

Creative Support Limited

Creative Support - Burnside Court Extra Care Carlisle

Inspection report

Flat 2
Roseberry Road
Carlisle
Cumbria
CA3 9HP

Date of inspection visit:
05 February 2016

Date of publication:
21 April 2016

Tel: 01228593134

Website: www.creativesupport.co.uk

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

This unannounced inspection took place on 5 February 2016. This was our first inspection of the service since it changed provider from Anchor Trust Integrated Care to Creative Support.

Creative Support at Burnside Court provides care to people who live in this sheltered housing complex. There are staff available both day and night to provide personal care to a number of people who make Burnside Court their home.

There was a registered manager in place. 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.

The service had sufficient appropriately recruited staff available to support people.

As part of their recruitment process the service carried out appropriate background checks on new staff.

Staff were aware of how to identify and report abuse.

Staff were trained to an appropriate standard.

All staff received regular supervision and appraisal from senior staff.

People who needed support with nutrition and hydration received it.

People told us that staff were caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

There was a quality assurance system in place at 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 was safe.

There was sufficient staff both day and night to provide support to people.

Appropriate pre-employment checks had been carried out to make sure staff were suitable to work with vulnerable people .

Staff new how to identify and report potential abuse.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Staff had received appropriate training.

The service worked in conjunction with other health and social care providers.

People received adequate support with nutrition and hydration where necessary.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

People told us that staff were caring.

People told us that staff were caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

There were plans and procedures in place to ensure that people's privacy was protected.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive to people's needs.

Care plans were written in a clear and concise way so that they were easily understood by staff providing support.

People were able to raise issues with the service in a number of ways including formally by using the complaints process.

People were supported to access the local community.

Is the service well-led?

The service was well led.

The registered manager had clear ideas about what the service should provide.

Staff told us they felt supported by their manager.

There was a quality assurance system in use.

Good ●

Creative Support - Burnside Court Extra Care Carlisle

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 inspection took place on the 5 February and was unannounced.

The inspection was carried out by an adult social care inspector.

Before the inspection the provider completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We also reviewed the information we held about the service, such as notifications we had received from the registered provider. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law. We planned the inspection using this information.

We spoke with five of the people who used the service. We also spoke with five staff including the registered manager.

We looked at five records of written care and other policies and records that related to the service. We looked at two staff files which included supervision, appraisal and induction. We saw a record of training and a training plan. We looked at quality monitoring documents.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

We spoke with people who used the service and asked them if the service had sufficient staff available to support them at Burnside Court. One person said, "There are enough staff." Another commented, "You are never overlooked."

During our inspection we looked at the duty rota. We saw that there sufficient staff to meet the identified needs of the people who used the service, this included during the night.

We spoke with the registered manager and asked how they ensured there were sufficient staff to meet people's needs in times of crisis or when people required additional support. They explained that staffing levels were based on people's needs and if those needs changed staffing levels could be increased by offering extra hours to staff within the service.

We saw that each individual who used the service had assessments in place that identified risks that they faced and planned ways to reduce them. For example some people required support to access the local community safely. Plans were in place to ensure that people were enabled to do this.

We spoke with staff and asked how people were protected from bullying, harassment and avoidable harm. Staff explained that they had all had training that ensured they were able to protect vulnerable people from abuse. Staff were able to tell us what kinds of abuse there were and how they would raise concerns about them. If staff were concerned about the actions of a colleague there was also a whistleblowing policy. The policy gave clear guidance as to how to raise concerns. This meant that staff could quickly and confidentially highlight any issues they had with the practice of others.

We looked at recruitment procedures in the service. The service provided assurances that all candidates for jobs completed an application form and underwent a formal interview with senior staff present. If they were successful criminal records checks were carried out and references sought. We saw staff records that confirmed this.

We looked at how the service managed medicines. The people who used the service lived in their own homes and therefore stored their own medication. The service was commissioned to provide support to some people with their medicines. Where this was the case we saw that medicines were managed appropriately.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

We spoke with people who used the service and asked if they thought the staff knew how to support them properly. One person said, "Yes they know what they are doing." Another added, "Oh aye."

We spoke with staff and asked them if they felt well supported and correctly trained. All staff told us that they were supported by the provider. The staff told us that they were given a wide variety of training including moving and handling and infection control

We looked at staff training records. We saw staff had completed their mandatory training and had attended additional courses such as the care certificate. We noted that though some of the training was electronic it was linked to assessment in order to check that staff were competent in what they had learned. Other training was delivered face to face, for example safeguarding training.

