

Stroud Care Services Limited

Fieldview

Inspection report

Pearcroft Road
Stonehouse
Gloucester
Gloucestershire
GL10 2JY

Tel: 01453791320

Website: www.stroudcareservices.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
12 January 2017
13 January 2017

Date of publication:
24 February 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement 

Is the service safe?

Good 

Is the service effective?

Good 

Is the service caring?

Good 

Is the service responsive?

Requires Improvement 

Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement 

Summary of findings

Overall summary

This inspection took place on 12 and 13 January 2017 and was unannounced. Fieldview is a service based over two individual buildings called Fieldview and Westend. Fieldview and Westend provide support for people living with mental health conditions. Fieldview provides residential care for seven people. Six people were living at Fieldview at the time of our inspection all of who required assistance with their personal care. People living at Westend received support and care to meet their needs. Five of the seven people living at Westend were receiving support with personal care from project workers. The service is located near the centre of Stonehouse, close to a range of local amenities.

There was not a registered manager in place for Fieldview. The last registered manager left the service after our inspection in August 2016. However a manager, (who was registered manager of another of the provider's services) was in place and was in the process of registering with the Care Quality Commission. 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.

We last inspected the service on the 16, 18 and 19 August 2016. At this inspection we found the provider was not always acting in accordance with the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the associated code of practice. The service had not always recorded where people could or couldn't consent to their care. We issued the provider and the former registered manager with a warning notice compelling them to take action by 30 September 2016. Additionally, the provider did not always ensure people's care records were complete or current. There were not always effective systems in place to assess, monitor and improve the quality and safety of the service provided. We issued the provider and the former registered manager with a warning notice compelling them to take action by 30 November 2016. Finally, we found the provider did not always ensure project workers were of good character before they started working at the service. At our inspection in January 2017 we found that appropriate action had been taken by the provider and registered manager to meet the relevant regulations. Whilst the service was meeting the regulations, it was not always possible to sufficiently evidence the consistency and positive impact these improvements had had on people living at Fieldview or Westend. However, it was clear that the negative impact on people had been minimised.

People's legal rights were protected and they received treatment and support that they had consented to or was in their best interests. People's capacity to consent to aspects of their care and treatment were being recorded, however these were not always accurately recorded. The manager was taking immediate action to address this, however it had no impact on people. Where people were being deprived of their liberty, the manager and provider was making appropriate applications.

The provider and registered manager had implemented new systems to assess, identify and improve the quality of service people received. These systems were new and therefore it was difficult to ascertain the

impact they had on driving the quality of the service. However the manager and project workers had carried out some audits and improvements which had a positive impact on the service people received.

The provider and manager ensured that new staff were of good character before they worked with people. People's care records were detailed and often reflected people's needs. There were some records which had not been updated, however this had limited impact and risk on people.

People in Fieldview benefitted from positive engagement with project workers. People were supported to access the local community independently, and some people enjoyed doing tasks around the service. People in Westend enjoyed their time with project workers and enjoyed accessing the community independently.

People felt safe living in Fieldview and Westend. People spoke positively about staff and had access to plenty of food and drink. Project workers knew people, their needs, likes and dislikes.

Project workers had access to supervisions and appraisals. Project workers were supported and had access to training and professional development. There were enough project workers with appropriate skills, deployed to meet the needs of people living at both Fieldview and Westend.

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. People felt safe and project workers had a good understanding of safeguarding. Staff ensured people were protected from the risks associated with their care.

There were enough staff to safely meet people's needs. The manager and provider ensured project workers were of good character before they started working in Fieldview and Westend.

People received their medicines as prescribed. People's medicines were managed and stored safely.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective. The service were ensuring people's legal rights were respected.

Project workers received regular supervision or appraisals. Project workers felt supported by the registered manager and had access to the training they needed.

People were supported with their on-going healthcare needs. People were supported with their dietary and nutritional needs. People's specific needs were met because project workers ensured they received appropriate support.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring. People were supported to spend their days as they choose. Project workers respected people.

Project workers knew what people liked and disliked and spoke about people in a kind and a caring manner.

Is the service responsive?

