







# Orione Care St John's

## Inspection report

1 Ferry Road  
Teddington  
Middlesex  
TW11 9NN  
Tel: 020 8977 7574  
Website: [www.orionecare.org](http://www.orionecare.org)

Date of inspection visit: 2 and 7 September 2015  
Date of publication: 08/10/2015

### 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	

### Overall summary

This was an unannounced inspection and took place on 2 and 7 September 2015.

The home provides personal care and accommodation for up to six people with learning disabilities. It is located in the Teddington area.

The home 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 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

In May 2014, our inspection found that the service met the regulations we inspected against. At this inspection the home met the regulations.

People and their relatives told us they were happy living at the home and with the way that staff provided care and support. People made their own choices including activities and the home was a safe place to live. During

# Summary of findings

our visit there was a welcoming, friendly atmosphere and people came and went doing activities and interacting positively with each other and staff. The activities they pursued were varied and took place at home and in the community.

The home's and people's records were kept up to date, covered all aspects of the care and support people received, their choices, activities and safety. People's care plans were fully completed and the information contained was regularly reviewed. This supported staff to perform their duties efficiently and professionally. People were encouraged to discuss their health needs with staff and had access to GP's and other community based health professionals, as required. People were supported to choose healthy and balanced diets that also met their likes, dislikes and preferences. This enabled them to be protected from nutrition and hydration associated risks. They said they were happy with the choice and quality of meals they ate.

People knew who the staff that supported them were and the staff knew them, their and their preferences. They were well supported and they liked the way their care was delivered. Relatives also said staff worked well as a team and provided them with updated information. Staff had appropriate skills and provided care and support in a professional, friendly and supportive way that was focussed on people as individuals. The staff were well trained and accessible to people using the service and their relatives. Staff said they enjoyed working at the home and that the organisation was a good one to work for. They received good training, support and there were opportunities for career advancement.

People said the management team and provider were approachable, responsive, encouraged feedback from people and consistently monitored and assessed the quality of the service provided.

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service safe?

The service was safe.

People told us that they felt safe and were well treated. There were effective safeguarding procedures that staff used, understood and the home was risk assessed.

The home had improved its practice by learning from incidents that had previously occurred and there were enough staff to meet people's needs.

People's medicine records were completed and up to date. Medicine was regularly audited, safely stored and disposed of.

Good



### Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

People's support needs were assessed and agreed with them and their relatives. Staff were well trained.

Food and fluid intake and balanced diets were monitored within their care plans and people had access to community based health services.

The home had Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) policies and procedures. Training was provided for staff and people underwent mental capacity assessments and 'best interests' meetings were arranged as required.

Good



### Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

People said they felt valued, respected and were involved in planning and making decisions about their care. People's preferences for the way in which they wished to be supported were clearly recorded.

Staff provided good support, care and encouragement. They listened to, acknowledged and acted upon people's opinions, preferences and choices. People's privacy and dignity was also respected and promoted by staff. Care was centred on people's individual needs. Staff knew people's background, interests and personal preferences well and understood their cultural needs.

Good



### Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

People chose and joined in with a range of recreational and life skill development activities at home and within the local community during our visit. Their care plans identified the support they needed to be involved in their chosen activities and daily notes confirmed they had taken part.

The home had a complaints procedure and system and people said that any concerns raised were discussed and addressed as a matter of urgency.

Good



# Summary of findings

## Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

The home had a positive and enabling culture at all staff levels. The manager enabled people to make decisions and staff to take lead responsibility for specific areas of the running of the home.

Staff said they were well supported by the manager and organisation.

The quality assurance, feedback and recording systems covered all aspects of the service constantly monitoring standards and driving improvement.

Good



# St John's

## 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 was an unannounced inspection and took place on 2 and 7 September 2015.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

During the visit, we spoke with two people who use the service, four relatives, two care staff and the registered manager. There were six people living at the home.

Before the inspection, we checked notifications made to us by the provider, safeguarding alerts raised regarding people living at the home and information we held on our database about the service and provider.

During our visit we observed care and support, was shown around the home and checked records, policies and procedures and maintenance and quality assurance systems. We also looked at the personal care and support plans for three people using the service.

We used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). SOFI is a way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

We saw that people were safe living at the home. People told us they thought the home was a safe place to live. They said they did not feel any pressure from the staff to do things and had never experienced being bullied. One person said, “Staff are good and I live with my friends.” A relative said, “(Person using the service) is very happy there.” Another relative told us, “(Person using the service) likes coming home to us, but always ready to go back.”

