

Amica Care Trust

Signature House

Inspection report

2 Maumbury Gardens
Dorchester
Dorset
DT1 1GR

Tel: 01305257248

Website: www.amicacare.co.uk/our-homes/signature-house

Date of inspection visit:
13 June 2023

Date of publication:
27 June 2023

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Inspected but not rated

Is the service well-led?

Inspected but not rated

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Signature House is a care home providing accommodation and personal and nursing care. The home is registered to provide care to a maximum of 48 people. The home specialises in the care of older people with dementia and/ or nursing needs. At the time of the inspection there were 44 people living at the home.

People's experience of using this service and what we found

People lived in a service run by a responsive provider. The provider had systems in place to monitor quality and plan on-going improvements. They responded robustly and transparently at the time when concerns about people's safety at night emerged.

We observed people were relaxed in the company of staff. People were cared for by staff who understood their safeguarding responsibilities and supported people safely.

People lived in a home where the registered manager was visible and monitored and improved the service.

Staff felt supported and part of a strong team that was committed to providing high quality care. They valued the support and recognition they received.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection

The last rating for this service was good (published 11 October 2022).

Why we inspected

The inspection was prompted in part due to concerns about how people were protected from harm at night were raised due to a safeguarding incident. The provider was responsive at the time and provided assurances about safety. A decision was made for us to inspect and examine those risks. We found no evidence during this inspection that people were at risk of harm from this concern. Please see the safe and well led sections of this report.

Targeted inspections do not change the rating from the previous inspection. This is because they do not assess all areas of a key question.

We looked at infection prevention and control measures under the safe key question. We look at this in all care home inspections even if no concerns or risks have been identified. This is to provide assurance that the service can respond to COVID-19 and other infection outbreaks effectively.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service, which will help inform when we next

inspect.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

At our last inspection we rated this key question good. We have not reviewed the rating as we have not looked at all of the key question at this inspection.

Inspected but not rated

Is the service well-led?

At our last inspection we rated this key question good. We have not reviewed the rating as we have not looked at all of the key question at this inspection.

Inspected but not rated

Signature House

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

This was a targeted inspection to check on a concern we had about the care people received at night.

As part of this inspection we looked at the infection control and prevention measures in place. This was conducted so we can understand the preparedness of the service in preventing or managing an infection outbreak, and to identify good practice we can share with other services.

Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by 2 inspectors.

Service and service type

Signature House is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing and/or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement dependent on their registration with us. Signature House is a care home with nursing care. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

Registered Manager

This provider is required to have a registered manager to oversee the delivery of regulated activities at this location. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Registered managers and providers are legally responsible for how the service is run, for the quality and safety of the care provided and compliance with regulations.

At the time of our inspection there was not a registered manager in post. The manager had started the registration process and had previously been the registered manager at this service.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority service improvement team. We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return (PIR). This is information providers are required to send us annually with key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. We used all this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We visited the service at night and spoke with 5 members of night staff, the registered manager and a representative of the provider organisation. We spent time with 3 people who used the service who were awake and in communal areas. We made general observations of interactions between people and staff. We reviewed a range of records related to staff training, the support and oversight of night staff and records made about the care and support of 2 people. Following our visit, we received feedback from a relative of a person living in the home.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At our last inspection this key question was rated good. We have not changed the rating as we have not looked at all of the safe key question at this inspection.

The purpose of this inspection was to check a concern we had about how people were protected from harm at night. We will assess the whole key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse; Learning lessons when things go wrong.

- The 3 people who were awake at night no longer used words to communicate effectively due to the progression of their dementia. They were visibly relaxed and comfortable with the staff supporting them and sought the staff out for reassurance.
- A relative commented on their confidence in the caring attentive nature of the staff. Observations of interactions supported this view.
- Staff reflected positively on the support they had received since the serious safeguarding incident.
- Staff had completed training to help them understand safeguarding and how to recognise and report any concerns. They were able to describe the actions they would take if they were concerned about a person's safety or well-being.
- Staff spoke confidently about the use of soft holds. They were clear that soft holds were used to keep people safe, for the minimum time possible and that this must be recorded in appropriate detail. Staff working with people who sometimes needed this support to be safe had all been trained to provide this type of support safely.

Preventing and controlling infection

- We were assured that the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.
- We were assured that the provider was supporting people living at the service to minimise the spread of infection.
- We were assured that the provider was admitting people safely to the service.
- We were assured that the provider was using PPE effectively and safely.
- We were assured that the provider was responding effectively to risks and signs of infection.
- We were assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises.
- We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.
- Visits to the home were conducted in line with the latest government guidance.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

At our last inspection this key question was rated good. We have not changed the rating as we have not looked at all of the well-led key question at this inspection.

The purpose of this inspection was to check a concern we had about how people were protected from harm at night. We will assess the whole key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements; Continuous learning and improving care.

- There was a new manager in post since our last inspection. They had previously managed the home and staff and professionals told us they had confidence in them.
- The provider responded robustly following the safeguarding concern and had been transparent with relatives and professionals. They had understood the impact on the staff team and ensured appropriate support, guidance and recognition of the team. Staff described how they had been impacted and told us they felt well supported.
- The manager and provider undertook a range of monitoring audits. We reviewed documentation related to night checks, the way whistleblowing was embedded and the oversight of restraint. These tools were effective in identifying areas for improvement and fed into a service development plan where improvement was monitored. There was ongoing work to improve reporting when we visited.
- The manager told us they felt well supported by the provider, and other registered managers within the organisation, who were always available to them to offer advice and support.
- The manager, and provider, were committed to ongoing improvements to make sure people received high quality, person centred care.