

Anchor Trust

Simon Marks Court

Inspection report

Lynwood Garth

Lynwood View

Leeds

West Yorkshire

LS12 4BE

Tel: 01132310454

Website: ah.simonmarkscourt@anchor.org.uk

Date of inspection visit: 1 May 2015

Date of publication: 12/06/2015

Ratings

Is the service effective?

Good



Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 11 November 2014 at which a breach of legal requirements were found. This was because competency checks on training were not completed and supervisions were not completed in relation to Anchors policy. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breach.

We undertook a focused inspection on the 1 May 2015 to check they had followed their plan and to confirm they now met legal requirements. At our focused inspection on the 1 May 2015, we found the provider had followed their plan which they had told us would be completed by the January 2015, and legal requirements had been met.

This report only covers our findings in relation to this topic. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for "Simon marks care home" on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Simon Marks Court provides accommodation for up to a 40 people who require support with their personal care. The home mainly provides support for older people over the age of 65.

The home's manager had worked in this role since for only a few weeks. The area manger attended the service twice a week to support the manager of the home. The manager was in the process of registration. 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 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

Staff had completed all mandatory training some which included equality and diversity, data protection, dementia awareness, moving and handling and safeguarding. All supervisions were in place in the home for staff.

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 effective?

We found that action had been taken to improve the effectiveness of the service.

Mandatory training had being completed in the home by all staff on induction and competency checks were being completed.

Supervisions with staff were being completed as the homes policy indicated they should be.

Good



Simon Marks Court

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 a focused inspection of Simon Marks Court on 1 May 2015. This inspection was completed to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection 11 November

2014 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service effective. This is because the service was not meeting legal requirements in relation to that question.

The inspection was undertaken by two adult social care inspectors. Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the home. This included the provider's action plan which set out the action they would take to meet legal requirements.

At the visit to the home we spoke to the manager of the home and looked through four staff files. We also looked at training records for staff in the home.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of Simon Marks Court in November 2014 we found that staff did not always receive the appropriate induction, training and support they needed to complete their role. This was a breach of regulation 23 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010, which corresponds to regulation 18 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. At our focused inspection 1 May 2015 we found that the provider had followed their action plan to meet shortfalls in relation to the requirements of Regulation 18 described above.

At this inspection we found that the staff files were easily accessible and easy to read. There was an index at the front of each staff file which guided the reader through it. We looked at four of the staff files and these showed that each staff member had completed an induction. The staff members had each been assigned a team leader/buddy and were receiving regular reviews every four, eight and twelve weeks.

We saw evidence that staff supervisions were completed every month and annual appraisals had been completed. The supervisions were very detailed and spoke about how

effective training was and how staff could use this in their work. The home was using a diverse approach in training for all staff and not using a “one fits all” approach by the home. Staff were asked in supervision which training method approach would benefit them in their work. Some staff preferred using the computer and completing training by e-learning, where other staff asked for face to face training.

The manager of the home had changed all staff files making these easy and accessible to follow. The manager had also put in place a training record on the computer which flagged up any training needs for all staff. The manager said this was been used and was effective. This meant that the service was effective and responding to the training needs of all staff.

The manager of the home had a training matrix on the computer which alerted the manager to any staff training that was going to expire. The manager of the home said they had changed training timescales to ensure each training session was completed on a different day as previously on some days the staff were completing two and three training topics in the one day. The training records showed that all staff had completed the required mandatory training.