

Royal Mencap Society

# Leicestershire Community Support Scheme

## Inspection report

Red Unit, First West Business Centre  
Linnell Way  
Kettering  
Northamptonshire  
NN16 8PS

Tel: 01536411415

Website: [www.mencap.org.uk](http://www.mencap.org.uk)

Date of inspection visit:

22 January 2016

25 January 2016

Date of publication:

02 March 2016

## 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 inspection took place on the 22 and 25 January 2016 and was announced. The service is registered to provide personal care to people living in their own homes or shared accommodation when they are unable to manage their own care. At the time of the inspection there were 13 people using the service.

There was a registered manager in post at the time of our 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.

People who could verbally communicate told us that they felt safe in their own home and we observed people who were unable to verbally communicate to be happy and relaxed around the staff that supported them. Staff understood the need to protect people from harm and abuse and knew what action they should take if they had any concerns. Staffing levels ensured that people received the support they required at the times they needed. We observed that there were sufficient staff to meet the needs of the people they were supporting. The recruitment practice protected people from being cared for by staff that were unsuitable to work in their home.

Support plans contained risk assessments to protect people from identified risks and help to keep them safe. They gave information for staff on the identified risk and informed staff on the measures to take to minimise any risks.

People were supported to take their medicines as prescribed. Records showed that medicines were obtained, stored, administered and disposed of safely. People were supported to maintain good health and had access to healthcare services when needed.

People were actively involved in decisions about their care and support needs. There were formal systems in place to assess people's capacity for decision making under the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

Care plans were in place detailing how people wished to be supported and people were involved in making decisions about their support. People participated in a range of activities both in their own home and in the community and received the support they needed to help them do this. People were able to choose where they spent their time and what they did.

Staff had good relationships with the people who they supported. Complaints were appropriately investigated and action was taken to make improvements to the service when this was found to be necessary. The management was approachable and had systems in place to monitor the quality of the service provided. Staff and people were confident that issues would be addressed and that any concerns they had would be listened to.

## 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

People felt safe in their homes and appeared happy and relaxed with the staff around them.

Risk assessments were in place and were continually reviewed and managed in a way which enabled people to safely pursue their independence and receive safe support.

Safe recruitment practices were in place and staffing levels ensured that people's care and support needs were safely met.

There were systems in place to manage medicines in a safe way and people were supported to take their prescribed medicines.

### Is the service effective?

Good 

The service was effective.

People were actively involved in decisions about their care and support needs and how they spent their day. Staff demonstrated their understanding of the Mental Capacity Act, 2005 (MCA)

People received personalised care and support. Staff received training to ensure they had the skills and knowledge to support people appropriately and in the way that they preferred.

People were supported to access relevant health and social care professionals to ensure they received the care, support and treatment that they needed.

### Is the service caring?

Good 

The service was caring.

People were encouraged to make decisions about how their support was provided and their privacy and dignity were protected and promoted.

There were positive interactions between people receiving care

and support and staff.

Staff had a good understanding of people's needs and preferences.

Staff promoted people's independence to ensure people were as involved and in control of their lives as possible.

### Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

People were listened to, their views were acknowledged and acted upon and care and support was delivered in the way that people chose and preferred.

People were supported to engage in activities that reflected their interests and supported their physical and mental well-being.

People using the service and their relatives knew how to raise a concern or make a complaint. There was a transparent complaints system in place and complaints were responded to appropriately.

### Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

People using the service, their relatives and staff were confident in the management. They were supported and encouraged to provide feedback about the service and it was used to drive continuous improvement.

There were effective systems in place to monitor the quality and safety of the service and actions completed in a timely manner.

The manager monitored the quality and culture of the service and strived to lead a service which supported people to live their lives as they chose.

# Leicestershire Community Support Scheme

## **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 22 and 25 January 2016 and was announced and was undertaken by one inspector. The provider was given 24 hours' notice because the location provides a domiciliary care service and we needed to be sure a member of staff would be available.

Before the inspection, we asked the provider to complete 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 reviewed the completed PIR and previous inspection reports before the inspection. We also sent out questionnaires to some of the people who used the service, their families, staff and other health professionals.

We checked the information we held about the service including statutory notifications. A notification is information about important events which the provider is required to send us by law.

We contacted the health and social care commissioners who monitor the care and support of people living in their own home.

During the inspection we spoke with six people using the service, five members of staff, an assistant manager, a manager and the registered manager. We also contacted two relatives who had agreed to speak to us.

