

# Anchor Trust

# St Edith's Court

## Inspection report

18 Hillside Crescent  
Leigh On Sea  
Essex  
SS9 1EN

Website: [www.anchor.org.uk](http://www.anchor.org.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
09 January 2017  
10 January 2017

Date of publication:  
09 February 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

The Inspection took place on the 10 and 11 January 2017.

St Edith's Court provides accommodation and personal care for up to 39 people some of whom may be living with dementia. At the time of our inspection 36 people were living at the service.

At our last inspection the service was rated as Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that was intended to ensure people's safety and welfare. People were cared for safely by staff who had been recruited and employed after appropriate checks had been completed. People's needs were met by sufficient numbers of staff. Medication was dispensed by staff who had received training to do so.

People were safeguarded from the potential of harm and their freedoms protected. Staff were provided with training in Safeguarding Adults from abuse, Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The manager knew how to make a referral if required.

People had sufficient amounts to eat and drink to ensure that their dietary and nutrition needs were met. People's care records showed that, where appropriate, support and guidance was sought from health care professionals, including GPs and dentists.

Staff were attentive to people's needs. Staff were able to demonstrate that they knew people well. Staff treated people with dignity and respect.

People were provided with the opportunity to participate in activities which interested them. These activities were diverse to meet people's social needs. People knew how to make a complaint and complaints had been resolved efficiently and quickly.

The service had a number of ways of gathering people's views including using questionnaires and by talking with people, staff, and relatives. The registered manager carried out a number of quality monitoring audits to help ensure the service was running effectively and to drive improvements.

## 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.

# St Edith's Court

## **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 the 9 and 10 January 2017 and was unannounced. The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Before the inspection, we reviewed previous reports and notifications that are held on the CQC database. Notifications are important events that the service has to let the CQC know about by law. We also reviewed safeguarding alerts and information received from a local authority.

During the inspection 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.

During our inspection we spoke with nine people, a relative, the registered manager, deputy manager, six care staff, a visiting health professional and the cook. We reviewed four care files, four staff recruitment files and their support records, audits and policies held at the service.

.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

At this inspection we found the same level of protection from abuse, harm and risks as at the previous inspection and the rating continues to be good.

People told us that they felt safe living at the service. One person said, "I feel a lot safer living here, than when I was at home, especially at night you only have to buzz and somebody is at the door checking." Another person said, "You couldn't find a better place to live."

The registered manager made sure they recruited staff of good character and ensured all staff completed enhanced disclosure and barring checks (DBS). Staff were then asked to provide evidence at regular intervals that they remained of good character. As part of the registered managers recruitment processes, people were involved in the interviewing of new staff and their opinion was sought as to the staff's suitability for the job.

Staff knew how to keep people safe and protect them from safeguarding concerns. Staff were trained and able to identify how people may be at risk of harm or abuse and what they could do to protect them. In addition staff were aware that the service had a safeguarding policy to follow and a 'whistle-blowing' policy. When concerns were raised the registered manager notified the local safeguarding authority in line with their policies and procedures and these were fully investigated.

Staff had the information they needed to support people safely. Staff undertook risk assessments to keep people safe. These assessments identified how people could be supported to maintain their independence. The registered manager used this information to calculate how many staff were required to support people and completed a 'dependency assessment' monthly. People and staff told us that there were enough staff working at the service. One person said, "They [staff] look after you here, they are always around."

People were cared for in a safe environment. The registered manager ensured there were regular risk assessments completed of the premises and equipment used and there was an emergency contingency plan in place should there be an event that effected the running of the service. Staff received training in first aid and health and safety to ensure they knew what action to take in an emergency. People living at the service also had a personal evacuation plan in place should they need to be evacuated. One person told us, "They do fire checks every week and we know to stay in our rooms with the door closed, while the staff complete their checks."