Staff understood what abuse was and the course of action to follow if it was encountered. They had access to abuse policies, procedures and induction and refresher training that enabled them to protect people from abuse and harm in a safe way. Their responses to our questions followed the provider’s policies and procedures.

There was no current safeguarding activity. Previous safeguarding alerts had been suitably reported, investigated and recorded. Staff were aware of how to raise a safeguarding alert and the circumstances under which this should happen. They had received appropriate training. There was also information about keeping safe available to people who use the service.

The staff recruitment process was thorough and records showed us were followed. There were scenario based interview questions interview that identified if prospective staff had the skills and knowledge to provide care for people with learning disabilities. References were taken up and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) clearance obtained before starting in post. Staff were provided with a handbook that contained the organisation’s disciplinary policies and procedures. The staff rota showed and staff confirmed that staffing levels were flexible to meet people’s needs. The staffing levels during our visit enabled people’s needs to be met and the activities they had chosen to be pursued safely. There was one maternity leave cover staff vacancy and staff had been in post for a number of years. The maternity leave was covered by the organisation’s bank or agency staff. The same agency staff was requested to provide continuity for people using the service.

There was assessment guidance that people’s risk assessments were based on. People were enabled to take acceptable risks and enjoy their lives safely by risk assessments that covered all aspects of their daily living. This included activities at home, within the community and when on holiday. There were also health related risk assessments for areas such as falls and choking. The risks were reviewed regularly and updated if people’s needs and interests changed. There were also general risk assessments for the home and equipment used that were reviewed and updated. Equipment was regularly serviced and maintained. Care plan information gave staff the means to accurately risk assess people’s chosen activities. They were able to evaluate and compare risks with and for people against the benefits they would gain. Examples of this were the way people were able to access facilities in the community such as shops, the theatre and college. The risks assessments were reviewed annually or as required, adjusted when needs and interests changed and contributed to by people, their relatives and staff. Staff encouraged input from people whenever possible.

The staff said they shared information within the team regarding risks to individuals. This included passing on any incidents that were discussed at shift handovers and during staff meetings. There were also accident and incident records kept. Staff told us they knew people living at the home very well, were able to identify situations where people may be at risk or in discomfort and take action to minimise the risk and remove discomfort.

We checked the medicine records for all people using the service and found that all the records were fully completed and up to date. Medicine was safely administered, regularly audited, safely stored and disposed of, as required. Staff were trained to administer medicine and this training was regularly updated. There were no people currently self-medicating and controlled drugs were not kept on the premises.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

People and their relatives said they made their own decisions about the care and support they received and when it was provided. They told us the care and support provided by staff was what they needed and delivered in a friendly, enabling and appropriate way that they liked. One person said, "I visit my mum." Another person told us, "I'm staying here because I like it." A relative said, "I am very pleased, (My relative) is very well looked after."

Staff were provided with comprehensive induction and annual mandatory refresher training. The induction was partly on line and participation based depending on its nature. New staff were also required to shadow experienced staff as part of the induction to increase their knowledge of the people who lived at the home. The training matrix identified when mandatory training was required. The training provided included infection control, challenging behaviour, medication, food hygiene, equality and diversity and infection control. There was also access to specialist service specific training such as effective communication, supporting people to live well and art based skills for people with dementia. Monthly staff meetings, six weekly supervision sessions and annual appraisals were used to identify any further individual or group training needs. There were staff training and development plans in place.

People's care plans contained a separate file for health, nutrition, diet and health action plans. These included completed and regularly updated nutritional assessments. Staff monitored weight charts weekly and they observed, checked and recorded the type of meals and how much people ate to encourage a healthy diet and make sure they were eating properly. There was also information regarding the type of support people required at meal times. A file stated 'I sometimes refuse meals; staff must be patient and encourage me.' Staff said any concerns were raised and discussed with the person and their GP if necessary. Nutritional advice and guidance was provided by staff and there was regular communication with the local authority health care team who reviewed nutrition and hydration. Other community based health care professionals, such as

speech and language therapists visited as required. People also had annual health checks. The records demonstrated that referrals were made to relevant health services as required.

People chose the meals they wanted using pictures as required, decided on a menu and participated in food shopping. One person told us, "I do cooking, we take it in turns" Another person said, "I haven't decided what to eat tonight yet." Meals were timed to coincide with people's preferences and activities they were attending. Staff monitored meals to ensure they were provided at the correct temperature and people had their preferred portion sizes.

