

# PLUS (Providence Linc United Services) Springbank Road

## Inspection report

152 Springbank Road  
Hither Green, London SE13 6SU  
Tel: 020 8697 3816  
Website: [www.plus-service.org](http://www.plus-service.org)

Date of inspection visit: 24 June 2015  
Date of publication: 06/08/2015

### Ratings

#### Overall rating for this service

Good 

Is the service safe?

Good 

Is the service effective?

Good 

Is the service caring?

Good 

Is the service responsive?

Good 

Is the service well-led?

Good 

### Overall summary

Springbank Road provides care, support and accommodation to up to four people with learning disabilities. We last inspected Springbank Road in January 2014. The service met all the regulations we checked at that time.

This unannounced inspection took place on 24 June 2015. Three people were using the service at this time.

Springbank Road has 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 and their relatives were happy with the service. They received their medicines safely as prescribed and their health needs were met. Staff worked with health professionals such as GPs and psychologists to make sure they fully understood people's needs. People received the treatment and healthcare they needed to keep as well as possible.

Staff assessed risks to people. They arranged support for people to keep them safe whilst ensuring they were able

# Summary of findings

to be as independent as possible. Staff understood how to protect people from abuse and upheld people's rights in accordance with the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

There were sufficient staff on duty to ensure people had the support to follow their individual interests. Staff were well-trained and knew people well. They understood how to communicate with each person. People and their relatives were fully involved in planning people's care and support.

The service was well-led and staff understood how to treat people with dignity and respect. The staff team worked effectively to ensure people had a positive experience of the service. Checks were made on the quality of the service and any necessary improvements were made.

# Summary of findings

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

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service safe?

The service was safe. People received their medicines safely as prescribed.

Staff assessed risks to people and followed plans to keep them safe. They knew how to protect people from abuse and neglect. There were enough staff on duty to keep people safe.

Good



### Is the service effective?

The service was effective. Staff received training and support which equipped them to understand people's needs. They assisted people to eat well and access appropriate healthcare.

People's rights were upheld in accordance with the Mental Capacity act 2005 and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Good



### Is the service caring?

The service was caring. Staff treated people with dignity and respect. Staff knew people well. They understood their preferences and communication needs.

People and their relatives were involved in planning people's support.

Good



### Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive. Staff identified people's needs and planned and delivered effective support. People were supported to be as independent as possible and follow interests of their choice.

Staff asked people and their relatives for their views on the support provided.

Good



### Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led. The registered manager supported the staff team and ensured they worked effectively and treated people appropriately.

The registered manager ensured the service continuously improved by making changes to address any issues of concern.

Good



# Springbank Road

## 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 24 June 2015 and was unannounced. The inspection was carried out by one inspector. Before the inspection, the provider completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the

service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We reviewed the PIR and other information we had received about the service whilst planning our inspection.

During the inspection we spoke with three people who use the service and three members of staff. We met with a senior manager and spoke to the registered manager on the telephone. We looked at the care records and medicine administration record (MAR) charts for three people. We reviewed information in relation to staff training and the operation of the service.

After the inspection we spoke to a person's relative. We reviewed information sent to us by the provider in relation to staff supervision and quality monitoring.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

A person's relative told us, "I feel certain [person's name] is safe at Springbank Road."

People received their medicines safely. Staff assessed people's needs in relation to the support they required to receive their medicines as prescribed. Staff completed medicines administration record (MAR) charts to show when people had received their medicines. For example, a person had been prescribed an antibiotic medicine for a limited period. Staff had completed the MAR chart to show the person had received it correctly. At the 'handover' between staff shifts, we saw staff checked whether people had received their medicines and confirmed MAR charts had been fully completed.

Records showed staff took action to clarify any questions they had about a person's medicines by contacting their GP or the specialist learning disabilities nurse. Some people were prescribed medicines to be taken 'as required'. Staff told us they understood how to support people to receive these medicines when they needed them. For example, they knew how people communicated when they were in pain and when to support them to take their 'as required' pain relief tablets. We saw that medicines were stored safely. Staff undertook a weekly check of the stocks of medicines to ensure people could always receive their prescribed medicines.

Risks to people were assessed and managed. For example, staff had assessed risks to people in relation to them

cooking and making hot drinks, travelling and when staff supported them to move around. Plans were in place which explained how staff supported people to keep them safe whilst promoting their independence. We observed that staff followed the guidelines which were in place when supporting people using kitchen equipment. A relative told us staff promoted people's opportunities and did not place any unnecessary restrictions on their freedom.

Staff told us they knew how to identify different types of abuse and neglect. They understood how to make safeguarding referrals to the local authority and how to 'whistle blow' if this was necessary to protect people from harm. We observed how staff carried out financial procedures to safeguard people from loss or theft of their money.

A relative told us there were always sufficient staff on duty to meet people's needs. We observed that people received one to one attention from staff when they needed it. For example, staff supported each person to separately go out of the service to activities of their choice in the community. Staff told us there was a core team of regular staff and a 'bank' of experienced staff who could assist if necessary to cover annual leave or sickness.

People were protected from the risk of fire. Records showed equipment such as smoke alarms and fire extinguishers were tested regularly. Staff had kept records of recent fire drills. These showed staff had ensured people knew how to evacuate the building in the event of a fire.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

Staff told us they attended training courses which equipped them with appropriate skills and knowledge. For example, they said they had recently received training on how to effectively support people whose behaviour may challenge the service.

Records showed staff had attended courses on understanding health conditions such as epilepsy, cerebral palsy and dementia. Staff had been trained in communication techniques with people with learning disabilities. During the inspection staff demonstrated skills in working with people with learning disabilities. For example, they used signs to communicate with people. Staff skills were regularly updated through courses for example, first aid, health and safety and fire safety.