We reviewed the care records of two people who used the service and four staff recruitment files. We also

reviewed records relating to the management and quality assurance of the service.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People who we were able to speak to said they felt safe with the staff that supported them; one person told us "Yes I feel safe, the staff are all good." Those people who were unable to tell us themselves if they felt safe looked happy and relaxed around staff. Staff understood their roles and responsibilities to safeguard people and knew how to raise a concern if they needed to do so. Staff told us that they felt able to raise any concerns around people's safety to the manager and outside agencies if they had any concerns people were at risk of harm or abuse. There was information available as to who to contact and an up to date safeguarding policy to support them. We found that all the staff had undertaken safeguarding training and this was regularly updated. Notifications in relation to safeguarding issues had been made to the local authority and sent to the Care Quality Commission.

People's individual support plans contained risk assessments to reduce and manage the risks to people's safety; for example people had risk assessments around the management of their epilepsy which provided staff with instructions about what to look out for and what to do if a person had a seizure. Risk assessments were also in place to manage other risks within the environment including the risk of using a wheelchair and a hair dryer. The support plans were reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that risk assessments and care plans were updated regularly or as changes occurred. When accidents had occurred the manager and staff took appropriate action to ensure that people received safe treatment. Training records confirmed that all staff had received health and safety and first aid training. Accidents and incidents were regularly reviewed to observe for any incident trends and control measures were put in place to minimise the risks.

Each person receiving support had their own personalised budget which included the cost of the staff support they had been assessed to need. Additional staff support was also made available when people needed to attend specific appointments or events. We could see that there were enough staff to support people and the staff rotas reflected the needs of people that used the service. Further funding was sought if the service identified someone's needs had changed.

The provider followed safe and robust recruitment and selection processes to make sure staff were safe and suitable to work with people. We looked at four staff files; appropriate checks were undertaken before staff started work. The staff files included evidence that pre-employment checks had been carried out, including written references, satisfactory Disclosure and Barring Service clearance (DBS), and evidence of the applicants' identity.

People's medicines were safely managed. We observed that medicines were stored securely and that Medication Administration Record sheets had been correctly completed. One person told us "My medicines are locked away and given to me when I need them." Staff received training before taking on the responsibility to administer medicines and their competencies had been assessed. Yearly observational competency reviews were undertaken by the manager which was recorded on staff training records. The staff we spoke to confirmed that they had all undertaken training and had completed yearly competency reviews with the manager.

## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

People received support from staff that had the skills, knowledge and experience to meet their needs. All new staff undertook an intensive and detailed induction programme which comprised of seven days classroom based training and four to six opportunities to shadow more experienced staff before working alone. New staff completed an induction handbook which involved undertaking competency based training and observations. One member of staff told us "I preferred to have training before I started to work with people; it helped me to understand what I was letting myself in for. I was able to shadow staff until I felt confident to work alone."

All staff had 'Shape your future' supervision sessions with the manager. These were a combination of supervision and on-going appraisal and personal development meetings and were held every twelve weeks. The staff told us that it gave them an opportunity to share any concerns and talk about what they were doing and hoped to do in the future. A number of staff said they felt listened to. One member of staff said "The manager is very responsive and supportive and listens to your ideas."

The staff training program was focused on ensuring staff understood people's needs and how to safely meet these. All staff had completed the training they needed and there was regular updated training available to help refresh and enhance their learning. The manager had recognised the need for staff to have a better understanding and working practice of Makaton, a form of sign language for people with communication difficulties, and was arranging training for staff. The staff told us they were looking forward to the training which would build on their knowledge and help them to be able to improve their communication with people. The relatives we spoke to both said that they felt the staff were very professional and were trained and skilled to look after their relatives.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The Act requires that as far as possible people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any decisions made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible. The registered manager and staff were aware of their responsibilities under the MCA. Capacity assessments had been undertaken and we observed staff seeking people's consent when supporting people with day to day tasks.

People were supported with their meals and drinks when necessary. The level of support they needed was recorded in the support plan. Each person had a daily diary which included information as to what they ate and drank each day. If the staff had any concerns about people's nutritional intake, or their ability to eat or swallow they reported this back to the manager and appropriate health professionals were contacted. We saw from records that a Speech and Language Therapist had been consulted when a person had difficulties in swallowing. A health professional told us "The staff were very aware of the risks for [name] and followed the plan put in place; the staff were very aware of [name] wishes and likes and understood them well."

People's healthcare needs were carefully monitored. Records showed that people had access to arrange of



health professionals, including community nurses, GP's, dentists and chiropodists; people had been referred to specialist services when required. Support files contained detailed information on visits to health professionals and outcomes of these visits including any follow up appointments. Any appointments were recorded in people's daily diaries to ensure that appointments were kept and there were sufficient staff to support people if they needed the support of staff.

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

People were supported by staff that were passionate about ensuring that they were enabled to live their lives as they chose. One person said "The staff are very good, they do as I ask." Staff demonstrated their care for people in the way they spoke and encouraged people to make choices for themselves and ensured that they were involved with what they are doing. One relative told us "The staff are lovely; they are very caring and professional."

