

Brunelcare

# Woodland Court

## Inspection report

Woodland Court  
Partridge Drive  
Bristol  
BS16 2RF

Tel: 01179061400  
Website: [www.woodlandcourt.org.uk](http://www.woodlandcourt.org.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
24 April 2018

Date of publication:  
25 May 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

Woodland Court is a complex of privately owned flats where people can receive support with their personal care if they need it. At the time of our inspection 13 people were receiving support with personal care.

At our last inspection we rated the service good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

People told us they felt safe. People were able to call staff in an emergency if they needed to. People were supported safely with their medicines where this was part of their care package.

The service was effective. Staff were well trained and supervised in their roles so that performance and development was monitored. Staff worked with healthcare professionals when required to ensure that people's needs were met.

People were supported by staff who were kind and caring. It was evident that strong, caring relationships had been formed. People were independent in many areas of their lives and this was fully supported by staff. Staff made courtesy calls to people each day to check on their wellbeing.

Activities such as Bingo and Quizzes were available for people who wished to take part in them. There was a community feel to the service, with people living there running a bar and helping out with gardening. People were able to make complaints if they needed and these were responded to.

The service was well led. There was a registered manager in post supported by a team leader and other senior staff within the organisation. There were systems in place to monitor quality and safety in the service.

## 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.

# Woodland Court

## **Detailed findings**

### Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

This was a comprehensive inspection. The inspection took place on 24 April 2018. The service was given 48 hours notice. This is because the service provides care to people in their own homes and we needed to be sure someone would be available in the office to support our inspection.

The inspection was carried out by one Inspector and an expert by experience. An expert-by-experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service. Prior to the inspection we gathered information such as the Provider Information Return (PIR). The PIR is a form used by the provider to record what they are doing well and any improvements they plan to make. We also looked at notifications. Notifications are information about specific events that the provider is required to send us by law.

During our inspection we spoke with seven people receiving support and one relative. We spoke with four members of staff and the registered manager. We reviewed support plans for three people as well as other documents related to the running of the service such as audits and satisfaction surveys.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People told us they felt safe living at Woodland Court. People told us for example they had call bells and burglar and smoke alarms and security on the door. This helped them feel safe and secure. Comments from people included "they came quickly when I fell" and "when you pull the bell, they come".

People received safe support with their medicines. People told us they received them on time and staff recorded the support they had given. One person "it's signed for and recorded in a book". There was information recorded in people's support plans in relation to what support they required with medicines. For example, some people required 'prompting' to ensure they took their medicines at the right time and another person needed help to manage the packaging of their medicines. We discussed with the manager how it would be useful to give a little more detail about the support people required and link it to the medicine policy which set out and defined the different levels of support people might need. This would help to ensure there was a consistent approach. The registered manager agreed to look in to this straight away.

Medicine administration was recorded on Medicine Administration Records (MAR) sheets. These were taken to the office once completed and were checked to ensure they were accurate.

There were sufficient numbers of staff to ensure people were safe. The registered manager told us that although the complex contained over 50 flats, only 13 people received support with personal care. The number of people requiring support had decreased over recent months and so at present they had no difficulty covering care calls.

When new staff were recruited to the service we saw that checks were undertaken to minimise the risk of unsuitable or unsafe staff being employed. This included a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. A DBS check highlights whether a person is barred from working with vulnerable adults or whether they have any convictions that might affect their suitability. References were also sought and photographic ID was kept on file.

Staff were trained in and felt confident about safeguarding vulnerable adults from abuse. Staff felt confident their concerns would be listened to by the registered manager. Staff told us their training was updated regularly so that their knowledge was current.

Risk assessments were in place where necessary to provide guidance for staff on how to support people safely. This included an assessment of the home environment. We also saw that incidents or accidents were recorded and actions taken to prevent recurrence.

## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

The service was effective. People told us that staff were able to meet their needs. Comments included "They're very good and we have a nice chat".

Staff received training and support to carry out their roles effectively. Staff were positive about the training they had and told us it provided them with the skills they needed. One member of staff told us the training was "second to none" and the registered manager would never expect them to care for a person if they didn't have the training to do so. Staff gave examples of training they had been given to meet the needs of individuals, such as for one person who had a stoma bag and another who received nutrition through a Percutaneous Endoscopic Gastrostomy (PEG).

New staff to the service completed the Care Certificate. The Care Certificate is a nationally recognised qualification that provides staff with the minimum skills required to work in the Care Sector. Staff received supervision so that the registered manager could monitor their performance and development. This included observing staff carrying out their care duties so that their practical skills could be checked as well as how they interacted with people. There was a system of annual appraisal in place. An annual appraisal allows the registered manager to review a member of staff's performance over the year and identify any areas that required development.

