

Russley Care Homes Limited

Russley Lodge

Inspection report

276 Wilbraham Road
Chorlton
Manchester
Greater Manchester
M16 8WP

Tel: 01618812989

Website: www.russleycarehomes.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
14 June 2017

Date of publication:
19 July 2017

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

Russley Lodge provides accommodation and personal care for up to a maximum of 17 people. At this inspection 17 people were living there.

At the last inspection the service was rated good. At this inspection we found the service remained good.

People continued to remain safe as staff knew how to recognise and respond to concerns of ill-treatment and abuse. There were enough staff to support people to meet their needs. The provider followed safe recruitment procedures when employing new staff members. People had their medicines when they needed them and were assisted by trained and competent staff.

People were assisted by a staff team who had the skills and training to effectively support them. They continued to receive care that was effective and personalised to their individual needs and preferences.

People were supported to have choice and control over their lives. They were assisted by staff in the least restrictive way possible. Staff were aware of current guidance which informed their practice and people's rights were protected by the staff who supported them.

People received support that continued to be caring and respectful.

People's privacy and dignity was respected by those providing assistance. People were supported at times of upset and distress.

People had care and support plans that continued to reflect their personal needs and preferences. When changes occurred in people's personal and medical circumstances, these plans were reviewed to reflect the changes.

Staff members knew people's likes and dislikes and supported them in the manner they preferred. People and their relatives were encouraged to raise any concerns or complaints. The provider had systems in place to address any issues raised with them.

Russley Lodge continued to be well-led by a management team that people and staff found approachable and supportive. People were involved in decisions about their care and support and their suggestions were valued by the provider.

Staff members felt valued as employees and their opinions and ideas were listened to by the provider. The provider had systems in place to monitor the quality of service they provided and where necessary made changes to drive improvements.

Further information is in the detailed findings below.

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 remains Good

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Russley Lodge

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 checked 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 that was completed by one inspector.

This inspection took place on 14 June 2017 and was unannounced.

We reviewed information we held about the service. We looked at our own system to see if we had received any concerns or compliments about the provider. We analysed information on statutory notifications we had received from the provider. A statutory notification is information about important events which the provider is required to send us by law.

We asked the local authority and Healthwatch for any information they had which would aid our inspection. We used this information as part of our planning.

We spoke with five people receiving support, three staff members, the registered manager, the director and one volunteer.

We looked at the care and support plans for two people including assessments of risk and guidance for the use of medicines. We looked at records of incidents and accidents, quality checks and details of service user satisfaction surveys. In addition, we confirmed the recruitment details of two staff members.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People continued to be protected from the risks of abuse and ill-treatment at Russley Lodge. This was because staff knew how to recognise and respond to any concerns. People we spoke with told us they felt safe and protected by the staff that supported them.

Staff members told us they had received training on how to identify and respond to any concerns of abuse or ill-treatment. Information was available to people, relatives and staff members on how to report any concerns that they had to the registered manager or the local authority. We saw that the registered manager and provider had made appropriate notifications to the local authority in order to keep people safe.

People told us they were safely supported to live at Russley Lodge. Risks associated with the environment or with equipment had been identified and steps taken to minimise the risk of harm.

For example, we saw that the registered manager had identified a need for a new hand rail for people to steady themselves when going into their garden. The registered manager arranged with the director for this to be provided. Individual risks to people associated with their care had also been assessed and action taken when needed. We saw assessments of risk including eating and drinking, going out and about and skin integrity.

Any incidents or accidents were reported by staff members and monitored by the registered manager and the provider. This was to identify any trends or patterns which required further action.

People told us, and we saw, that there were enough staff to support them safely and to assist them to do what they wanted. The provider followed safe recruitment procedures when employing new staff members. These checks included obtaining references and checks with the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). The DBS helps employers make safer recruitment decisions and prevent unsuitable staff from working with people. The provider had systems in place to address any unsafe staff behaviour. This included retraining or disciplinary action if needed.

People told us they received their medicines when they needed them and were supported by staff who were competent to do so. One person said, "Although I could do my medicines myself I do need some help just to make sure I don't make mistakes. They (staff) ensure I have what I need."

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People told us they continued to be supported by staff who had the knowledge and skills to effectively meet their needs. One person said, "Everyone here is just so good." Staff members told us they were supported by the provider with obtaining qualifications in health and social care.

