

Jaffray Care Society

Tudor Gardens

Inspection report

27-29 Tudor Gardens
Erdington
Birmingham
West Midlands
B23 6FD

Tel: 01213863073
Website: www.jaffraycare.com

Date of inspection visit:
26 September 2018

Date of publication:
05 November 2018

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 was unannounced and took place on 26 September 2018.

Tudor Gardens provides accommodation and personal care for up to 15 people who require specialist support relating to their learning and physical disabilities. The home consists of three bungalows, each purpose built to accommodate five people. At the time of our inspection, there were 15 people living at Tudor Gardens. At the last inspection on 08 March 2016, the service was rated as Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

A registered manager was in place. A 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.

Staff understood how to protect people from abuse and received regular training around how to keep people safe. Staff had been recruited following appropriate checks.

People received their medicines as prescribed to support their healthcare needs and there were enough staff to support them. People were supported to access other healthcare professionals when required and to maintain a healthy diet which reflected their choices and preferences.

Staff said on-going training was in place to ensure they had the skills to meet the needs of the people they supported. People's choices were listened to and staff understood they could only care for and support people who consented to their care.

People had positive relationships with staff, who they were comfortable around and we saw staff treated people with dignity and respect. Staff spoke warmly of the people they cared for and said they enjoyed their role.

Staff respected people's individuality and diversity and care files contained information about people's personal histories and people's preferences, so staff could consider people's individual needs when delivering their care.

The staff and the management team were approachable and people and relatives told us if they had any concerns they would be listened to and dealt with appropriately.

People told us they enjoyed living in the scheme and relatives spoke positively about the management team.

The provider ensured regular checks were completed to monitor the quality of the care that people

received. Areas identified for improvement were acted on.

Staff were supported by management team to provide a good service. The registered manager had a clear vision for the further development of the service and worked with other agencies to support the well-being of the people living at scheme.

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 remained Good.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remained Good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remained Good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remained Good.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remained Good.

Tudor Gardens

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 26 September 2018 and was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of two inspectors.

As part of the inspection we reviewed information we held about the service including statutory notifications that had been submitted. Statutory notifications include information about important events which the provider is required to send us by law. The provider had also submitted to us a Provider Information Return (PIR). A PIR is a form that asks the provider to give key information about the home, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We also contacted local authorities who provide funding for people to ask them for information about the service. We used this information to plan the inspection.

During our inspection we spoke to two people who lived at the home and used different methods to gather experiences of what it was like to live at the home. We also spoke with three relatives of people living at the home by telephone during the inspection.

We spoke with the chief executive officer for Jaffray care, the registered manager, three deputy managers, two care support workers and one driver on the day of the inspection. We looked at the care records for four people to see how their care was planned. We also looked at two staff recruitment files, medication records for two people and audit records.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At the last inspection on 08 March 2016, we rated this key question as 'Good.' At this inspection the rating remains unchanged.

We saw people looked comfortable around staff. Relatives we spoke with told us they felt people were safe with the support of staff. One relative told us, "It's a great relief to me to know [person's name] is in such good hands."

Staff we spoke with confirmed that they had received training in safeguarding people and demonstrated a good understanding of the types of abuse people could be at risk from. Staff told us they were confident to report any concerns with people's safety or welfare to the registered manager or with external agencies. Staff said they were confident that action would be taken. Staff also told us the provider had a whistleblowing policy which could be used.

Staff were knowledgeable about the help and assistance each person needed to support their safety. People's risks were recorded in their care plans and staff said the assessments gave them the correct level of information to provide care and support and they were aware of any changes to people's care needs.

People were supported by sufficient staff and during the inspection we observed that staff were available to support people promptly. All staff we spoke with were assured that people were safe and they felt there was enough staff to support people living in the home. One member of staff commented, "There is enough staff to support people well and give them individual time." They told us when staff were off work the staff team all supported one another and their shifts were covered by other staff to ensure consistency of care which was important to the people living at the home. One member of staff said, "We are a small team but it's a good team and we all support each other."

We looked at two staff records and saw employment checks completed by the provider ensured staff were suitable to deliver care and support before they started work. The provider had made reference checks with previous employers and with the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). The DBS is a national service that keeps records of criminal convictions. Completing these checks reduces the risk of unsuitable staff being recruited.

People were supported by staff to take their medicines. Staff told us they had received training in supporting people to take their medicines and this was monitored and checked. Checks were completed by the management team to ensure records were completed to show when people had taken their medicines. An external pharmacy audit had also been completed.

