

# Fairplay

# Fairview House

## Inspection report

95 Sheffield Road  
Chesterfield  
Derbyshire  
S41 7JH  
Tel: 01246 203963  
Website: office@fair-play.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 26/11/2015  
Date of publication: 20/05/2016

## 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	

## Overall summary

Fairview House provides respite care for children and young people who use the services of Fairplay Support Services. It can accommodate up to six young people or children who do not need assistance with their mobility. The service is designed to provide a weekend 'sleepover' with friends for young people and children up to 18 years of age. There were 17 children and young people who used the service on the day of our inspection. This was their first inspection.

The service is a weekend service and shares the registered manager and staff of Fairview Support Services.

There was a registered manager in post. . 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.

# Summary of findings

People were safe and the provider had effective systems in place to safeguard people. Their medicines were stored, recorded appropriately. They were supported to plan menus and to shop and cook their meals over the weekend. People chose how to spend their weekend. This included outing to films, shows and or sporting events of their choice.

There were sufficient, skilled staff to support people at all times and there were thorough recruitment processes in place. Staff were trained and used their training effectively to support people. There was an effective quality assurance system in place. The provider had a complaints policy in place and people knew how to use it.

Most of the people cared for were children or young people, however the staff understood and where appropriate complied with the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and the associated Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.

Staff were caring and respected people's privacy and dignity. Staff were encouraged to contribute to the development of the service and understood the provider's visions and values. These were to develop the service to meet the changing needs of those who used it.

# 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.

There were enough staff to meet people's needs. People's medicines were being safely managed. People felt safe and they were protected from harm and abuse. Staff recruitment arrangements were and staffing levels ensured there were suitable and sufficient staff to meet people's needs safely. There were plans in place to keep people safe in the event of an emergency.

Good



### Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

Staff were trained to deliver care in a way that met people's needs and wishes while ensuring they always had the person's consent to care beforehand. Staff ensured people were supported to eat sufficient and nutritious food and drink. Staff understood their responsibilities under the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA), and the associated Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Good



### Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

Staff interaction with people was caring and people's privacy and dignity was protected.

Consent was obtained before care was administered.

Good



### Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

Young people decided on what they wanted to do for their weekend's respite care.

People were supported to follow their interests.

The service had a complaints procedure and people knew how to use it.

Good



### Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led

The provider and the registered manager were proactive in meeting the needs of people who used the service.

The provider had an effective system for monitoring the quality of the service they provided.

Staff were aware of the provider's vision and values which were embedded in their practices.

Good



# Fairview House

## 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.

The inspection took place on the 26 November 2015, it was unannounced and conducted by one inspector.

We looked information we held about the service, including notifications sent to us by the provider. A notification is information about important events which

the provider is required to tell us about by law. As part of the inspection process we also spoke with a manger from the local authority contracts department, responsible for commissioning services at Fairview House..

During the inspection we spoke with five young people who used the services of Fairview House and Fairplay Support Services, three relatives, four care workers, the deputy manager and the registered manager We observed care practice and general interactions between the young people and staff.

We looked at documentation, including three people's care and support plans, their health records, risk assessments and daily notes. We also looked at three staff files and records relating to the management of the service, including various audits such as care planning and risk assessments. Risk management in relation to the environment, staff rotas and training records.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People and their relatives said they thought the service was safe. Young people told us that they planned their own weekend and the staff ensured the activities were safe. One relative told us, “Not only do they have a great time, they learn a little more about themselves and what they can achieve in a very safe place.” Another said, “They are as safe as they would be at home with us looking after them.”

The provider had policies and procedures regarding protecting young people and children from abuse and harm. Staff had received training in them and we saw staff provided care in a manner that kept people safe. Staff were aware of what abuse was and of their duty of care to protect the young people and children they cared for. They said protecting people from harm and abuse was part of their induction and refresher training. Safeguarding information was available and a safeguarding pathway with local authority contact numbers was on display in a communal area. Staff said they would follow the pathway and report abuse should they need to.

People’s care plans contained risk assessments relevant to the activities carried out over the weekend. These included shopping for food for the weekend safely, cooking snacks and assisting staff to cook the evening meal. This enabled young people to take acceptable risks and still enjoy life in a safe environment.

There were general risk assessments for the service and equipment that were reviewed and updated at specified intervals. These included fire risks, hoists and other

equipment used. The facilities were well maintained and equipment used was regularly checked and serviced. The fire service completed a full safety assessment on the building prior to the service starting. This ensured people were cared for in a safe environment.