New staff members received an introduction which included training to equip them with the skills to support people. In addition they had the opportunity to work alongside more experienced staff members. One staff member told us, "This is so we can get to know people and how they like to be supported. We can also ask any questions that we have."

People were supported to have choice and control over their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems at Russley Lodge supported this practice. When someone could not make decisions for themselves, the provider and staff knew what to do in order to protect the individual's rights. This included helping people to continue go out and enjoy their local community facilities.

People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the Mental Capacity Act. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The provider had made appropriate applications. Staff members we spoke with knew the conditions of authorised applications and how to support people and protect their rights.

People were supported to have enough to eat and drink to maintain their well-being. People told us if they didn't like something an alternative would be provided. People's weights were monitored by staff. If needed staff sought the assistance of healthcare professionals if they were concerned about fluctuations in people's weights.

People had access to healthcare services when they needed it. At this inspection we saw a visiting health care professional support someone with changes in their health. In addition an optician also attended to complete individual assessments with people.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People told us they continued to be supported by staff they described as, "kind" and "helpful." Staff members spoke about those they supported with warmth and fondness. At this inspection we saw many spontaneous interactions between people and staff. These included jokes and general conversation about things people found interest in.

People were supported in their religious beliefs with attendance at places of worship and observance of religious festivals. People told us they were assisted by staff members to celebrate their faith.

We saw people receiving support from staff members when they started to become upset and anxious. Staff members took the time to sit and listen to how people felt and allowed them the opportunity to express themselves.

People told us they were involved in making decisions about their care which included how they wished to be supported. We saw people asked to be assisted at a different time or to do something else. This included the activities they wished to take part in. Staff members responded and supported people in accordance with their choices.

People's privacy and dignity was respected by those supporting them. People told us staff always asked their permission before doing anything to support them.

People were encouraged to do what they could for themselves and staff members assisted where needed. We saw people engaged in household tasks including clearing the tables after lunch. One person told us it felt good to keep busy and involved in things.

People's information was kept confidential and stored securely. We saw staff members confirming visitor's authority to access confidential information.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People told us they were still involved in the development of their own care and support plans. One person said, "Before I came here [staff member's name] went through all that I needed help with." We saw care and support plans which gave the staff member's information on how people wished to be supported. The staff members that we spoke with could tell us about those they supported including their likes and dislikes, personal histories and those that matter to them. People were supported by staff members who knew them well and took an interest in them as individuals.

People regularly reviewed their care and support plans with the staff members assisting them. Any changes in needs were assessed and when needed additional support was requested from healthcare professionals.

At this inspection we saw people were engaged in a range of activities which they told us they found fun, interesting and stimulating. We saw people taking part in arts and crafts as well as bingo. During the arts and crafts session people were encouraged to have a group discussion about recent events in their local area.

People told us they knew how to raise a complaint or a concern if they needed to do so. One person told us they had a disagreement regarding their living arrangements. They felt able to approach the registered manager and raise their concerns. They felt listened to and worked with the registered manager to resolve their disagreement. The provider had systems in place to respond to concerns which included investigation and contact with those involved.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

People we spoke with described the registered manager as "approachable" and "always ready to listen." People went on to say that they regularly spent time with the registered manager who often worked alongside the care staff. People also told us that they knew who the provider was and that they saw them often.

People were involved in the service they received and contributed to decisions regarding their own home environment. People told us they knew about recent renovations to Russley Lodge and had been consulted about the new carpets in the communal areas.

We asked staff about the values they followed when assisting those living at Russley Lodge. Staff told us they tried to create a friendly and homely environment. Those we spoke with told us they believed staff displayed these values when supporting them.

Staff members understood the policies and procedures that informed their practice including the whistleblowing policy. They were confident they would be supported by the provider should they ever need to raise such a concern.

The registered manager and the provider undertook regular checks to drive quality. These included regular checks on the environment in which people lived and the support they received. We saw the registered manager identify a fire door which needed a repair to operate effectively. This was reported and we later saw this repair being completed by a member of the maintenance team.

A registered manager was in post and present at this inspection. They understood the requirements of registration with the Care Quality Commission. The registered manager had appropriately submitted notifications to the Care Quality Commission. The provider is legally obliged to send us notifications of incidents, events or changes that happen to the service within a required timescale.