Staff told us they had been trained on the key principles of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). Care records included assessments of people's mental capacity in relation to making specific decisions. Relatives and health professionals had been involved in making 'best interests' decisions when appropriate. DoLS applications had been made to the local authority to ensure that people's rights were upheld.

Staff said they received supervision and support which helped them to support people effectively. Supervision records showed the registered manager had assisted staff

members to effectively plan people's support. For example, the content of a supervision meeting included a discussion about how best to support a person in relation to their health needs.

People were supported to eat food which they enjoyed and met their nutritional needs. Each person was involved in planning what they ate and drank. For example, we saw a person make themselves a healthy breakfast and a drink of their choice. Staff had supported them to buy and store food items appropriately. A relative told us, "The meals are of good quality."

Staff supported people to maintain a healthy body weight. Records showed that, when appropriate, people's weight was checked regularly. Staff had involved the GP when there were any concerns about people's dietary needs. They had then put the advice from the GP into practice.

People were supported with their day to day health needs. Records showed staff had worked closely with people's GPs and other healthcare professionals to clarify and meet people's health needs. A person's GP had been contacted when they had developed a chesty cough and they had received appropriate treatment. Staff had involved psychologists in developing positive behaviour management guidance for staff when people's behaviour challenged the service.

A member of staff explained to us how they were alert to changes in people's mood and behaviour which could indicate that they were unwell. Staff told us how they ensured they communicated the outcome of people's health appointments with their colleagues and made sure people were supported to attend any follow up visits.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

A relative told us, “I have always observed the staff to be polite and respectful towards people.” During the inspection we saw staff spoke to people in a friendly and encouraging way when offering them support. For example, a member of staff said to a person who they were assisting to make a cup of tea, “Should I take the teabag out now?” Another member of staff explained to a person how they would be assisted to follow their chosen activities and interests. They made sure the person understood how and when they would be supported.

Staff had a good understanding of how to treat people respectfully and how to protect people’s privacy. For example, we observed that people were quietly offered support with day to day tasks and asked what assistance they would like from staff.

Care records showed that people were involved in developing their support plan and in deciding how staff should support them. For example, a person had been asked about the cooking skills they would like to develop and was involved in planning how they would learn new tasks. Photographs were used so the person could understand the progress they were making.

Records contained information about how people communicated. We observed that staff followed communication guidelines to ensure people were given the

opportunity to make choices about what they did. A member of staff told us, “Offering people choices is the centre of everything we do as we are trying to make people more independent.”

Staff knew people well. They were able to explain how they gave them support which took into account their individual needs and preferences. For example, a member of staff was able to tell us about a person’s background and history, their likes and dislikes and what support they required to keep healthy and to develop their skills. They were able to detail how they communicated with each person in the service taking into account their different strengths and needs.

People were supported to keep in touch with their friends and relatives. A relative told us how they were made to feel welcome at the service and felt the staff did everything they could to ensure people and their relatives had a positive experience of the service. They said that communication between them and the staff team was “excellent” and they felt all the staff, “were very committed to their work with people”.

During the inspection people appeared to be relaxed and well-cared for. For example, one person had been to the hairdressers in the past few days and it was evident staff had assisted them to maintain their new hair style. A person’s relative had written to the service to say how happy and well the person was, attributing this to the support they had received from staff at Springbank Road.

# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

People's needs were assessed and their care and support was planned and delivered appropriately. Staff clarified people's support needs in relation to their physical and mental health, the learning of new skills and following their interests. At the time of the inspection, two people were new to the service. Records showed staff were working with health professionals such as the learning disabilities nurse, GPs, and psychologists to ensure they had accurate information about people's needs.

Staff had developed support plans which explained how each person received their support. For example, some people had complex needs and their support plans explained how staff supported them with their personal care. A relative told us staff had asked them, and the person using the service, for their views, which were then fully taken into account when the person's support was planned. For example, care records included information about how staff should support the person in relation to their hobbies and interests.

Daily diaries were kept by staff which showed people's support had been delivered as planned. Staff had reviewed

people's support to ensure that their current needs were met. Records showed staff provided support which was flexible and enabled people to follow their interests and took their preferences into account. We observed that people were asked what they wanted to do and staff assisted them with their choices. For example, a person was assisted to go out to a café of their choice for lunch.

A person's relative told us they were aware of how to make a complaint if they needed to. They said, "I am certain the staff would deal with it straight away and try and sort it out." The service had not received any recent complaints. The provider sent out an 'easy read' questionnaire to people and their relatives to ask for their views of all their services, including Springbank Road. The report on the responses showed that any concerns people had raised were followed up.

People were asked how they experienced the service at Springbank Road at reviews of their support needs. A relative told us staff always listened to their views. They said staff were flexible and made changes to people's support 'as they went along'.



# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

The service has a registered manager. Staff told us she provided effective leadership. A member of staff said, “She is on the ball. She cares about the people and the staff. She listens and takes note.”

Staff said they enjoyed working at Springbank Road because teamwork was effective. They told us handovers worked well between shifts, so they were clear about what was happening with each person. Notes of team meetings showed staff had the opportunity to discuss work issues and plan how to develop the service. For example, people’s behaviour which challenged the service was discussed and information was shared on the most effective ways of supporting the person.

Staff told us the registered manager was not always at the service but was readily available by telephone and always responded to their requests for advice and support. Staff said the registered manager set them a good example in relation to how they should relate to their colleagues and people. For example, they told us she emphasised open, straightforward communication and offering people choices.

A senior manager had made regular checks on the quality of the service people received at Springbank Road. They had made reports of their findings. Areas for improvement were highlighted and the registered manager had implemented any required changes within a set timeframe. The reports covered the cleanliness and maintenance of the building, the views of people and staff and record keeping.