

Selborne Care Limited

63-66 Kinsey Road

Inspection report

63 - 66 Kinsey Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 4SL

Tel: 01215654970
Website: www.selbornecare.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
12 July 2017

Date of publication:
16 August 2017

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

63-66 Kinsey Road provides residential care and support for younger adults with learning disabilities, autistic spectrum disorder or mental health needs. The service consists of four separate flats over three stories. The service is registered to provide personal care for up to four people and at the time of our inspection the service was supporting four people living in their own individual flats. At the last inspection, the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

People who used the service were safe. Staff demonstrated that they were aware of the action to take should they suspect that someone was being abused. Staff knew the risks associated with people's specific conditions and the actions required when people were at risk of harming themselves or others. There were enough staff to meet people's care and support needs promptly. People received their medicines when they needed them.

People were supported by staff who had the skills and knowledge to meet their needs. People were supported to have the maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible.

People chose what they wanted to eat. Staff provided advice and guidance to help people choose healthy meal options. People in the home were supported to make use of the services of a variety of mental and physical health professionals.

People told us that staff were caring. People were supported by regular staff who spoke fondly about the people they supported. People had key workers who understood people's preferred communication styles and assisted them when necessary to express their views. Staff promoted people's independence and respected their privacy.

Staff supported people to engage in activities they enjoyed. People's care and support was planned in partnership with them so their care plans reflected their views and wishes. People were supported to set and achieve goals which enhanced their wellbeing. People told us that staff were approachable and would take action if they were not happy or had a complaint.

People told us that the home was well run. The registered manager was aware of their responsibilities to the commission however they had not always notified us of specific events they were required to. Staff enjoyed working at the service and felt valued team members. People had the opportunity to influence and develop the service they received. The provider and registered manager made checks to help ensure that the standard of care was maintained.

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.

63-66 Kinsey Road

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.

This comprehensive inspection took place on 12 July 2017 and was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of one inspector and an expert by experience. An expert by experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of service.

As part of planning the inspection we reviewed any information we held about the service. We also checked if the provider had sent us any notifications. These contain details of events and incidents the provider is required to notify us about by law, including unexpected deaths and injuries occurring to people receiving care. We used this information to plan what areas we were going to focus on during our inspection visit.

During our inspection visit we spoke with three people who lived in the home and the relatives of three people. Some people living at the home were unable to speak with us due to their health conditions however we observed staff interactions with people and how care was delivered. This helped us to understand the experience of people who could not talk with us.

We also spoke the care coordinator, team leader and three members of the staff team. We sampled the records including three people's care plans, staffing records, complaints, medication and quality monitoring.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

All of the people we spoke with told us that they felt safe in the home. One person told us "I am not scared. It is safe living here." A relative told us, "I don't have to worry because he is safe and they (staff) are there for him." Another person's relative said, "They (staff) are kind to our relative." We saw people were comfortable to approach staff when necessary and appeared relaxed and at ease.

People were protected from avoidable harm and potential abuse. Staff received training and demonstrated they knew how to protect people from the risk of abuse. One member of staff told us, "We look for emotional, financial and physical abuse. We can always call the police or CQC." Staff we spoke with knew how to support people in order to protect people from the risks associated with their specific conditions. People's behaviour was monitored so they could receive prompt intervention if it was felt their conditions were deteriorating. There were records of the risks associated with people's conditions and the action staff were to take in order to minimise the possibility of harm. There were clear records so any risks associated with people's conditions could be shared with other health professionals.

There were enough suitably trained staff on each shift to keep people safe. The relative of one person said, "There are enough staff, plenty of staff. There is always somebody there 24/7." Staff told us and records confirmed that people we constantly supported by the number of staff required in their care plans. Staff responded promptly when people required support or reassurance. When staff were absent their planned work was covered by colleagues working additional hours or regular bank staff who knew peoples' individual care needs. Recruitment checks had been completed by the provider's human resources department to ensure people were supported by suitable staff.

Staff managed medicines consistently and safely. Medicines were kept in a suitably safe location and stored at the correct temperature to ensure they remained effective. The medicines were administered by staff who were trained to do so. People knew what their medicines were for and were supported to self-medicate if they wished. Regular audits and reviews ensured people received the appropriate medication as prescribed.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The people and relatives that we spoke with told us that staff were good at meeting their needs. One person told us, "I have lived here for three years and it is good. The staff are nice and I think they are trained, they know what they are doing." The service had recently recorded positive feedback they had received from a visiting health professional which stated that, "[Person's name] has gained so much more self-esteem and confidence." People told us and records showed that people's conditions had improved when they started using the service.

The needs of people were met consistently by staff who had the right competencies, knowledge, qualifications, skills, experience, attitudes and behaviours. One member of staff told us, "We always get training. A community nurse showed me how to manage a person's [specific medication]." We saw staff attend a planned monthly meeting with senior staff and staff confirmed they received informal and formal supervision from senior staff on a regular basis to reflect on their practice.