We saw people were supported by staff to keep their home clean and tidy. Staff told us they had had access to cleaning products and protective equipment, for example, gloves and aprons, to reduce the risk of cross infection when providing personal care and support. Tudor Gardens was awarded a Food Hygiene Rating of 5 (Very Good) by Birmingham City Council on 01 March 2017.

The registered manager had records in place to monitor any accidents and incidents. We saw information collated looked for any trends and learning so that action could be taken to minimise the risk of any further occurrences.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At the last inspection on 08 March 2016, we rated this key question as 'Good.' At this inspection the rating remains unchanged.

Relatives we spoke with told us they felt staff had the right skills to support people. One relative commented, "Staff know how to look after [person's name]." Staff told us they continued to receive the right training to support people living at the home.

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). The 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 had completed MCA training and were aware of their responsibilities to ensure people's consent was sought before providing care and support. During the inspection we saw staff asking people's consent to provide care and when one person refused support this was respected by the member of staff. Where people were not able to give their verbal consent, staff gave examples of how they looked for facial expressions or hand gestures to indicate the persons consent.

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. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA. We saw that where the registered manager assessed that a person was being deprived of their liberty the appropriate application had been made.

People were supported by staff to eat and drink enough to keep them well. People enjoyed a choice of foods and this was confirmed by one relative we spoke with who said, " [Person's name] tries different foods and eats a varied diet." Staff were aware of special dietary requirements for some people, for example, people who through a health condition were at the risk of choking. We saw that referrals had been made to SALT (Speech and Language Team) and advice followed. Staff were also able to tell us how they supported people to enjoy meals reflecting their cultural heritage and we saw one person had a pictorial menu to enable them to make independent meal choices.

People and their relatives had been involved in the assessment of their care and support needs to ensure care was delivered in line with their preferences and care plans we looked at showed people's needs and choices were assessed. Staff were given information about people's illnesses and the effects that people may experience. For example, guidance on the effects of a brain injury.

We saw that people were supported to access healthcare professionals and one person told us, "I get to see the doctor and dentist." We saw from people's care plans that people had regular appointments with their GP, dentist and hospital consultants.

The home had been developed and designed in line with the values that underpin the Registering the Right Support and other best practice guidance. These values include choice, promotion of independence and inclusion. People with learning disabilities and autism using the service can live as ordinary a life as any citizen. We saw people's rooms were individually decorated and reflected people individual interests. When we asked one person if they liked their room we received a big smile and a thumb's up.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At the last inspection on 08 March 2016, we rated this key question as 'Good.' At this inspection the rating remains unchanged.

We saw people were comfortable around the staff and one person told us they liked the staff that supported them. They smile when they told us, "My staff are good." Relatives also said they felt their family members were respected by the staff and they said staff treated them with dignity. One relative commented, "Staff are so good, they are very compassionate and kind."

Relatives told us people living at the home had developed good relationships with staff that supported them. One relative told us they enjoyed seeing their family member with staff because it was clear they were happy. They commented, "They are like family to [person's name]." During our inspection we saw staff approached people in a friendly manner and we heard staff chatting with people, offering people support and reassurance where necessary. For example, when one person was anxious we saw one member of staff stand with them and gently touch their arm. We saw this helped relax the person and they became more settled.

People were able to make choices about their care. One person told us they had choices about how they spent their day. They told us, "I can stay in bed if I want to." Relatives also confirmed people were involved in making choices about their care. One relative said their family member was supported as, "They [staff] talk to [person's name] in a way they understand."

Where they were able, people were encouraged to be involved in planning their meals and day-to-day tasks so they could maintain their independence. During the inspection we also saw staff gently encourage some people in day-to-day tasks, for example, people had been involved internet shopping for grocery items and then putting grocery items away when they were delivered. One relative told us, "They [staff] encourage [person's name], they are involved in more things."

People's relatives told us they were able to visit when they chose, and they felt welcomed by staff. One relative commented staff were, "Very helpful, very welcoming, very friendly." A second relative also said, "Staff always do parties for birthdays." They confirmed they were invited to all celebrations and said, "Staff very much include me in what [person's name] does."

All staff we spoke with spoke warmly about the people they supported and provided care for and said they enjoyed working at the home. One member of staff said, "I enjoy working here. I like to see them [people] happy. I joke with them and they lift my mood. Every day is different, they are all such individual characters, it's great."

We saw staff were discreet when discussing people's personal care needs. Staff and the registered manager were aware of the need to maintain confidentiality and store information securely.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At the last inspection on 08 March 2016, we rated this key question as 'Good.' At this inspection the rating remains unchanged.