Staff received mandatory training in The Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). Mental capacity was part of the assessment process to help identify if needs could be met. The Mental Capacity Act and DoLS required the provider to submit applications to a 'Supervisory body' for authority. Applications under DoLS were submitted by the provider and four were awaiting authorisation. The outcome of 2 people's the authorisations had been received by the home. People who did not have capacity to make decisions for themselves had 'Best interests' meetings arranged on their behalf to determine the best course of action. Staff that had received appropriate training, carried out the capacity assessments and they recorded in people's care plans. Staff continually checked that people consented to the way they were treated and were happy with what they were doing and activities they had chosen during our visit. There were advocacy services available and people were made aware of them. An advocacy service represents people and speaks on their behalf.

The organisation had a restraint policy and procedure that was de-escalation based and staff had received training in de-escalation procedures. They were also aware of what constituted lawful and unlawful restraint. Individual de-escalation guidance was contained in people's care plans as appropriate and any behavioural issues were discussed during shift handovers and staff meetings.

The home worked closely with the local authority and had contact with organisations that provided service specific guidance and informed of local events taking place, such as Richmond Mencap.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

People and their relatives told us that staff treated them with dignity, respect and compassion and that the care provided was of a good standard and delivered in a friendly and approachable way. This matched the staff care practices we saw, when staff were aware and unaware that we were observing them. Staff listened to what people had to say, valued their opinions and acted on them, rather than meeting just the basic needs of people. They also provided support in a friendly, cheerful, caring and helpful way. One person told us, "My keyworker is nice, they treat me well." Another person said, "Staff help me do what I want." A relative said, "The staff are very nice." Another relative said, "Very pleased, always been well looked after." A further relative told us, "I'm very satisfied with the staff." People's body language was also positive throughout our visit that indicated they were happy with the way staff delivered care.

During our visit staff demonstrated skill, patience and knew the people, their needs and preferences well. People's needs were well met and they were encouraged and supported to make decisions for themselves. Staff communicated with people in a patient way, making sure they were understood and understood what people were telling them. They asked what people wanted to do, where they wanted to go and who with. This included the type of activities they liked. These were also discussed with staff during keyworker sessions and home meetings.

The home provided care focussed on the individual and we saw staff put into practice training to promote a person centred approach. At each opportunity people were enabled to discuss their choices, and contribute to their care and care plans. The care plans were pictorial to make them easier to understand, developed with people and had been signed by them or their representatives where practicable. Staff were warm, encouraging and approachable. Where people had difficulty expressing themselves staff listened carefully and made sure they understood what the person was saying. They had also been trained in the use of Makaton, which is a form of sign language.

People were constantly consulted by staff about what they wanted to do, if they needed anything and if they had been out, what they had been doing. One person told a member of staff, "I need a glass of water for my medicine." They responded by getting the person some water. There was a visitor's policy which stated that visitors were welcome at any time with the agreement of the person using the service.

Staff had received training about respecting people's rights, dignity and treating them with respect. This was reflected in their respectful care practices and way they provided support that still provided a relaxed, inclusive and fun atmosphere which people enjoyed. The home had a confidentiality policy and procedure that staff said they understood, were made aware of and followed. Confidentiality was included in induction and on going training and contained in the staff handbook.



# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

People and their relatives said they were enabled to make decisions about their care and the activities they wanted to do. Staff knew what people's needs and wishes were and met them. Their needs were met in a way that they enjoyed, was comfortable, relaxed and homely. They were asked for their views by the organisation, home's management team and staff. During our visit people were encouraged to give their views, opinions and make choices by staff and the manager. Staff enabled them to decide things for themselves, listened to them and took action if needed. Staff were available to people to discuss any wishes or concerns they might have. Needs were met and support provided promptly and appropriately. One person told us, "The lady is here for aromatherapy today and I'm doing it." They said to another person using the service, "Come on, put your glasses on, you're coming with me too." A relative said, "(Person using the service) comes here every other weekend and if I wasn't happy I would soon contact the social services." Another relative told us they were, "In contact with the staff every week and they keep me informed."

We saw that staff met peoples' needs in an appropriate and timely way. People were given the opportunity to decide what support they wanted and when. People's positive responses reflected the appropriateness of the support staff provided. If people felt they had a problem, it was resolved quickly and in an appropriate way.

The last person to move in was 5 years previously. A staff member explained the procedure to follow when a new person was considering moving in. The assessment process identified if people's needs could be met. Local authorities referred people and provided assessment information. The home also requested information from any previous placements. The home shared all available information with staff to identify if people's needs could initially be met. The home then carried out its own pre-admission needs assessments with the person and their relatives.