The staff recruitment procedure was thorough and all stages of the process were recorded. References were taken up prior to starting in post and staff’s work histories were checked. There was also a six month probationary period, at the start of which new staff shadowed experienced staff. The provider had disciplinary policies and procedures in place that were available to staff. All staff had completed security and police checks prior to starting work in the service. There were sufficient staff to meet people’s needs and the numbers reflected those recorded on the staff rota. Staff and people we spoke with thought there were enough of them to meet people’s needs. The manager told us that the staff rota was flexible to meet people’s needs and extra staff were provided if required. Staff were aware in advance who was staying for the weekend and what their needs were. They said they planned staff numbers in advance. Young people told us there was always, “Someone there when you needed them.”

The staff who administered medicine were trained to do so. People using the weekend respite service brought their own medicines with them. Young people told us they were assisted to take their medicines appropriately. We did not see the administration of medicines but we saw they were stored in locked facilities and records were maintained appropriately.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

Young people who used the service told us that staff knew how to care for them without interfering too much. One young person said, “The weekend is really important and staff get it right.” Another said, “We need the staff but it’s our weekend. They know this.” All the people we spoke with agreed the staff were ‘great’ and made the weekend good.

We were told by staff and relatives that where possible people made their own decisions about their care and support. Where this is not possible relatives told us they were very involved in care delivery especially when children were involved.

Young people who used the service had complex needs. Staff told us they were trained to meet these. The manager said they kept track of training by using a training matrix. A review of this showed when training was due. There was also access to specialist service specific training such as epilepsy awareness and how to administer emergency medication to people in the event of a seizure. All the staff we spoke with had this training. The staff and the registered manager told us that senior staff assured the effectiveness of the training by working alongside staff to oversee care delivery.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides the 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 capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and least restrictive as possible.

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 Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). We checked whether the provider was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions or authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty were being met. We found that staff were aware of their duties under the Act and found that they were able to tell us the age group that the MCA and DoLS applied to.

Staff were aware of special dietary needs and directions were available for staff to ensure dietary needs were met while still including people in the eating experience. For example people who were on a gluten free diet or a high fat diet had the same eating experience as everyone else but met their needs such as a take away meal. This meant that people could enjoy the same experience but eat what was suited to them.

The provider had a system in place to contact families of young people who were feeling unwell during the weekend. Staff told us that so far they didn’t have to use it.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

Young people and their relatives told us that they were supported by staff who were kind and caring. Discussions with staff and our observations supported this. One young person told us, “I love meeting my friends for the weekend.” Another said “Staff make sure we have a lovely time.”

We were told that staff knew which young people liked to share rooms to enable them to chat while they are in bed and have a proper ‘sleepover’. We were told this was very important to them as they could not do this in their own home due to the health conditions they were living with.

Staff were aware of people’s needs and the importance of the relationships people had developed through using the service.. We saw staff interacted with them in a focused manner and used kindness and compassion. Staff gave them time and space to digest what was said and to respond in their own time.

Young people told us that as well as having a lovely time, “We have to look after ourselves. The staff will only help us if we really can’t do something for ourselves. We learn how to be more independent and look after ourselves better.” They also said, “We have to help with the cooking and the clearing up. But this is okay as we are learning to be more independent.”

Staff spoke in a positive manner about the people they supported to have their weekend break. They had had taken the time to get to know people’s preferences and wishes. For example, not all the young people were fit enough to stay awake chatting into the night and some needed to be assisted to their rooms early. Young people told us this was always done with their consent. We saw staff treated people with respect and that dignity was promoted at all times. For example offers of assistance were done with discretion.

# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

Young people told us that the service was brilliant. A relative said the weekend respite service was set up to allow young people to have the same experience as their peer group. They said the manager was proactive in responding to the needs of young people.

Care planning was carried in an inclusive manner. Relatives were involved in care planning and we were told that their views were respected and discussions and reviews were held to ensure the best possible care.

The provider had access to and worked to the care plans drawn up by Fairplay Support Service. This meant that staff were offered the information they needed about the young person's life history likes and dislikes. The provider had a shortened version of the care plan that focused on what the young person wanted for the weekend and a brief account of their needs. This included outing and activities they wanted to participate in such as outings to the cinema or shows.

We saw the plan of care included personal information that reflected young people's wishes. The plans included information on people's communication, behavioural and care needs and detailed how people wished to be supported in these. Information and input from relatives and people who knew them well had been included when the plans were developed. This ensured the care delivered was what young people wanted.