Requires Improvement ●

The service was not always responsive. People's care and support plans had been reviewed; however there was still some area for improvement to ensure people were protected from the risk of unsafe care or treatment.

People were supported to access the community independently,

however people to not always benefit from positive engagement with project workers in Fieldview.

People's comments and concerns were listened to and acted upon by the home's management.

Is the service well-led?

The service was starting to be well-led. The manager and provider had implemented a new quality assurance system however they had not been in place long enough to drive improvements within the service.

The views of people and their relatives were sought and acted upon.

Project workers were given additional responsibilities and spoke positively about the manager and the encouragement they received to make changes.

Requires Improvement 

Fieldview

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 was 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 12 and 13 January 2017 and it was unannounced. The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

We reviewed the information we held about the service. This included notifications about important events which the service is required to send us by law.

We spoke with three people who were living in Fieldview and three people who were receiving personal care and support in Westend. We used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). SOFI is a specific way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us. We spoke with five project workers, the training manager and the manager. We reviewed the care files of five people living at Fieldview and three people living at Westend. We looked at project worker's recruitment and training records and records relating to the general management of the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our last inspection in August 2016 we found that the provider and registered manager did not always ensure project workers were of good character before they started working with people in both Fieldview and Westend. This was a breach of regulation 19 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Additionally, people's risk assessments had not always been updated and did not provide clear and current guidance for the project workers to follow to protect people from the risks associated with their care. This was a breach of regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. We issued the provider and former registered manager with a requirement notice and a warning notice regarding the relevant breaches. At this inspection we found some appropriate action had been taken to address these concerns.

Records relating to the recruitment of new project workers showed relevant checks had been completed before they worked unsupervised at the service. These included employment references and disclosure and barring checks (criminal record checks) to ensure staff were of good character. Since our last inspection the provider and manager had implemented a recruitment checklist. This checklist was used by the manager to ensure all relevant checks and references had been sought for project workers before they commenced employment. Manager's signed to say they were happy for the project worker to start work.

People had been assessed where project workers had identified individual risks in relation to their health and wellbeing. These included moving and handling, agitation, nutrition & hydration and activities. Risk assessments gave project workers clear guidance which enabled them to help people to stay safe such as risks assessments around people's behaviours and the day to day support they required. Risk assessments had been reviewed and updated since our last inspection, and provided project workers clear information on managing the risks associated with people's care.

People were supported to take positive risks and develop their independence. Risk assessments provided clear guidance on how people needed to be supported and the assistance they required to access the community. For example, one project worker told us how they had supported one person to access the community and manage their anxieties within the community. They explained how they observed the person and knew how to reassure them which reduced the risk of the person becoming anxious in the community and said, "We observe people and it's important to diffuse behaviours, before people become aggressive. We're doing more work regarding being proactive, rather than reactive to concerns."

Project workers were working proactively to reduce the risk of people exhibiting behaviours which may challenge. Project workers spent time observing people and identifying triggers which may cause them to become agitated. They spoke positively of this change and felt that the amount of preventable incidents had reduced. One project worker told us, "I think there have been positive improvements here. The first is that we're reading people's body language. We're positively assisting people to stop situations from escalating." We observed project workers assisting people with one to one engagement, or trips into the community to deescalate any potential behaviours. For example, two people were becoming agitated by another person living at Fieldview. A project worker assisted the person out into the community, which helped alleviate any

tension within the home.

People's medicines were securely stored in line with current and relevant regulations and guidance. People's medicine records accurately reflected the medicine in stock for each person. Medicine stocks were checked daily by project workers. Project workers spoke positively about changes they had made to the administration of people's medicine Fieldview. For example, the home's medicine room had been moved upstairs. One project worker told us, "We don't get disturbed upstairs when dealing with people's medicines, which means there is less risk of us making an error." A project worker recently employed to work at Fieldview had used their previous work experience to make changes to how people's medicine stocks were being managed. They had implemented new systems to help reduce the risk of medicine administration errors, including ensuring boxes were dated when opened and unopened boxes were sealed.