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. Staff demonstrated an understanding of people's rights to choose how they were supported and respected their decisions. When people were felt to lack mental capacity the registered manager had held meetings with appropriate others to identify care which would be in the person's best interests.

People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)." We saw that two people who were subject to DoLS authorisations were being supported in line with the conditions of those authorisations. This ensured their human and legal rights were protected.

People were supported to go shopping and purchase food they enjoyed. A person's relative said, "My relative was underweight but has gained weight now which is good." Staff supported people to be independent and prepare their own meals if they wanted. When necessary staff prepared meals in line with people's known preferences. Staff provided guidance on healthy eating and monitored people's weights so people could review and reflect on how their diets affected their health.

People in the home were supported to make use of the services of a variety of mental and physical health professionals including GPs and dietician in order to manage their specific conditions. This ensured people received prompt and appropriate support when needed.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People who used the service and relatives told us that the staff were caring. One person told us, "When I was in hospital they stayed with me day and night." A person's relative told us, "They are really kind to [person's name] and to the other residents."

People were supported by regular staff who know and understood their history, likes, preferences, needs, hopes and goals. The relationships between staff and people they supported consistently demonstrate dignity and respect at all times.

Staff spoke fondly about the people who used the service and how they enjoyed supporting them to engage in things they liked. Staff spoke proudly about how they wanted to improve people's conditions so they could improve the quality of their lives. One member of staff said, "The residents are fantastic. They are wonderful."

People were proactively supported to express their views and staff were skilled at giving people the information and explanations they need and the time to make decisions. We saw staff regularly ask people how they wanted supporting and respected their wishes. We observed staff communicating with people in their preferred styles which supported people to express their views and feelings. Records showed that people were regularly approached to review their care and identify if they would like to make any changes. This helped people to feel listened to and included in how the service was run.

We saw staff respected people's privacy and they took care to ask permission before supporting people with personal care. People were encouraged to help with chores such as laundry and preparing meals, if they wanted, to promote their independence and achieve their personal goals. One person "Staff help me to be independent."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Feedback about how staff responded to their needs and preferences of the people who used the service described it as consistently good. One person told us, "My family can visit when they want to and I go to visit them." A person's relative told us, "There is plenty for [person's name] to do and they offer him loads." Another person's relative said, "The carers do let our relative do what they want to do." Staff and the people we spoke with told us about the activities that people enjoyed and we saw that staff supported people to choose what they did each day.

People were actively involved in developing their care plans and were supported by staff who had the skills to assess their needs and knowledge about people's preferred communication styles. People were regularly supported to express their views and engage in activities they liked. We saw that activities were varied and reflected people's known interests.

People's care plans were thorough and reflected people's needs, choices and preferences. People's changing care needs were identified promptly and regularly reviewed with the person. There are systems in place to make sure that changes to care plans were communicated to staff and other health professionals. People received support promptly when required.

There was a range of ways for people to feed back their experience of the care they received and any concerns they may have. One person told us, "The staff are very caring and they always listen to me if I have any worries." When necessary staff took action in response to information received in order to improve the support people received. There were details of the provider's complaints process and how to raise concerns available around the service.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

All the people we spoke with told us that they felt that the home was well run. One person's relative said, "The atmosphere at Kinsey Road is great and the other residents come and say hello to me. The staff relationships are good as well." Another relative told us, "I would rate Kinsey Road as outstanding. It is great, fantastic and I am happy my [relative] is there." We saw that people who use the service appeared happy in the home.

At the time of the visit the service had 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. Although the registered manager was not present during our visit, the care co-ordinator was aware of their responsibilities to the commission and knowledgeable about the type of events they were required to notify us of. Their latest inspection ratings were displayed appropriately and the care co-ordinator could explain the principles of promoting an open and transparent culture in line with their required duty of candour.

Senior staff lead by example and were available to staff for guidance and support. They provided staff with constructive feedback and clear lines of accountability. Members of staff told us that senior staff were supportive and led the staff team well. Staff understood their roles and felt appreciated. Staff were motivated and this had contributed to the establishment of a knowledgeable and consistent staff group.

The service has a clear vision and set of values. Staff spoke of the importance of people receiving safe, consistent care while respecting people as individuals and their rights to live independent and fulfilling lives. Staff practice and records consistently reflected this vision.

There were systems in place to ensure people were involved in commenting on how they wanted to be supported. People's care plans were updated in response to people's wishes. People had the opportunity to influence and develop the service they received.

The provider monitored the quality of care people received. We saw that they had taken action when necessary to improve the care people received. Records showed that there were systems to make sure that relevant checks had been made on services and equipment in the home so they continued to meet people's specific needs.