

St. Anne's Opportunity Centre Limited

Chaffinches

Inspection report

108 Paynesdown Road
Thatcham
Berkshire
RG19 3TE

Tel: 01635874836

Date of inspection visit:
16 May 2017

Date of publication:
20 June 2017

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

Chaffinches is a care home without nursing that provides a service to up to three people with learning disabilities and/or autistic spectrum disorder. At the time of our inspection there were three people living at the service.

At the last inspection, the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good and had continued to meet all the fundamental standards of quality and safety.

Why the service remained Good:

Staff had a good understanding of how to keep people safe and protect them from abuse. Personal and environmental risks to the safety of people, staff and visitors had been assessed and plans were in place to minimise those risks. Recruitment processes were in place to make sure, as far as possible, that people were protected from staff being employed who were not suitable. There were sufficient numbers of staff and medicines were stored and handled correctly.

People benefitted from a staff team that was well trained and supervised. People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible. The policies and systems in the service supported this practice. People were supported to eat and drink enough and their health and social care needs were met.

The staff team were caring and respectful and provided support in the way people preferred. People's right to confidentiality was protected and their dignity and privacy were respected. People were encouraged and enabled to live as full a life as possible, maintaining their independence where they could.

People received care and support that was personalised to meet their individual needs. People were supported to maintain relationships with those important to them. They led busy lives, participating in work, education and activities. They enjoyed and were encouraged to try new activities where they wanted to. People knew how to raise concerns and felt confident they would be listened to if they did.

People were relaxed and happy and there was an open and inclusive atmosphere at the service. Staff were happy in their jobs and there was a good team spirit. They felt supported by the management and said the training and support they received helped them to do their job well. Quality assurance systems were in place to monitor the quality of the service being delivered and the running of 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 remains Good.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Chaffinches

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 was a comprehensive inspection carried out by one inspector. It took place on 16 May 2017 and was announced. The provider was given 48 hours' notice because the location is a small care home for younger adults who are often out during the day; we needed to be sure that someone would be in. The registered manager was not available on the day of our inspection. One of the service's team leaders was available to help.

We looked at all the information we had collected about the service. This included previous inspection reports, information received and any notifications the registered manager had sent us. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to tell us about by law.

During the inspection we spoke with all three people who use the service. We spoke with one team leader, one support worker and an administrator who also oversaw staff training. After the inspection we received written feedback from an additional four support workers. We observed interactions between staff and people who use the service. As part of the inspection we requested feedback from three health and social care professionals but received no responses.

We looked at all people's care plans, monitoring records and medication sheets. Medicines administration, storage and handling were checked. We reviewed a number of other documents relating to the management of the service. For example, staff training records, health and safety risk assessments, the fire risk assessment, routine and annual fire equipment safety checks, gas and electrical service checks and the annual checks of portable electrical equipment.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

The service continued to provide safe care and support to people.

People were protected from the risks of abuse. Staff knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and knew what actions to take if they felt people were at risk. Staff were confident they would be taken seriously if they raised concerns with the management and were aware of the provider's whistle blowing procedure. People told us they felt safe and that staff knew what they were doing when they supported them. The service had a full staff complement and never needed to use agency staff. This meant people were only supported by staff they knew and who knew them. In the service's 2016 satisfaction survey we saw one person had commented, "Staff advise me on things to keep me safe."

People were protected from risks associated with their health and care provision. Staff assessed such risks, and care plans included measures to reduce or prevent potential risks to individuals. For example, risks associated with specific long term conditions. During our observations we saw staff were aware of the risk reduction measures in place and were carrying out activities in a way that protected people from harm.

The staff monitored general environmental risks, such as fridge and freezer temperatures and maintenance needs as part of their daily work. Other premises checks were also carried out regularly. For example, weekly hot water temperature checks, fire safety checks and fire equipment checks. Emergency plans were in place, such as individualised emergency evacuation plans. There had been no accidents or incidents since our last inspection but systems were in place to ensure details would be recorded and reported to the registered manager. The registered manager would look into any accidents or incidents and take steps to prevent a recurrence where possible.

People were protected by the recruitment processes in place. Although no new staff had been employed since our last inspection, people could be confident that staff were checked for suitability before being allowed to work with them. The service was staffed with a core number of staff each shift with one member of staff during the day and one sleeping on the premises overnight. Additional staffing was then provided depending on the activities taking place and the needs of the people at the service. We saw staff were available when people needed them and they did not need to wait.

People's medicines were stored and administered safely. Only staff trained in administering medicines and assessed as competent were allowed to do so. Medicines administration records were up to date and had been completed by the staff administering the medicines. We saw that staff carried out appropriate checks to make sure the right person received the right drug and dosage at the right time.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The service continued to provide effective care and support to people.

People received effective care and support from staff who knew how they liked things done. The care staff team was made up of the registered manager, one senior team leader, one team leader, two senior care workers and three care workers. Care staff and people living at the home worked together on meal preparation, cleaning and laundry. People told us staff knew what they were doing when they provided support. One person said: "We have good staff." and another told us, "They help me out a lot and I like that."

There had been no new staff since our last inspection but any future new staff would be provided with induction training which followed the care certificate developed by Skills for Care. People received care from staff that had the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to perform their roles. The service provided an induction programme, mandatory training, supervision sessions and performance appraisals to staff. We found staff received additional training in specialist areas, such as mental health awareness. This meant staff could provide better care to people who may be at risk of harm. Work was underway to review and amend the training provision so that it was in line with the latest Skills for Care guidance on ongoing training for social care staff. Staff we spoke with felt they had the training they needed to deliver quality care and support to the people living at the service.