Project workers had identified that the temperature of the room where people's medicines were stored was not always kept in a temperature in accordance with the manufacturer's guidelines. Project workers had recorded this concern prior to our inspection and informed the manager and provider. The provider was looking at a solution to ensure the temperature of the room was in accordance with manufacturer's guidelines.

Where people received as required medicines such as 'pain relief' or homely remedies (medicines which were not prescribed and were available over the counter, such as hay fever medicines) there was a clear record of the support they needed or received.

People told us they felt safe and comfortable living in both Fieldview and Westend. Comments included: "I feel safe here"; "I'm alright here, its safe here"; "Very much feel safe here" and "It's my home, of course I feel safe here".

People were protected from the risk of abuse. Project workers had knowledge of types of abuse, signs of possible abuse which included neglect, and their responsibility to report any concerns promptly. Project workers told us they would document concerns and report them to the manager, or the provider. One project worker said, "I would raise the concern with the manager. If someone was at immediate harm, I would remove them from that situation." Another project worker added that, if they were unhappy with the manager's or provider's response they would speak to local authority safeguarding. They said, "If I thought action hadn't been taken I would phone safeguarding myself." Project workers told us they had received safeguarding training and were aware of reporting safeguarding concerns.

Project workers promoted people's individual safety. For example, one senior project worker working at Westend, had supported people to deal with visitors to their home. They told people they should always ensure people had relevant identification, including new project workers to the home. They told us, "This is their home. They don't let anyone in they don't know. It's helped people with their safety." One person told us, "It's given me confidence to question people at the door. I feel safe in my home." The manager told us, "I've been told off for not coming down with my ID on. It is raising people's awareness."

People told us there were enough staff to meet their needs at both Fieldview and Westend. People confirmed there were always project workers around if they needed support. One person said, "There is always someone around when I need them." Another person told us, "I get the support I need, when I need it."

People living in Westend told us they received their care and support when they needed it. Comments included: "They are always here for me" and "We definitely have the support we need."

Project workers occasionally worked in Fieldview, Westend and another home owned by the provider. Project workers spoke positively about the staffing arrangements within the service. Comments included: "It would always be nice to have an extra member of staff to give people all the one to one support they desire. However we have a great team and we meet people's needs"; "We have enough staff to meet people's needs and provide the stimulation they need" and "Staffing is a lot better now. We definitely have enough staff with the right skills." The manager told us they had carried out recruitment at both Fieldview and Westend to ensure there were enough dedicated and skilled staff to meet people's needs. The manager had identified the number of staff they needed each day to ensure people's needs were met. Staff rota's showed us this level of staff was achieved.

The atmosphere in both Fieldview and Westend was pleasant and calm on both days of our inspection. Project workers spent time assisting people with day to day tasks and ensure people had the one to one time they needed. Project workers took time to assist people with their requests and were aware of when people were becoming anxious.

People were protected from financial abuse as their money was kept securely and a record of their finances was maintained by project workers. Some people required support with the handling of their money which included the safe keeping and the management of their daily expenses, including an accurate record of their expenses and income. Project workers ensured people's financial records were checked to ensure their expenses were recorded correctly and that no financial abuse had occurred.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

We last inspected the service on the 16, 18 and 19 August 2016. At this inspection we found the provider was not always acting in accordance with the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and the associated code of practice. The service had not always recorded where people could or couldn't consent to their care. Additionally where people were being deprived of their liberty, the service did not always ensure their legal rights were protected. We issued the provider and former registered manager with a warning notice in relation to regulation 11 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. At this inspection we found measures were now in place to ensure people's legal rights were protected.

People's rights to make a decision were protected, as staff acted within the legal framework of MCA. For example, there were clear mental capacity assessments relating to one person regarding the management of their finances. Project workers clearly understood the support the person required to support them with their access to money. The person told us, "I have my own money, the staff help me, they give me information." Another person had a clear mental capacity assessment in place regarding their health care as they were at risk of self-neglect. A best interest assessment had been carried out which documented the support the person required. Project workers were aware of the support the person required in managing their risk of possible self-neglect.

The manager had knowledge of the Deprivation of liberty safeguards (DoLS) and since our last inspection the service had submitted applications for people where they were being deprived of their liberty. 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. For example, one person was being deprived of their liberty under DoLS. They needed support from a project worker to access the community including going to the town centre and going on car journeys with staff. As part of their DoLS being authorised there were clear conditions the service needed to meet to ensure the support the person received was provided in the least restrictive way.