During visits to people's homes we saw staff interacted well with people and engaged them in conversation and decisions about their activities of daily living. We heard one staff member comment to one person "The engineer has finally arrived [name], how many days has that been since we called him out?" One person was sat with a member of staff completing an activity together; they appeared very contented and absorbed in what they were doing. There was a calm and relaxed atmosphere in the houses we visited with everyone doing what they wanted and staff supporting people where they needed support.

Care plans included people's preferences and choices about how they wanted their support to be given and the things they liked to do. One person told us about a cruise they had planned to celebrate their birthday. They had chosen which staff they wanted to go with them as support. Another person brought out a jigsaw to show us and staff helped them with it. A relative told us about how the staff would sing to their relative when they went to bed which always helped them to settle.

We observed staff protecting people's privacy and dignity; when a person needed assistance with their medicines the staff spoke quietly to them and took them to their room. Staff went up to people to ask them if they wanted anything; we observed staff communicating with one person using Makaton a form of sign language, the person signed back. Staff told us that they respected that they were coming into people's own homes to provide their care and support and acted accordingly. The staff also explained to us how they would protect people's privacy and dignity while being supported in the community and undertaking leisure activities, they talked about not discussing individual's needs and speaking to people discreetly if they needed help when they were out.

There was information on advocacy services which was available for people and their relatives to view. No one currently using the service had an independent advocate but people had used the advocacy service in the past. The staff knew how to refer people to the advocacy service and gave examples of when people may be referred in the future.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

People were assessed to ensure that their individual needs could be met before the service was provided. We saw detailed assessment information; this was used to build a person centred support plan detailing what care and support people needed to enable them to reach their individual goals and live a fulfilled life. Support plans were put together in a way which ensured that the person and their families had been as involved as possible. Some plans had pictures to explain what was being recorded which helped those people who had different ways of communicating. The plans contained life histories of people and detailed significant people and friends in their lives.

The staff we spoke to demonstrated a good knowledge and understanding of the person they supported. A number of the staff had supported some of the people for a number of years and spoke of how they had developed a good understanding of people's needs and recognised as people's needs were changing. One member of staff told us "[Name] decided they did not want to go to a day centre anymore so spends more time at home or going out to the pub." The person confirmed they enjoyed this activity. Each person had a daily diary which detailed what they had been doing during the day, how they were and what activities were planned. This helped them to remember what they were doing and helped the staff to prepare people for the day ahead.

The support plans were reviewed on a regular basis with the people using the service and where appropriate their relative to ensure they were kept up to date and reflected each individual's current needs. We saw that the support plans had been regularly updated and details of any meetings with the people being supported were recorded.

We could see from the support plans that where people's health and wellbeing had been a concern that plans had been put in place to monitor them. For example where it had been identified that someone had the potential to develop pressure sores a plan was in place to ensure the person sat or lay in different positions throughout the day and night. The information was detailed to ensure people got the support they needed.

People had been given information about how they could raise a complaint if they needed to. This was in different formats to meet the different communication needs of people. Some of the people using the service shared houses and each week the house had meetings which enabled people to express if they had any concerns or not. One person told us "I am very happy here, the staff are very good and do what I ask; I can get up when I like and go to bed when I like."

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

Everyone we spoke with was complimentary about the management of the service. One member of staff told us "[Name of manager] listens to you and quickly tries to sort out any problems for you." A relative told us "If I had any issues I needed to raise I would and I know they would be resolved as quickly as possible." The manager worked on shifts on a regular basis. They told us this helped them to understand what was happening and helped them to address any concerns people or staff may have. The registered manager carried out spot checks to ensure that the staff were delivering care in a way which met the needs of the people and respected their wishes.

Each person had been given a service user handbook which gave them details about the personal support service. In addition to information about making a complaint and charges, it provided people and their families with information about what to expect from the service and what the service could not do for them. It was written in a way which reflected the ethos of the service, which was to support people to live their lives as they choose.

Communication between people, families and staff was encouraged in an open way. Relative's feedback told us that the staff worked well with people and there was good open communication with staff and management. One relative told us that they always felt valued and supported and the staff were always very professional in their approach.

Staff met with management on a regular basis which ensured staff were kept informed of what developments there were within the service, they also gave staff the opportunity to raise suggestions. The registered manager told us that staff meetings gave management the opportunity to share good practice and celebrate with the staff what had gone well in the service. Staff told us they felt well supported and informed.

Regular audits and surveys were undertaken and these specifically sought people's views on the quality of the service they received. People were generally happy and content. One relative said "If I was a millionaire I still could not buy a better service."

Quality assurance audits were completed by the registered manager to help ensure quality standards were maintained and legislation complied with.

The management and staff strived to provide people with the care and support they needed to live their lives as they chose. Management were committed to providing well trained and motivated staff.