

Dr Kandiah Somasundara Rajah

Ascot Villa Care Home For Autism & LD

Inspection report

13 Ascot Road
Moseley
Birmingham
West Midlands
B13 9EN

Tel: 01214499845

Date of inspection visit:
22 August 2016

Date of publication:
10 October 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Ascot Villa is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide accommodation and care for up to six people who are living with mental health conditions, autism and learning disabilities. The home has a registered manager who was present throughout the inspection. 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.

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 8 March 2016. The registered provider had not ensured that adequate systems to monitor the safety and quality of the service were in place. They were in breach of Regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act (2008) Regulations 2014, good governance. After the comprehensive inspection, we met with the provider and they wrote to us to say what they would do to meet the legal requirements and to consistently provide a well led service. At this inspection we found that improvements had been made and that the home was no longer in breach of this regulation. Further improvements were still needed to ensure that compliance with the regulations would be maintained.

We carried out this unannounced inspection on 22 August 2016. We undertook the inspection to check if the provider had followed their plan and to confirm that they were now meeting legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Ascot Villa Care Home on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service well-led?

Action had been taken to improve the governance of the service. This had not yet been embedded in everyday practice and people could not be confident they would receive a consistently good service.

There was a registered manager in post who was aware of their responsibilities to improve and lead the home.

We could not improve the rating for well led from requires improvement because to do so requires consistent good practice over time.

We will check this during our next planned comprehensive inspection.

Requires Improvement ●

Ascot Villa Care Home For Autism & LD

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.

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of Ascot Villa Care Home on 22 August 2016. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 8 March 2016 inspection had been made. The team inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: 'is the service well led?' This is because the service was not meeting some legal requirements.

We reviewed action plans sent to us from the provider before the inspection and other information we had received from them such as notifications. The inspection was undertaken by one inspector. During our inspection we spoke with two people, two staff and the registered manager. We looked at the providers records in relation to their quality assurance systems.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

During the previous two inspections we had found that there were ineffective systems in place to monitor the quality of the service, and drive forward improvements. During this inspection we found that some progress had been made to address these areas and the home was no longer in breach of Regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act (2008) Regulations 2014, good governance.

New systems had been developed and implemented to monitor the quality of the care being provided, as well as the physical environment of the home. An external auditor came to the service on a monthly basis and reviewed these aspects of the delivery of the service. This included asking people who lived at the home how they found the experience of living there, and what improvements they would like to see. People we spoke with told us they were happy living at the home and they now enjoyed more activities. One person told us, "I'm doing more now and I like it, I'm going out to the shops and enjoy myself."

We saw that the auditor had summarised their findings at the end of each report but that there was not a robust system of checking if the actions that had been identified had been completed in a timely manner. The auditor did not check at the following audit if action had been taken in line with the findings in the report. The registered manager told us that they read each report and took the appropriate action as identified. This meant that outcomes for people had improved but that providers systems for making sure this continued and happened in the future were not yet effective and fully embedded in everyday practice.

Peoples' views on the service they were receiving had been sought on a regular basis. People had been given individual questionnaires to complete. We saw that the registered manager had addressed any concerns or issues in a timely manner when they had been returned to the office. This had been done on an individual basis, focussing on one person's issues at a time. For example one person wanted a more structured activity programme which they had been supported to devise with the assistance of staff. The registered manager told us that the person was much more relaxed since the introduction of the programme. They said they had also seen a marked reduction in the amount of behaviours of concern the person had shown.

Staff had been made aware of these changes in the staff meetings and in individual supervisions with the registered manager. Staff told us that they had noticed an improvement in the person's behaviour and had discussed this with the person's relative who had agreed with them. This meant that actions were being taken to improve people's outcomes.

We saw that other surveys had been given to staff, external agencies and relatives. These had also resulted in some improvements, for example: it had been identified that a shower which was still working needed to be serviced so that it worked better. The work was undertaken and the shower now works much better. We noted that individual outcomes for people had improved but there remained a lack of analysis of the comments as part of the quality assurance process. The registered manager told us that information had not been used to look for trends, or to improve the service overall for the benefit of all the people who lived at the home.

During our inspection we spoke with people who were aware of who the registered manager was. We saw that the registered manager had a kind and relaxed relationship with people and clearly knew them very well. This indicated that the registered manager was an integral part of the home and was therefore aware of the day to day culture it.