The manager had assured themselves that all appropriate applications had been made and that people's legal rights were now being protected. Where appropriate, project workers supported people to understand why they were being deprived of their liberty. For example one project worker told us how they had communicated this to one person. They said, "I explained to them what DoLS is and why they have it. He understands the reasons."

Project workers had undertaken training on the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005. 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 showed a good understanding of this legislation and were able to cite specific points about it. Comments

included: "I wouldn't stop them having a choice. They are at the centre of their support"; "They [people] have to be in control of their care. We have to assist people, not do things for them or to them. It's important they we promote their needs" and "We help people to make decisions. For example, one person can access their own money, we can't stop them. However we discuss it with them, help them to make an informed decision." One person told us, "I feel I am in control and have the information I need."

People were positive about project workers and felt they were skilled to meet their needs. Comments included: "The staff are great. They keep me up to date on things"; "The staff are very supportive. You can go to them and they know what to do" and "They are very supportive to me, I couldn't wish for better."

People were supported by project workers who had access to supervision (one to one meeting) or appraisals with their line manager. Project workers told us supervisions were carried out frequently and were useful and the received the support they required. Comments included: "I definitely get the support I require. I have monthly supervisions. I feel that's good, I get feedback and I feel listened to" and "The manager is very supportive. I have supervision and support. I feel I have their full backing."

People's needs were met by project workers who had access to the training they needed. Project workers told us about the training they received. Comments included: "I have the training I need to meet people's needs. I can also request training, which I did regarding dementia training. I got this training"; "I was given plenty of support and training. I have the skills I need" and "I have the shadowing and support I require to meet people's needs." Project workers had completed training which included safeguarding, fire safety and moving & handling. The training manager for the provider had a clear record of the training project workers had received or required. The training manager was completing 'train the trainer' courses in relation to safeguarding and positive behaviour support to ensure all project workers received the training and support they required effectively.

Project workers told us they were supported by the manager and provider to develop professionally. All project workers spoke positively about how they had been encouraged to develop and given responsibilities within the service. One project worker told us, "I want progress [professional development] and I've discussed that with the manager. They are looking into the support they can provide me. They are supporting me to maintain my first aid training"

People spoke positively about the food and drink they received at Fieldview and Westend. Comments included: "The food is good. The quality and choice is great" and "We really have good meals. We never go without and food is always available." In Fieldview, there was a menu which provided people with clear choice. One project worker had been given responsibility to manage the meals within the service ensuring people had access to choice and a variety of meals. People were being supported to plan and prepare their own menus. For example, one project worker was giving one person one to one support around planning their weekly menu, they discussed what meals the person liked, and discussed healthy options and alternatives where appropriate. The person appreciated the conversation, they told us, "It helps."

People's dietary needs and preferences were documented and known by project workers. Project workers knew what food people liked and which foods people needed to meet their nutritional needs. For example, project workers recorded the daily food intake of one person who was at high risk of self-neglect. Project workers told us how they supported and prompted this person with their dietary needs.

People were supported to maintain good health through access to a range of health professionals. These professionals were involved in assessing, planning, implementing and evaluating people's care and treatment. These included GPs, psychiatrists and dentists. Where guidance had been sought from

healthcare professionals this was clearly recorded on people's care records.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People had positive views on the caring nature of the service they received in both Fieldview and Westend. Comments included: "The staff are alright"; "They're very kind and caring" and "I'm really happy here. The staff are very caring and considerate."

People enjoyed positive relationships with project workers and the manager. The atmosphere was calm in Fieldview. We observed people and project workers in both Fieldview and Westend enjoying talking with each other. For example, two people enjoyed a lively conversation with two project workers regarding their holidays and future holiday destinations they would like to visit. People enjoyed talking and treated each other as equals.

Project workers engaged with people in both Fieldview and Westend in a respectful manner. We observed warm and friendly interactions. People were informed about the purpose of our visit by project workers who asked them if they would like to talk to us. The project worker supported and encouraged people to speak to the inspector to make their views on the care they received known.