Medicines were managed and administered safely. People told us that they got their medicine on time and when they needed it. Only trained and competent staff administered medication. Medication was stored safely in accordance with the manufactures guidance. The registered manager and pharmacy provider completed regular audits to ensure medication was managed safely.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

At this inspection, we found staff had the same level of skill, experience and support to enable them to meet people's needs effectively, as we found at our previous inspection. People continued to have freedom of choice and were supported with their dietary and health needs. The rating continues to be good.

People told us they received the care and support they needed. One person said, "The staff are very good, they know what they are doing." Another person said, "You can't fault this place it's a very good home." Staff told us that they felt confident in the support and training they received and that they had the correct skills to perform their role. In addition staff said that they had regular opportunities to reflect on their practice and to discuss the running of the service. One member of staff said, "We have regular meetings and I have supervision with a senior to discuss my performance or any training I want to do."

The staff and registered manager understood their responsibilities under the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. People told us that they made their own decisions about their care and support. Staff understood that people had this right and supported them to make decisions and to be as independent as possible. Staff were also aware that people could change their mind about decisions they had previously made. For example every month when going through care plans with people staff checked that if they had a 'do not resuscitate' in place that this was still their wish and recorded this in their notes.

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).

The registered manager completed assessments as appropriate to check people's understanding, memory and capacity to make decisions. Where assessments indicated a person did not have the capacity to make a particular decision, there were processes in place for others to make a decision in the person's best interests. The registered manager understood their responsibilities and where appropriate had made applications under the act and had followed these applications up with the local council to ensure they were being processed. This told us people's rights were being safeguarded.

People said they had enough food and choice about what they liked to eat. We saw throughout the day people were provided with food and drinks. Every room we went into we saw people had fresh jugs of drinks and had drinks within their reach. People were very involved in the menu planning and the service's chef held taste testing sessions with people as part of the menu planning cycle to gain their feedback and preferences. People were very complimentary of the food and we saw the dining experience was a very pleasant experience for people with most people choosing to attend the dining room and socialise at meal times.

Staff carried out nutritional assessments on people to ensure they were receiving adequate diet and hydration. Staff also monitored people's weight for signs of loss or gains and made referrals where appropriate to dietitians. We saw from records that staff were very good at ensuring where people were at

risk of poor nutrition they were supported to have fortified diets and additional fluids.

People were supported to access healthcare as required. The service had good links with other healthcare professionals, such as, chiropodist, opticians, community nurses and GPs. People told us that staff supported them to visit their GP and attend hospital appointments or family members went with them. We saw from records that staff were very observant of people's changing health conditions and sought prompt medical advice for them.

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

At this inspection people remained happy living at the service, they continued to be very complimentary of the staff and felt cared for. The rating continues to be good.

Staff had positive relationships with people. They showed kindness and compassion when speaking with them. Staff took their time to talk with people and showed them that they were important. Staff always approached people face on and at eye level, we saw many occasions of this, and of staff using appropriate touch to reassure people when talking with them. A visiting health professional told us, "I cannot rate them highly enough they are a very caring organisation." We received many positive comments about staff and people's relationships with staff, one person told us, "The staff are very approachable, they treat you like human beings, it's very good here." Another person told us, "There is a nice atmosphere here, the girls are lovely and you can have a laugh with them." A relative we spoke with said, "I arrive happy and I leave happy".

Staff knew people well including their preferences for care and their personal histories. Staff told us that they try to support people to maintain their independence as much as possible and assessed the level of support people needed all the time. For example one person liked to go out independently; the service made sure that they always had a contingency plan in place if they needed assistance whilst out, by knowing where they were going and ensuring they carried a mobile phone and contact number and address of the service. People and relatives told us that they were involved in planning care. One relative told us, "There is a care plan we discuss and there are records kept of everything." We saw care plans were very detailed and contained biographies of people's life so far as well as containing details of their hopes and aspirations for the future. Each person had an allocated member of staff as a key worker, one member of staff said, "As a key worker I make sure that they have everything they need, the way they like it, and I liaise with the family. I will also do any shopping they need or spend time talking with them and doing activities."

