including mealtimes, staff sitting with people reading, staff and people playing games together, staff supporting people in personal care and staff supporting people to attend outside appointments.

The atmosphere in the home was calm and relaxed and staff spoke with people in a caring and respectful manner. Staff understood people's support needs and communication methods and were therefore able to detect any discomfort or distress and provided caring interventions in a respectful manner. People's care records contained clear person-centred descriptions of how people preferred to be supported and these were followed by care staff.

In addition to regular monthly house meetings, with the most recent one having been held in June, the keyworker system was used in order to ensure that people continued to feel involved in decision making and have their views taken into account. Staff used their keyworker responsibilities to engage people on a daily basis and to co-ordinate monthly reviews on each person so that all staff were updated on any changes. We observed that staff constantly involved people in the activities and tasks of the home, using a range of methods from ordinary reminders and invitations to some people, through to prompting and physical assistance for others.

Other examples of people's involvement and decision making were evident in the individualised programmes of activity for each person. Each person had a personal support plan which included details of the way the person would like to spend their average week and what kind of support was needed from staff to achieve this.

People were supported to have annual health checks and were supported in understanding relevant information about their care through the use of keyworkers explaining things and easy to read posters and policies.

People's privacy and dignity was respected and promoted through clear policies that emphasised people's rights and staff behaviour towards people. People were able to lock their bedroom doors for privacy, with the locks allowing for emergency access if required.

Staff were knowledgeable about people and their past histories. Care records recorded personal histories, likes and dislikes. Throughout the inspection it was evident the staff knew the people they supported well.

Staff were able to tell us about people's hobbies and interests, as well as their family life. People's rooms were personalised which made it individual to the person that lived there. People told us they could have relatives visit when they wanted, or go and stay with their relatives if they wished.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

People received care that was responsive to their needs. The manager met people or their relatives prior to admission and completed a pre-admission assessment to ensure the service could meet their needs. The assessment provided a basis for subsequent care planning which was reviewed and updated once they came to live at the service.

Staff were knowledgeable about and attentive to the needs of people they supported. Each person's care plan contained a summary of their life before they came to the service providing prompts for topics of conversation, including "What is important to me?" and details of what aspirations the person had.

People's care records were person centred in the way they were written and identified people's needs, goals and preferences and how they were expected to be delivered. This information about people provided guidance that enabled staff to deliver appropriate care and support in a responsive manner.

The staff supported people who had a range of disabilities, including non-verbal communication, Autism, and behaviours which challenged the service. There were good links with the organisation's Positive Behaviour Team, who supported the staff in finding ways to support people in the least restrictive manner possible.

The manager reported good working relationships with GPs and learning disability teams and care records documented visits and appointments. People's care records contained individual health files and health action plans which enabled staff to act responsively when needing to communicate with health services.

The home had a complaints procedure and maintained records of any complaints, accidents and incidents as well as reporting these to senior managers via an online reporting system. Relatives we spoke to told us they had not had to raise any formal complaints and that any concerns or questions were dealt with swiftly and in an informal manner. There had been no formal complaints received at the home since our last visit.

People's care and treatment were regularly reviewed to ensure the most appropriate response to their needs. For example, there were daily records, shift handover information, monthly keyworker reviews and formal annual reviews. We saw that care plans and care reviews were up to date.

People had access to a range of activities that interested them, ranging from home-based activities to attendance at community day centres and further education. In addition some people visited relatives on some weekends and the service had an open visiting policy for friends and family.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

There was a positive culture within the home between the people that lived here, the staff and the manager. One person told us, "It's friendly with the staff." Another person said, "I like to talk to the manager."

The manager was involved in participating in Service Manager meetings and regional meetings where issues and quality assurance targets were discussed and monitored. In addition there were monthly auditing visits by a senior manager, the most recent visit being in July 2016. There were also weekly checks with regard to food and health and safety. The manager was supported by Team Leaders and support workers.

Feedback from relatives was positive. They told us there was a relative's forum where they were able to meet and discuss things, and confirmed that they felt included in areas such as reviews and any proposed changes.

The registered provider carried out surveys and questionnaires for staff, people living in the home and relatives. In the most recent surveys, the home scored above 80%, with 80% being the benchmark for quality.

The manager had been in post since April and was completely familiar with all aspects of the management role, including their regulatory responsibilities under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. This included reporting significant events to the Care Quality Commission and other outside agencies. This meant we could check that appropriate action had been taken.

Records management was good and showed that the home and care provided was regularly checked to ensure it was of a good standard. Records were stored safely and confidentially.