

# MacIntyre Care Monro Avenue

## Inspection report

54 Monro Avenue  
Crownhill  
Milton Keynes  
MK8 0BL  
Tel: 01908 269116  
Website: [www.macintyrecharity.org](http://www.macintyrecharity.org)

Date of inspection visit: 10 & 13 July 2015  
Date of publication: 11/08/2015

### 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

This inspection was carried out 10 & 13 July 2015 and was unannounced.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Monro Avenue is a care home, which provides residential care for up to 14 people with a learning disability. On the day of our inspection 13 people were using the service.

There was a registered manager in post. 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 felt safe. Staff had received training to enable them to recognise signs and symptoms of abuse and to know how to report them.

People had risk assessments in place to enable them to be as independent as they could be.

# Summary of findings

There were sufficient staff, with the correct skill mix, on duty to support people with their needs.

Effective recruitment processes were in place and followed by the service.

Medicines were managed safely and the processes in place ensured that the administration and handling of medicines was suitable for the people who used the service.

Staff received a comprehensive induction process and ongoing training. They were well supported by the registered manager and had regular one to one supervisions.

Staff had attended a variety of training to ensure they were able to provide care based on current practice when supporting people.

Staff always gained consent before supporting people.

People were supported to make decisions about all aspects of their life; this was underpinned by the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. Staff were knowledgeable of this guidance and correct processes were in place to protect people.

People were able to make choices about the food and drink they had, and staff gave support when required.

People were supported to access a variety of health professional when required, including doctors, opticians and dentists.

Staff provided care and support in a caring and meaningful way. They knew the people who used the service well.

People and relatives where appropriate, were involved in the planning of their care and support.

People's privacy and dignity was maintained at all times.

People were supported to follow their interests.

A complaints procedure was in place and accessible to all. People knew how to complain.

Effective quality monitoring systems were in place. A variety of audits were carried out and used to drive improvement.

# 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.

Staff were knowledgeable about protecting people from harm and abuse.

There were enough trained staff to support people with their needs.

Staff had been recruited using a robust recruitment process.

Systems were in place for the safe management of medicines.

Good



### Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

Staff had attended a variety of training to keep their skills up to date and were supported with regular supervision.

People could make choices about their food and drink and were provided with support when required.

People had access to health care professionals to ensure they received effective care or treatment.

Good



### Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

People were able and encouraged to make decisions about their daily activities.

Staff treated people with kindness and compassion.

People were treated with dignity and respect, and had the privacy they required.

Good



### Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

Support plans were personalised and reflected people's individual requirements.

People and their relatives were involved in decisions regarding their care and support needs.

There was a complaints system in place. People and relatives were aware of this.

Good



### Is the service well-led?

The service was well led.

People and their relatives knew the registered manager and were able to see her when required.

People and their relatives were asked for, and gave, feedback which was acted on.

Quality monitoring systems were in place and were effective.

Good



# Monro Avenue

## 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 10 & 13 July 2015 and was unannounced.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Before the inspection we checked the information we held about the service and the service provider. No concerns had been raised and the service met the regulations we inspected against at the last inspection which took place on 24 January 2014.

During our inspection we observed how staff interacted with people who used the service, assisted with personal care, breakfast and going out. We also observed morning medication being administered.

We spoke with three people and the relatives of two people who used the service. We also spoke with the senior on duty, the area manager, a registered manager from another service who was supporting the service in the registered manager's absence and four staff.

Some people who used the service were unable to communicate verbally with us.

We reviewed four care records, five medication records, four staff files and records relating to the management of the service, such as quality audits.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People told us they felt safe. One person said, “Yes I am safe.” A relative said, “We know [relative’s name] is safe, we have no worries about that.”

Staff had a good understanding of the different types of abuse and how they would report it. One staff member said, “I would report it immediately to the manager.” Another explained what would make them think someone was being abused. They told us about the safeguarding training they had received and how they put it into practice and were able to tell us what they would report and how they would do so. They were aware of the company’s policies and procedures and felt that they would be supported to follow them.

There were notices in the office giving information on how to raise a safeguarding concern with contact numbers for the provider, the local authority safeguarding team and the Care Quality Commission (CQC).

Staff also told us they were aware of the provider’s whistleblowing policy and would feel confident in using it.

Within people’s support plans were risk assessments to promote and protect people’s safety in a positive way. These included; accessing the community, finances and life skills. These had been developed with input from the individual, family and professionals where required and explained what the risk was and what to do to protect the individual from harm. We saw they had been reviewed regularly and when circumstances had changed.

There was an emergency information file available to staff. It contained; contact numbers for people’s relatives, emergency contacts for professional and a set of floor plans. People had their own emergency plans within their support plans. This was to aid staff and emergency services in the event of evacuation of the service.

Accidents and incidents were recorded and monitored. We saw records of these which were completed correctly in line with the provider’s policies.