Staff were encouraged to study for and gain additional qualifications. The registered manager held the level 5 Quality and Care Framework in care. Of the remaining seven members of the care team, one held a Registered Manager's Award, two held a National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) level 4 in care, three held an NVQ level 3 and one held an NVQ level 2. Four staff held the Learning Disability Qualification (LDQ) at level 3 and three held an LDQ at level 2.

People's rights to make their own decisions, where possible, were protected. Consent was legally obtained and documented. People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the Mental Capacity Act 2005. The procedures for this in care homes are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). At the time of our inspection no people living at Chaffinches were being deprived of their liberty.

People were able to choose their meals, which they planned with staff support. People told us they enjoyed the food at the service and there were always alternatives available on the day if they did not want what had been planned. Snacks and drinks were also available at all times and people were free to decide what and when they ate. People's weight was monitored and staff told us referrals would be made to the GP where there was a concern that someone was losing weight, or was putting on too much weight.

People received effective health care support from their GP and via GP referrals for other professional services, such as speech and language therapists and occupational therapists. People all had health action plans. A health action plan holds information about a person's health needs, the professionals who support

those needs, and their various appointments. People had an annual health check from their GP as part of their health action plan.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

The service continued to provide compassionate care and support to people.

People were treated with care and kindness. Staff showed skill when working with people and it was obvious they knew them well. People were comfortable with staff and were confident in their dealings with them. Throughout our inspection it was obvious staff and people living at the home worked well together in partnership as they went about their daily activities. When asked what they thought the best thing about living at Chaffinches was, one person said, "The Staff" and another said, "My room."

People's care plans were geared towards what they could do and how staff could help them to maintain their independence safely wherever possible. People's abilities were kept under review and any change in independence was noted and investigated, with changes made to their care plan as necessary. The care plans were drawn up with people, using input from their relatives, health and social care professionals and from the staff members' knowledge from working with them in the service.

People's wellbeing was protected and all interactions observed between staff and people living at the service were caring, friendly and respectful. Staff listened to them and acted on what they said. Staff were knowledgeable about each person, their needs and what they liked to do. Where possible relatives were involved in people's lives and participated in annual reviews. People told us staff knew how they liked things done and confirmed staff were polite and nice to them. People told us they were happy living at the home with one person saying, "I am very happy here. Staff keep me happy and calm."

People's right to confidentiality was protected. All personal records were kept in the office and were not left in public areas of the service. We observed staff protected people's rights to privacy and dignity as they supported them during the day. Staff never entered people's rooms without their prior permission.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

The service continued to provide responsive care and support to people.

People received support that was individualised to their personal preferences and needs. People's likes, dislikes and how they liked things done were explored and incorporated into their care plans. Each care plan was based on a full assessment and each plan included details of how the person had been involved in drawing up their plan. The care plans were kept under review and amended when changes occurred or new information came to light. People confirmed they had taken part in drawing up their care plans and were involved in any changes made.

People were supported to make and maintain contact with people important to them. Where possible the service provided access to local events to enhance social activities for all people to get involved with, taking into account their individual interests and links with different communities.

People had access to a busy activity schedule. Each person had their own individual daytime plan. Some people had part time jobs and others attended further education colleges. Everyone kept busy with pre-arranged activities and at other times decided what they wanted to do, either inside their home or outside. People could choose what they wanted to do and were also able to try out new activities when identified.

People were involved in the local community and visited local churches, shops, library, cinema, clubs, pubs, restaurants and other venues. People planned for short breaks and annual holidays of their choice with staff support where needed. They had weekly one-to-one meetings with staff where they could discuss how things were going and what they would like to work towards. We saw staff then worked with people to support them to meet their goals.

People knew what to do and who they would talk to if they had any concerns. Staff were aware of the company complaints procedure and knew what to do if anyone raised a concern. All people could raise concerns in an informal setting if they wished. There had been no formal complaints made to the service since our last inspection and no one had contacted us with concerns. One person told us they had nothing to complain about and added, "It's nice here, I have no problems."

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The service continued to provide well-led care and support to people.

At the time of this inspection the service had a registered manager. 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. All of the registration requirements were met and the registered manager ensured that notifications were sent to us when required. Notifications are events that the registered person is required by law to inform us of. Records were up to date, fully completed and kept confidential where required.

People benefitted from monitoring of the service that ensured the premises remained suitable for their needs. People felt they were included in decisions regarding any changes at their home. One person told me they held monthly house meetings where everyone got together and spoke about anything they wanted to regarding living at Chaffinches. The provider had an effective audit system in place that included regular audits of the care plans, health action plans and medication records. The registered manager carried out a separate audit that looked at a large selection of documents covering all areas of the running of the service. For example, complaints and compliments records, accident and incident records, financial records, menus, food hygiene records and communication sheets. Any issues found during any of the audits were documented and actions taken to address the issues were recorded.

People benefitted from a staff team that were happy in their work. The service had a small, well established staff team who had all worked for the provider a number of years. Staff told us they enjoyed working at the service. They felt supported by the management and their colleagues when on shift and said they felt they were provided with training that helped them provide care and support to a high standard. They felt encouraged to make suggestions for improvement and felt their suggestions were taken seriously.

The provider carried out an annual survey of people who use the service and their relatives. The last annual survey took place in August 2016 and the next was due in August 2017. All responses received in 2016 had been positive and demonstrated how happy people were with the service provided. There were no negative comments or issues raised. In that survey people said they were very happy with the support they got to plan the activities they did outside the home. They also said they felt staff listened to them and helped if they had a problem.

All interactions observed during our inspection between staff and people living at the service were positive, friendly and respectful. One person told me how happy they were at Chaffinches and added, "This is a good care home, brilliant, awesome!"