Relatives we spoke with told us staff involved people in their care and cared for them in the way they wanted. One relative commented, "You can tell they know [person's name] well. They have taken the time to get to know them. It is very reassuring that they look after [person's name] so well." Staff said as a small service they felt able to get to know people and they were able to describe people's preferences and how they liked to be supported.

Staff told us they gave individual care ensuring they worked at the pace of the person whilst giving encouragement. We saw examples of this throughout the inspection. One member of staff said, "It's all about your approach. Taking time and encouraging people....for example, saying would you like a bath so you'll feel nice and clean?"

Staff were able to tell us about the level of support people required, for example, where one person required regular blood tests for their specific dietary needs. Staff told us a strength of the service was the individualised care provided. One member of staff said, "We cater for the individual."

We saw people were supported to enjoy activities in support of their wellbeing and in reflection of their interests. One relative said, "They [staff] do so much with them, they go on holiday, go to the pub, meals and cinema, so [person's name] is very happy." They added, "Staff are geared up for their needs." We saw that the provider had also made links with the community in supporting people. For example, we saw that the home was part of a tenant's association and people living at Tudor Gardens attended community parties and events. One relative commented this was a particular strength of the service. They said, "I like the fact it is part of a community."

Staff told us people's care plans were kept up to date and gave the right level of information to support people. We looked at four people's care records which showed they had been updated when a change had been required. The registered manager told us that to develop the care plans further, the provider was planning to trial a new person-centred software where staff talk into a computer tablet to enable them to update care plans and risk assessments more easily.

Staff respected people's individuality and diversity. Care files contained information about people's personal histories and people's preferences, so staff could consider people's individual needs when delivering their care. One member of staff told us of the support provided to one person reflecting their cultural heritage.

Relatives told us although they had no reason to complain, they felt able to complain or raise issues should the situation arise. One person told us if they had problems they would tell the staff. They said, "I would tell [Deputy manager's name]." Relatives also confirmed they would speak to staff. One relative commented, "If

there is anything troubling me I will speak to staff."

Staff told us they had not had reason to raise any concerns but felt they could approach the registered manager with any concerns if they needed to. We saw that complaints received had been recoded, investigated and responded to.

We looked at information made available by the provider to see if it was accessible to the people lived at the home. We saw information in a suitable format was available throughout the scheme, for example, guidance information was available in the communal kitchen. We also saw pictorial information on how to complain was clearly displayed in each bungalow along with pictorial information on activities.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At the last inspection on 08 March 2016, we rated this key question as 'Good.' At this inspection the rating remains unchanged.

People we spoke with told us they were happy living at Tudor Gardens. One person said, "I like it here." All relatives we spoke with also told us they were happy with the overall care and considered the service to be well managed. One relative said, "I'd like to think [person's name] will always be there [at the home]."

A registered manager was in place. 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.

Staff told us they felt supported by the registered manager, who they said led by example. We saw the registered manager worked alongside staff providing care, they told us this enabled them to see the care provided first hand to ensure it was of the required standard. Staff told us they felt supported in their role, understood their responsibilities and had regular supervisions. Staff told us they felt able to access advice and guidance on people's care whenever they needed because the registered manager was always available to them. One member of staff said, "You can always ask questions or for advice. The manager has a great approach."

People and staff were able to provide feedback on the way the service was managed. Pictorial questionnaires were used to enable people to give feedback about different aspects of the service. The providers PIR advised information from the forms was displayed in a 'You said; we did' format, to give people information on the actions being taken. During the inspection we saw this was clearly displayed in each bungalow.

The provider ensured regular checks were completed to monitor the quality of care that people received and looked at where improvements could be made. Where areas requiring improvement were found we saw that action had been taken. For example, areas for improvement in medication storage had been identified we saw that action had been taken. We also saw that an external agency was used to complete a comprehensive audit of the home. Where actions had been identified an action plan had been put in place to ensure timely action was taken.

The registered manager said they felt supported by the provider and they constantly looked for ways to improve learning and keep up to date with current legislation. They told us they accessed information and updates from the CQC and NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) websites commenting, "Google is my best friend". The registered manager also told us they were booked on training courses in December 2018 to further develop their learning.

We saw that the registered manager had been awarded the 'Registered Managers Award' at The National

Learning Disability and Autism Awards in June 2018. The awards are to celebrate excellence in the support for people with learning disabilities. The registered manager told us they felt the award was in recognition of work by the entire staff team and it had made them feel valued. We saw reference to the award on the providers website, in which the judges of the award stated, "The manager's passion for the services and the teams she manages really shines through and she is a real credit to Jaffray Care."

Records we saw showed the management team worked with other agencies to support the well-being of the people living at scheme. For example, we saw referrals to GP's, opticians and community health teams.