Project workers encouraged people to spend their days as they wished, promoting choices and respecting people's wishes. For example, one person wanted to go out into the community, which staff encouraged. Another person was supported to shop for a mobile phone and accessories on the home's computer. The project worker talked about online shopping with the person and how important it was to them.

There was a calm, pleasant and homely atmosphere in both Fieldview and Westend during our inspection. Project workers were not rushed and had time to assist people in a calm and dignified way. They had time to spend talking and engaging with people throughout the day. For example, three people enjoyed an engaging conversation about meals, holidays and daily events.

People were cared for by project workers who were attentive to their needs and wishes. For example, project workers knew what was important to people and supported them with their day to day needs and goals. Project workers spoke positively about managing people's needs. Project workers had been given time to observe people and identify triggers which may lead to behaviours which challenge. One project worker told us, "The care is focused on them. We need to support them to be as independent as possible. Understand their goals."

Project workers were supported to spend time with people and they spoke positively about this. Project workers working at both Fieldview and Westend spoke clearly about developing strong caring relationships with people to help promote their independence and well-being. Comments included: "We try and ensure people get outside most days. We take people with us to help go to recycling centres, going to other services. We try and incorporate them into these tasks. It gives them a change of pace and scenery. That really helps people."

People were treated with dignity and respect. We observed project workers assisting people throughout our

inspection of Fieldview and Westend. Project workers respected people's personal rooms, knocking on their doors and asking if they could come in. Where they supported people with their personal care they told us they ensured people's dignity was respected and that people were kept comfortable. One person said, "They're very kind, I feel I'm respected."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At our last inspection in August 2016 we found that people's care and support assessments had not always been updated and did not always provide clear and current guidance for project workers to meet people's needs. This was a breach of regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. We issued the provider and former registered manager with a warning notice regarding the relevant breaches. At this inspection we found some appropriate action had been taken to meet the relevant regulation, there were some records which had not yet been updated or reviewed. The impact and risk to people was however minimal, as project workers had the knowledge of people and their needs.

People's care plans and risk assessments had been updated and reviewed since our last inspection and now reflected their current needs. These assessments documented the support people required with their personal needs, such as mental health needs, personal hygiene and medicines. Project workers spoke positively about people's care and support plans. One project worker told us, "They are detailed and provide us with the information we need. Our job is to ensure they are updated."

People's care plans reflected their care and support needs. For example, one person required the support of project workers to access the community. Clear guidance was in place regarding the support this person needed, including how to assist them with their anxieties. The person's care records had been updated to document the change or support they required and the benefits and risks of this support in promoting the person's independence to access the community.

Where people's needs had changed, care and support documents were updated to ensure project workers had the information they required to meet the person's needs. For example, there was clear guidance on how the person's needs had changed and the day to day support and encouragement they required to meet their needs. The person's support plans showed project workers had encouraged them to become more active in the home and were helping them access the community with support.

The manager had recently implemented a new key worker system within Fieldview. This system allocated a project worker to a person. The key workers responsibility was to carry out a monthly review meeting with the person and support them with their individual goals and objectives. Records of recent key worker meetings showed the discussions project workers. For example, one person discussed the support they required around accessing the community and managing their dietary needs. Key worker meetings were not always being continually carried out or recorded for all people, for example, one person's care plan did not contain a record of key worker meetings.

Whilst people's care plans had been reviewed, there was still some information which required reviewing and could provide conflicting information to project workers. For example, there was a clear protocol in place for one person to access the community independently, however the project workers and the manager informed us this person was no longer able to access the community independently and required full support and supervision. All project workers were aware of the risks to the person's wellbeing if they left the service unsupervised. The person however could be placed at risk if a new member of staff, or an agency

staff worker followed this protocol. We discussed this with the manager, who removed the document immediately.

Whilst project workers supported people to make decisions about their care people's mental capacity assessments were not always clear. The previous registered manager had carried out two mental capacity assessment for one person which had not been reviewed since they were written in September, however, these documents were due to be reviewed. The assessments did not accurately reflect the support and needs of the person. We discussed this with the manager who was planning to review the assessments immediately. These assessments had not had an impact on the support the person received.