People told us there were enough staff on duty. The senior said, “We try not to use agency staff. We have our own relief staff which is better for continuity.” We looked at the rota and found that it was planned around the dependency needs and planned activities of people who used the service and the correct amount of staff with differing skill levels were on duty at any time.

Staff told us that rotas were flexible if the needs of the person changed for any reason. One staff member said, “Sometimes there are different things happening so more staff come on duty to assist.” Rotas were planned in advance to enable enough staff to be on duty to support people with their chosen activities. We saw the rotas for the past two weeks and the following week.

We found safe recruitment practices had been followed. One staff member said, “I had to provide references and have checks carried out before I started.” We looked at staff files and found that they contained copies of appropriate documentation. These included copies of application form, minimum of two references, a Disclosure and Barring Services (DBS) check and an up to date photograph.

Staff told us they were only allowed to administer medicines if they had completed training and competency to do so. We observed the morning medication administration round. This was completed correctly. People were given their medication in their rooms and time was taken to ensure it had been taken and they were fine following this. The staff member administering the medication checked and completed the Medication Administration Record (MAR) at each stage and completed a stock check of medication which was boxed. The staff member said, “We always do a stock count every time.” We checked five people’s medication records. These contained information and a photograph of the person and of the medication they had been prescribed. MAR sheets we looked at had been completed correctly. Medicines were stored correctly and audited weekly.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

Relatives told us staff appeared well trained. One relative said, “Yes, they appear properly trained to me.”

The provider had an induction programme which all new staff were required to complete. The registered manager told us that new staff had a Personal Development Plan (PDP) which they needed to complete before being found competent. This included the new care certificate. We looked at two people’s PDP’s. Staff were expected to read and comment on policies, procedures and all documentation used on a daily basis at the service, as well as completing specific training. This was then signed by the registered manager following discussion with the staff member. Documentation we reviewed confirmed this had happened.

Staff told us they were very much supported by the registered manager. One staff member said, “We can speak to her at any time.” Another said, “[registered manager’s name] is very supportive. She works with all of us.” We were told that staff had regular one to one supervision with the registered manager. We saw completed supervision forms within staff files. These showed a variety of subjects were covered. There was a supervision matrix in the office showing dates had been made for the whole of the year.

Staff told us they received a lot of training. One staff member said, “We have a lot of training from face to face and e-learning.” Two staff discussed the merits of both types. One said, “I like the e-learning as I can go over it as many times as I like until I understand it.” We reviewed the training matrix and found this showed training which included; safeguarding, moving and handling and safe handling of medication along with more specialised such as epilepsy and challenging behaviour. Some staff had completed nationally recognised qualifications at both level two and three.

The Care Quality Commission is required by law to monitor the operation of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) and to report on what we find. We saw that there were policies and procedures in relation to the MCA and DoLS to ensure that

people who could make decisions for themselves were protected. Staff we spoke with told us they had attended training and showed a good understanding of MCA and DoLS.

We saw evidence within people’s support plans that mental capacity assessments had been carried out, along with best interest meetings, when required and some people were subject to DoLS. Staff were able to tell us who was subject to a DoLS and why it was in place.

Consent to care and support was gained at all times. Staff told us that even if people were unable to verbally communicate their agreement, they knew them well enough to understand if they did not agree. Where possible people had signed their support plans in agreement. We observed staff gaining consent throughout our inspection, for example, when asking if ready for medication, personal care or wanting to go out.

People told us they had enough to eat and drink. One person said, “It is nice.” Staff we spoke with were aware of individual’s tastes. They told us that if anyone had a problem with nutrition they would seek advice and support from professionals. We observed breakfast and lunches packed for people to take out with them on their activity. People were offered a variety of foods to choose from. A variety of drinks was also offered. Staff explained that the menu was developed weekly with the people who used the service and shopping was then done. There was a plentiful supply of food in the kitchen including fresh fruit and vegetables.

People we spoke with told us they saw the doctor or dentist when needed. Staff told us that each person was supported to see or be seen by their GP, chiropodist, optician, dentist or other health care professionals, including well women and well men clinics. People had health passports. Staff explained that these contained all documentation regarding the person’s health with contact numbers and information. The person took this with them to every health appointment and if they had to go into hospital. We saw evidence within people’s support plans that they had attended various appointments to enable continuity of health care.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

People told us that staff were very kind. People and relatives made comments regarding the kind and caring approach of the staff. One person said, "They are all kind." A relative said, "They are wonderful, they care very well for my relative."

We observed positive interactions between staff and people who used the service, for example, when they were helping people to mobilise or give general support, staff were chatty and there was a good atmosphere.

Staff demonstrated that they knew people's needs and preferences very well. We observed staff chatting with people about things of interest to them. One person was becoming unsettled and staff knew how to respond to help the person settle. They spoke to them in a calm and settling manner whilst rubbing their back. This settled the person and showed the staff member knew them well. We later saw recorded in that person's support plan that this was the documented way to calm them. Staff were able to tell us about individuals and the contents of their care plan, and we observed this in practice.