Not everybody required support with their nutritional needs; there was a restaurant on site where people went to eat their meals if they wished to. Staff would take meals to a person's flat if they preferred this. People commented about the food "Very good, we're very lucky", "Quite nice, it's something different every day" and "It's very good, we have lamb hot pot today!".

The registered manager told us that people had capacity to make decisions for themselves and so they had not been involved in assessing people's capacity or making best interests decisions on their behalf in line with the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). . Consent for day to day issues had been recorded in the person's support plan. For example people had been asked to consent to their information being shared with relevant other professionals.

Staff worked with other healthcare professionals to ensure people's needs were met. One member of staff told us for example they would liaise with the district nurse for one person. The registered manager told that the GP came to service on a weekly basis; most people using the service were registered at the same practice and so good working relationships had been built. Staff did comment however that there were times when communication could work better between the pharmacy, GP and service to ensure that staff had up to date information about people's medicines

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

People spoke positively about the care they received and it was evident that strong relationships had been built between staff and the people they supported. Comments included that staff were "All so friendly and lovely", "They listen to what we've got to say" and "We have a chat and then I feel better".

Care staff were kind and caring and dedicated to their work. During our visit staff stayed on after their shift was due to end, telling us they didn't want to go home until they were satisfied everything was complete and people were ok. Staff commented about working at Woodland Court "love working here", "lovely – don't want to work anywhere else" and "thoroughly enjoy it".

The service also employed staff in the role of 'service provider'. Part of this role was to make courtesy calls to each person every morning to check on their wellbeing. We observed a member of staff making these calls during our inspection.

Staff talked in a positive and caring manner about the people they supported. They told us that people were quite independent in their lives and they would encourage this as much as they could. Staff gave examples of this such as supporting people to make snack and meals for themselves. It was evident that staff also had good relationships with people's friends and relatives. We saw the registered manager talking to visitors in a kind and respectful manner. One person commented "My son gets on well with staff, he is able to sort out any problems".

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

The service was responsive to people's needs. Calls were flexible and could be adapted if people's needs changed. For example, the registered manager told us that extra calls could be arranged if a person had just returned from hospital. Staff also told us they didn't feel rushed during visits and call times could be adapted if people needed a little extra support on a particular day. One person told us "My mother-in-law has just come out of hospital and they have increased her package. We're very pleased, no complaints".

There was a strong community feel to the service. Activities were provided for people who wished to take part. This included a choir who came to visit on a weekly basis. Staff in the role of 'service provider' carried out activities such as bingo and quizzes. Within the complex, there was a bar. This was run by a person living in one of the flats. Other people were involved in gardening activities. Raised flower beds had been provided so that people with mobility problems wouldn't have to bend over too far. Comments from people included "I have a bench outside and I sit there or walk around the garden", "I go to Bingo and music" and, "We like to sit in the seating area of the gardens".

People had support plans in place and these were reviewed regularly to ensure they were current and continued to meet people's needs. People were independent in most areas of their lives and so support plans did not need to include large amounts of information. However, relevant details were covered that encouraged staff to treat people as individuals. For example there was information entitled 'my life so far', which gave details about the person's previous jobs and activities they enjoyed. Information was updated if a person's needs changed. For example in one person's plan it was noted that the person felt weaker following a stay in hospital. Having up to date information helped ensure a consistent approach amongst the staff team.

There was a process for managing and responding to complaints. We saw examples of complaints that had been clearly recorded and resolved. The registered manager had spoken personally with the person raising the complaint. We also noted that a number of compliments about the service had been received. One person had written 'you all went the extra mile and I shall always appreciate that'. Another person wrote 'many thanks for all the kindness and care you have shown (x)'.



## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

The service was well led. There was a registered manager in post supported by a team leader. Staff told us they felt well supported. It was evident that there was a strong team spirit amongst staff, comments included "we all support each other". Staff told us they felt able to approach the registered manager with any concerns or issues they had.

People told us they would recommend the service and had done so in the past. Comments included "I've never regretted moving here". People knew who the manager was and felt able to approach them. One person told us "had one or two problems, but I spoke to the manager and she sorted them".

There were regular staff meetings. These were an opportunity to discuss any concerns about individuals and developments within the service. Staff told us they felt able to raise and discuss issues at these meetings, demonstrating that there was an open and transparent culture within the organisation where feedback from people and staff was encouraged.

There were systems in place to monitor the quality and safety of the service. This included gathering feedback from staff and people using the service in the form of a survey. The latest results from these showed good levels of satisfaction. Comments included 'staff are marvellous' and 'very helpful and very good, very lovely here and I have a lovely flat'. Quality assurance visits took place by senior staff within the organisation. We saw that these visits had identified areas for improvement. For example, in one visit record it had been identified that there was an issue with how complaints were recorded. This had led to improvements being made in the complaints process. These visits also checked people's care files to see that relevant information was included.