Records we looked at detailed decisions people had made about their care and recorded people's likes, dislikes and personal preferences. People's care plans had been reviewed and regularly updated by the staff team which showed that people's individual needs, wishes and

preferences had been taken into account. This meant that staff had up to date information on the person's needs and wishes. Staff told us that this helped them assist people to get the most out of life in the home.

The staff we spoke with were knowledgeable about people using the service. They knew their care needs and what was significant to them in assisting them to live well. Such as being able to spend time with their special friends. We were told that the weekends were planned well in advance so that friends could book in at the same time. Staff told us they kept up to date with people's changing needs and preferences through handovers which took place at the beginning of each shift. They said these were carried over to the weekend service to ensure staff had up to date information on the young people they were caring for. They said this enabled them to deliver appropriate care and support.

Whilst visitors were welcomed to all aspects of Fairplay Support Service the weekend respite was regarded as a special weekend away to allow young people to have their own space. Relatives were aware of this and said they would only interrupt if there was an emergency.

The provider had a complaints process in place and was proactive in receiving feedback and was open to listening and making changes before they became a problem. For example, relatives told us that the manager's door was always open and they can and do chat about issues at any time. Details on how to make a complaint was available in communal areas and people we spoke with were aware of it. All the people, relatives and staff confirmed this open approach to dealing with complaints and grumbles ensured issues were dealt with before they became a problem.



# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

The young people who used the service said the registered manager was great and listened to and acted on what people wanted. An example of this was the setting up of this service. One young person said, “This is great I can be like other people now and have a sleep over, [registered manger] did that.”

The service was managed in an open manner where the opinions of the people and staff were sought and where possible put in place. People, their relatives and staff told us this created a positive culture in the home and allowed people and staff to freely give their opinions thus allowing them to be part of how the home was run and managed.

All the people we spoke with said that people and their families were at the core of the service and they said the manager worked closely with everyone to ensure they were providing a service that was inclusive. One relative said, “They know [relative] almost as well as I do.”

All the young people and relatives we spoke with said the registered manager was easy to talk with and acted in the best interests of the people who used the service. They were proactive in developing the service. The registered manager told us that their vision was for young people and children with complex needs would have the same opportunities as those without. Setting up Fairview House was a start down that road. The young people using the service agreed it was a ‘brilliant service’.

The registered manager had variety of ways of capturing people’s views. They spent time with relatives outside the service and used this time to capture their views on how the provider was meeting the young people’s needs. Relatives we spoke with confirmed this. We saw other ways of gaining information were by using forums and questionnaires.

One staff member said, “The managers are here for the children and the families.” All the people we spoke with said the managers put the welfare and development of young people at the centre of all the service did. A staff member said that they had any ideas they have were considered. For example, they wanted to start basic cooking skills in the new year. The registered manager was looking at how this could be achieved to increase peoples’ skill and promote independence and how it could be

incorporated into the respite service. Another staff member said, “It’s great working here.” Staff we spoke with told us that they were very proud of the improvements that had been made in the young people’s lives.

Staff felt the registered manager and deputy manager were easy to talk to and they were confident in raising any issues or concerns they had. One staff member said, “I can speak with any of the senior staff about anything. They are very supportive”. Another staff member told us the manager was, “Approachable and responds and listens to what we need”. We were told, “We all work together for the young people.” Another staff member said, “Teamwork is important.” Another member of staff told us that the registered manager was, “A wonderful manager” who has a good rapport with staff.”

There were regular staff meetings where staff were encouraged to share their views and opinions to help improve the quality of service provided. Staff were involved in developing the service by way of these meetings and opportunities to give feedback at supervision meetings. We saw from minutes of the meetings that staff had contributed to discussions at a staff meeting. This was about training provision that works well at the home and what not so well. Staff told us that the culture at the home was very open and person-centred. This meant that the care of people was central to how the home was managed.

Staff told us and records showed they had regular supervision and they had monthly staff meetings. These were partly used to identify any gaps in individual and group training. There were staff training and development plans in place. This meant that staffs’ training needs were identified and planned for.

We saw a range of quality audits had been completed. Where actions had arisen from these audits we saw that these were monitored until the registered manager was sure solutions were in place. For example, providing more training for staff if necessary so that the service delivered the best possible care.

The provider conducted an annual review and published a report. We saw it covered achievements during the year and plans for the year ahead. It was distributed to all stakeholders in the organisation to enable them to keep up to date on future plans and to understand the focus and achievements of the service.

## Is the service well-led?

The registered manager clearly understood their responsibilities in relation to their registration with us. The provider ensured notifications were submitted to us about any incident or event they were required by law to tell us about.