People told us that staff respected their privacy and promoted their dignity. One person said, "I lost my confidence walking after I had a fall, but staff really encouraged me to walk again and walked with me until I got my confidence back." Another person said, "I have been here for five years, the staff encourage me to do things for myself. I am 100 and I think it is because I am so well looked after here." People had access to individual religious support should they require this and people could attend church if they wished. In addition the service held a multi faith service each month people could attend if they wished to.



## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

At this inspection we found staff were as responsive to people's needs and concerns as they were during the previous inspection. The rating remains Good.

The service continued to be responsive to people's changing needs. Since our last inspection the registered manager and provider had focussed on supporting people with dementia. As part of a project supported by the provider to inspire staff to make a difference to people's lives they had focussed on supporting people's memories and past experiences through a number of innovations. In conjunction with people living at the service one of the lounges had been adapted with old time furniture and sideboards, bone china tea sets, a gramophone, reading area, pictures from the past and items such as ration books, old money and newspapers from the 1940s onwards. This facility was always available for people to use, one person told us, "We have reading club in there, or we sit and have chats. The bone china tea sets are nice to use to." We saw a comment from a relative how they had sat with their relative and remembered times gone by. They said that even though this made them both cry it had been a very happy experience for them to remember the past and people they had lost.

Staff encouraged people to maintain their interests and links with the community. The registered manager employed activity staff to work with people throughout the day and support them with activities. The activities staff were very innovative with the activities they provided and we saw that some of these were very popular. For example we saw a number of people attending the exercise group, due to popular demand this now happened twice a week. People had been supported to join in a number of projects and activities one of these had been going on a virtual cruise around the world. Another was a virtual train journey around Britain. We saw from photographs displayed these had been popular events usually ending with some form of entertainment, garden party or afternoon tea. One person told us, "There is always something to do here, and the gardens are lovely." Staff worked with people to find out what their interests were and supported them to access these, for example one person used to like teaching ballroom dancing, although they were no longer able to dance, staff accessed DVDs of ballroom dancing for them to watch, which they enjoyed doing.

The registered manager had a robust complaints process in place that was accessible and all complaints were dealt with effectively. People and relatives said if they had any concerns or complaints they would raise these with the manager. However people told us they generally did not have any complaints.

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

At this inspection we found staff were as well led as at the previous inspection. The rating remains Good.

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.

People told us that they were happy with the quality of the service, one person said, "You couldn't find anywhere better to live, the staff are good, the food is good, we have entertainment, what more could you want."

The registered manager and staff were very passionate and enthusiastic about the service and staff shared the manager's vision and values. One member of staff told us, "We want to support people to be independent in their last years, to show them love, attention and support with their daily life." Another member of staff said, "We want people to keep their dignity and independence and general well-being."

The registered manager gathered people's views on the service through regular meetings with relatives and people. During the meetings they gained people's views on the service and any suggestions they had. One relative told us, "The meetings are very good for sharing information and the minutes always come out promptly." We saw from minutes that care was discussed along with food, entertainment and the general running of the service. The registered manager also sent out questionnaires to gain people's, opinions on the service and how it was running. When these were reviewed any issues raised were then addressed as appropriate. The manager displayed this in the format 'You said' 'We did' for example the provider was going to change the way the laundry service was run however following consultation with people and relatives and following their objections it was decided not to change this service as people were happy with how it was run. This showed that the management listened to people's views and responded accordingly, to improve their experience at the service.

Staff felt supported and valued by the management team. Staff told us that the registered manager and deputy manager were always available to give them support and that the deputy manager was 'very hands on' with care. One member of staff said, "I can go to them managers about anything without any qualms." Staff also felt supported by each other, one member of staff said, "We have a good team here, we all work well together."

The registered manager had a number of quality monitoring systems in place to continually review and improve the quality of the service provided to people. They carried out regular audits, for example, on people's care plans, medication management, accident and incidents, health and safety, and environment. This information was used as appropriate to continually improve the care people received.