We looked at supervision and appraisal records for staff. We saw that the registered manager was ensuring that supervision and appraisal were carried out in accordance with the provider's policy. Staff told us, "You don't have to wait until your supervision if you have a problem."

We examined how the service supported people to make their own decisions. People we spoke with lived as independently as possible at Burnside Court. We saw that the service supported people to continue living independently for as long as they were able.

We spoke with people who used the service and asked if they were satisfied with the nutritional support they received. People told us, "The food is very good."

We looked at how staff supported people to take adequate nutrition and hydration. We saw that staff organised a daily communal meal. The meal was well attended and gave staff the opportunity to check that people were taking adequate food and fluids. In addition to this people had support plans in place if there was concerns around nutrition.

We saw from the written records the service regularly involved other health and social care professionals in people's care. This included members of the local community mental health team as well as GP's.

Although the service did not work with people who were deprived of their liberty under the Mental Capacity Act we saw the registered manager had a good knowledge of 'best interest' legislation and had been involved in helping people and their relatives to make best interest decisions.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

We spoke with people who used the service and asked them if they thought the service provided good care. One person told us, "I sing their praises." Then added, "They are exceptionally nice." Another person who used the service said, "I've got a good quality of life."

We observed staff supporting people in a kind and caring way. Staff told us they knew the people who used the service well and had worked hard to build positive caring relationships with people. Our observations confirmed this.

We saw that people were encouraged to express their views about their care and their likes and dislikes. Staff used this information to ensure that people were supported in a manner of their choosing.

The service ensured that people lived as independently as possible. Support plans reflected this.

People told us that staff respected their rights to privacy and dignity. We observed staff ensuring that they knocked on people's doors before entering and spoke with people in a respectful manner.

We noted that the service had robust policies that referred to upholding people's privacy and dignity. In addition the service had policies in place relating to equality, this helped to ensure people were not discriminated against.

At times the service had supported people towards the end of their lives. We saw that staff had the appropriate skills to be able to do this properly and competently. The registered manager showed us thank you cards from relatives who complimented this aspect of the service.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

We asked people if they knew how to raise concerns about the service they received. People told us that they felt comfortable telling someone if they were unhappy about anything at Burnside Court. One person said, "I'd tell the manager."

The service had a formal complaints policy and procedure. The procedure outlined what a person should expect if they made a complaint. There were clear guidelines as to how long it should take the service to respond to and resolve a complaint. The policy mentioned the use of advocates to help support people who found the process of making a complaint difficult. There was also a procedure to follow if the complainant was not satisfied with the outcome.

At the time of our inspection the service had no outstanding formal complaints. The registered manager explained that wherever possible they would attempt to resolve complaints informally.

We looked at the written records of care for people who used the service. We saw evidence that indicated the service had carried out assessments to establish people's needs. People were assessed as to whether they needed support in all aspects of their life.

We looked at the standard of care plans in the service. We found evidence that the service was formulating clear and concise care plans that were easy to understand. Staff had written daily notes that corresponded with people's plans of care.

People who used the service had access to their care plans as a copy was kept in their homes. Reviews of care plans were carried out regularly and involved the person receiving support. Their relatives and other health and social care professionals were invited to these reviews.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

When we spoke with people who used the service they did not raise any issues about how the service was managed. All of the people we spoke with clearly knew the registered manager well and referred to her by using her first name.

We spoke with staff. They were very complimentary about the leadership of the service and felt the registered manager had a team based approach. They explained that the registered manager went to great lengths to ensure that they were well looked after. This included driving them to and from work during the recent floods and ensuring that both staff and people who used the service were provided with a meal during a power cut.

The registered manager of this service told us, "I want people to be safe, feel happy and receive care in a way that suits them. I want us to provide a responsive service."

We saw there was a clear management structure in place for this service. The registered manager was in regular contact with the provider.

We saw evidence that questionnaires were sent to people annually who used the service. They were designed to ascertain whether people were satisfied with the service they received. Audits and checks were undertaken regularly. These included paperwork audits, training audit and spot checks on the staff's performance. The outcomes of audits were analysed by the manager of the service who then used them to improve the way the service was run.