We observed people being involved in their care and support and given choices in their routines. One person was not well on the day of our inspection and was not

going out. They did not want to get up so staff encouraged them to have a drink then stay in bed for a while, which they did. Staff assisted with personal care later in the morning.

The registered manager told us that there was access to an advocacy service if required. People were informed of this on admission, but staff would recommend it if they felt it was appropriate. The area manager told us that an advocacy service had recently attended the managers meeting to update them on what services were available.

We observed staff treating people with dignity and respect and being discreet in relation to personal care needs. People were appropriately dressed. Staff spoke about offering choices when dressing, at breakfast and when people got up or as well as going out. Support was provided in a kind and calm manner. People appeared relaxed and at ease with staff.

There were some areas within the home and garden where people could go for some quiet time without having to go to their rooms. This showed that people could be as private and independent as they were able.

People told us they could have visitors when they wanted. A relative said, "I visit any time and the staff are great." Staff told us that visitors are welcomed and people are encouraged to visit.

# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

People told us they were involved in their care plan if they wanted to be. There was evidence in the care plans we saw that people and their families or representatives had been involved in writing their care plans.

A relative we spoke with told us the staff and the registered manager could not be more helpful. One relative said, “I do not think I could get better care for [relative's name] they support [relative's name] to do so much, and they always seem to know what to do.”

Staff told us they knew the people in their care but used their written care plan to confirm there had been no changes. They also had a handover between shifts to pass on information to ensure continuity of care and support.

Staff confirmed that before admission to the service people had a thorough assessment. This was to ensure that the service was able to meet the person's needs at that time and in anticipation of expected future needs. This information would be used to start to write a care plan for when the person moved in. Care plans we looked at showed this had taken place.

During our inspection we observed positive interactions between staff and people, who used the service, and that choices were offered and decisions respected. For example, what people wanted to eat, where they wanted to sit and

what they wanted to do. A relative told us that their family member was able to make choices about aspects of their life. This demonstrated that people were able to make decisions about their day to day life.

People had an individual plan of activities for each day. This had been developed with their key worker. On the day of our visit we observed people going to different activities. One person had recently finished a college course and had been attending a variety of short visits to other activities to enable them to make an informed choice. Three people were at home during the afternoon, staff gave them some options as to how to spend the time and they decided to go out to a local park farm. Staff used the bus belonging to the service to take them.

There was a complaints policy and procedure in place. A relative said, “I know how to complain, I have written information, but have never had to.” The policy was also available in an easy read pictorial format to assist people with making a complaint. We saw documentation which showed complaints had been dealt with in the correct way and had been concluded in a way which was satisfactory to both parties.

The registered manager told us that an annual survey is sent out to people and their relative's. The survey for the people who used the service was in pictorial and easy read format to assist with completion. The results were available for the 2014 survey. The comments were all positive. The results from this were fed into the service plan by the registered manager.



# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

Staff said that there was an open culture, they could speak with the registered manager about anything and they would be listened to. They also said they were fully involved in what happened in the service. They were kept informed of any changes.

Staff told us that they received support from the registered manager and other senior staff. At the time of our inspection another registered manager was covering the service. One staff member told us, “The manager is very good; we can speak to her about anything.” Another said, “When [registered managers name] is away like now, we get cover from another manager of a nearby service, she is very nice.”

The registered manager told us that the provider had a whistleblowing procedure. Staff we spoke with were aware of this and were able to describe it and the actions they would take. This meant that anyone could raise a concern confidentially at any time.

There was a registered manager in post. People we spoke with knew who she was and told us they saw her on a daily basis. During our inspection we observed the registered manager who was covering the service, chatting with staff and people who used the service. It was obvious from our observations that the relationship between the registered manager and the staff was open and respectful.

Information held by CQC showed that we had received all required notifications. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law in a timely way. Copies of these records had been kept.

The registered manager told us there were processes in place to monitor the quality of the service. This included fire equipment testing, water temperatures, medication audits and support plans. These audits were evaluated and, if required, action plans would be put in place to drive improvements. The registered manager told us that every week that put all of the information into the providers computer system. This enabled the area manager to evaluate and act if necessary.

The registered manager told us that all accidents and incidents were recorded and reviewed by them and the provider. This was to see if any patterns arose and what could have been done, if anything to have prevented it happening or to stop it happening in the future. Documentation we saw confirmed this.

A variety of meetings had been held on a regular basis, including; residents, relatives and staff meetings. Staff told us they attended staff meetings as they were useful to keep up to date with things. One staff member said, “The area manager came to the last meeting. That was useful. We asked about some things and they have been acted on already.” This showed suggestions were listened to and acted on. We saw minutes of all of these meetings.