People were supported to access the community and live as independently as possible with the support of project workers. On both of the days we inspected, some people from Fieldview and Westend enjoyed accessing the local town independently or with the support from project workers and also enjoyed their time spent with other people. One person spoke positively about living near Stonehouse and enjoyed buying their own lunch and accessing local services. Project workers told us how they used people's likes and dislikes to help them plan and attended activities. For example, one project worker told us how they were supporting one person to access the local community with support. They told us how they involved the person on car journeys and how the change of environment was beneficial to the person. People who lived at Westend, accessed clubs and activities independently.

People were engaged in a meaningful way by project workers. Project workers discussed improvements at Fieldview. All project workers felt that they worked as a team to meet people's needs and provide effective support and communication. We observed project workers clearly engaging people with conversations around holidays, their meals and purchasing equipment. Project workers were also responsive to people's needs. For example, where people requested support or pain relief, project workers provided this quickly. All project workers spoke positively and confidently about providing person centred care and felt this was a key area for further development within the service. As a team, they were observing people's behaviour to identify the best way to support them and provide a clear team approach. One project worker stated, "We're managing people's needs better because we're understanding them and we're meeting their wellbeing needs better."

In both Fieldview and Westend, people were encouraged to do jobs, like cleaning their room and were clearly involved in the process. One person was being supported with cleaning their room on the day of our inspection. They did this in private with the support of the project worker.

People knew the process if they wished to complain about the service. One person told us, "I'd speak to the staff or the manager if anything upset me." The provider had a complaints policy which was available for people to access. One person told us, "I know I can complain, I also speak with my advocate if I'm unhappy." Since our last inspection there had been no complaints made to the service.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

When we last inspected the service in August 2016 we found the provider and the former registered managers did not have effective systems to monitor the quality of the service. The views of people, their relatives and staff were not always acted upon. These concerns were a breach of regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Following our inspection we issued the provider and former registered manager with a warning notice asking them to meet the regulations by the end of November 2016.

Since our last inspection, the previous registered manager had left, and a new manager was in place, who was registering with the Care Quality Commission to become the registered manager. Whilst improvements had been made, a number of the systems the manager had implemented had only just started; this meant it was difficult to evidence the impact all these systems had at Fieldview and Westend. The service was meeting the regulations, however it was not possible to evidence how the improvements they had made would consistently drive improvements.

The manager had implemented an audit programme which covered both Fieldview and Westend. These audits focused on the regulations to assist the manager or provider to identify concerns which would inform an improvement plan for the homes. The manager informed us they had only recently started these audits; therefore there was limited evidence of how these audits had improved the quality of the service being provided. However the service carried out regular audits in relation to health and safety and the management of medicines. These audits had identified concerns with medicine administration and the recording of when people had received support with their prescribed medicines. Where actions have been identified these informed an action plan for the service. Where actions had been completed these were signed off as completed. For example, records showed that changes had been made to the storage of people's prescribed medicines.

Where health and safety audits identified shortfalls or area of work, these were clearly identified and acted upon. A representative of the provider carried out maintenance work at the property and was responsible for actions regarding maintenance tasks. This included actions around refuse storage within Fieldview.

People's views were sought at both Fieldview and Westend through regular tenancy meetings. These meetings discussed people's views regarding the service and any improvements or changes they wished to suggest. One person told us, "We're involved in things and I think they ask for our opinions."

Project workers were complimentary about the manager and provider. Comments included: "The service has improved a lot under the new manager. We get more support and day to day the service is a lot more organised"; "The manager has made some significant changes. It's different to when I started" and "The manager has made a lot of changes for the better. The support from the management has been fantastic."

Project workers were supported to take on responsibilities and involved in the development of the home. For example, project workers told us their ideas for improvements to the service were listened to and acted

upon by the manager. Project workers told us they had been encouraged to make improvements in relation to the storage of people's prescribed medicines and also changed the layout of communal areas in the home. One project worker told us, "The improvements have really helped, people are happier." Another project worker said, "I suggested a change of labelling cupboards with pictures of the contents. The manager agreed, this has had a positive change."