People and their relatives were consulted and involved in the decision-making process and invited to visit as many times as they wished before deciding if they wanted to move in. Staff said care and support was focussed on the individual by recognising the importance of people's views

as well as those of relatives. This included the views of people already living at the home. During the course of people visiting the manager and staff added to the assessment information.

Updated written and pictorial information about the home and organisation was provided for people using the service and regular reviews took place to check that people's placements were still working. The manager said that if a placement was not working alternatives would be discussed and information provided to prospective services where needs might be better met.

People's care plans were individualised, person focused and part pictorial to make them easier to understand. They recorded people's interests, hobbies, health and life skill needs and the support required for them to be fulfilled. They were focussed on the individual, contained people's 'social and life histories' and were live documents that were added to when new information became available. People's needs were regularly reviewed, re-assessed with them and their relatives and re-structured to meet their changing needs. People were encouraged to take ownership of the plans and contribute to them as much or as little as they wished. They agreed goals with lead staff that were underpinned by risk assessments and daily notes confirmed that identified activities had taken place.

Each person had their own weekly activity planner. One person said, "I go to the pub and for walks to the river, it's nice." The home made use of local community based activities wherever possible and people chose if they wanted to do them individually or as a group. There were also group and individual holidays with people having visited Butlins. One person told us "Butlins was fun." Activities included attending day centres where one person did gardening, swimming, cooking and shopping. Other activities included eating out with friends, some of whom were from other homes, discos, bowling and a visiting musician. People were also encouraged to do tasks in the house to develop their life skills such as laundry, tidying their rooms, helping with lunch and putting the rubbish out. There were also home based activities such as drawing and puzzles. One person told us how much they enjoyed doing puzzles and there were examples of people's artwork hanging on a wall in the kitchen. The home had its own transport and trips had taken place to Hampton Court, Richmond Park and Kew Gardens.

## Is the service responsive?

People and their relatives said they knew about the complaints procedure and how to use it. It was provided in pictorial form for people who use the service to make it easier to understand. There was a robust system for logging, recording and investigating complaints. Complaints made were acted upon and learnt from with care and support being adjusted accordingly. There was a whistle-blowing procedure that staff said they would be comfortable using. They were also aware of their duty to enable people using the service to make complaints or raise concerns.

The home and organisation used different methods to provide information and listen and respond to people and their relatives. There were weekly house and menu planning meetings where people could express their views. Annual questionnaires were sent to people using the service, relatives and staff. There were also monthly keyworker and annual care reviews that people were invited to.

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

People and their relatives told us that they were made to feel comfortable by the manager, staff and organisation and were happy to approach them if they had any concerns. One person said, “I like the manager.” A relative told us, “They keep us informed.” During our visit, we found that the home had an open culture with staff and the manager listening to people’s views and acting upon them.

The organisation’s vision and values were clearly set out. Staff we spoke with understood them and said they were explained during induction training and regularly revisited during staff meetings. The management and staff practices we saw reflected the organisation’s stated vision and values as they went about their duties. There was a culture of supportive, clear, honest and enabling leadership.

There were clear lines of communication within the organisation and specific areas of responsibility. Staff told us the support they received from the manager and organisation was good. They felt suggestions they made to improve the service were listened to and given serious consideration. The organisation was transparent and there was a whistle-blowing procedure that staff felt confident in. They said they really enjoyed working at the home. There were regular minuted home and monthly staff meetings that enabled everyone to voice their opinion. The records demonstrated that regular staff supervision and appraisals took place and this was confirmed by staff.

There was a policy and procedure in place to inform other services, such as district nurses, of relevant information should services within the community or elsewhere be required. The records showed that safeguarding alerts, accidents and incidents were fully investigated, documented and procedures followed correctly including hospital admissions. Our records told us that appropriate notifications were made to the Care Quality Commission in a timely way.

There was a robust quality assurance system that contained performance indicators that identified how the home was performing, any areas that required improvement and areas where the home was performing well. This enabled required improvements to be made. Areas of good practice were also recognised by the provider. Annual organisational quality audits were conducted, there were annual care development plans and monthly care services manager audit visits also took place. These included random sampling of different aspects of the care and support provided at each visit. They included checking files, records, talking to people using the service, staff, building maintenance and budgeting. There were also daily health and safety checks that staff members took responsibility for and the manager checked were taking place. Shift handovers included information about each person that enabled staff coming on duty to be aware of anything they needed to know. There were also local authority contract monitoring visits.