

Thanweer Care Limited

Southlands Court Residential Home

Inspection report

Bridgerule
Holsworthy
Devon
EX22 7EW

Tel: 01288381631

Date of inspection visit:
27 June 2019
02 July 2019

Date of publication:
14 August 2019

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

About the service: Southlands Court Residential Home is a 'care home' for a maximum of 26 older people. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection. At the time of our inspection there were 24 people living at the home.

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

The service provided safe care to people. One person commented: "I feel very safe with the staff." Measures to manage risk were as least restrictive as possible to protect people's freedom. People's rights were protected because the service followed the appropriate legal processes. Medicines were safely managed on people's behalf.

Care files were personalised to reflect people's personal preferences. Their views and suggestions were taken into account to improve the service. People were supported to maintain a balanced diet. Health and social care professionals were regularly involved in people's care to ensure they received the care and treatment which was right for them.

Staff relationships with people were caring and supportive. Staff provided care that was kind and compassionate.

There were effective staff recruitment and selection processes in place. People received effective care and support from staff who were well trained and competent.

Staff spoke positively about communication and how the management team worked well with them and encouraged their professional development.

A number of methods were used by the home to assess the quality and safety of the service people received. The service made continuous improvements in response to their findings.

Rating at last inspection: The last rating for this service was Requires Improvement (report published in July 2018). However, the service was not in breach of any regulations.

Why we inspected: This was a planned inspection based on the previous rating.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Southlands Court Residential Home on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Follow up: We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as

per our re-inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

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

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

The service was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Good ●

Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

Details are in our effective findings below.

Good ●

Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

Details are in our caring findings below.

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

Details are in our responsive findings below.

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

Details are in our well-Led findings below.

Good ●

Southlands Court Residential Home

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 Care Act 2014.

Inspection team:

The inspection was conducted by one inspector and an Expert by Experience on the first day, and one inspector on the second day. It was unannounced. An Expert by Experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

Service and service type:

Southlands Court Residential Home is a 'care home' for a maximum of 26 older people. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

There was a registered manager in post. 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.

What we did:

Prior to the inspection we reviewed the Provider Information Record (PIR). The PIR 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 and notifications we had

received. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law.

We spoke with eight people receiving a service, one relative and nine members of staff, which included the registered manager. We spent time talking with people and observing the interactions between them and staff.

Some people living at the service were unable to communicate their experience of living at the home in detail with us as they were living with dementia. We used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). SOFI is a specific way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people, who could not comment directly on their experience.

We reviewed three people's care files, three staff files, staff training records and a selection of policies, procedures and records relating to the management of the service. After our visit we sought feedback from health and social care professionals to obtain their views of the service provided to people. Unfortunately, we did not receive any feedback.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

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

At the last inspection this key question was rated as requires improvement. This was due to the need for an increase in staff at lunchtimes and evenings and risk assessments not being fully completed. This inspection found improvements had been made and this key question rating has now improved to good.

Good: This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People felt safe and supported by staff. Comments included: "Yes, I feel safe with the staff."
- Staff demonstrated an understanding of what might constitute abuse and knew how to report any concerns they might have. For example, staff knew how to report concerns within the organisation and externally such as the local authority, police and CQC. Staff had received safeguarding training to ensure they had up to date information about the protection of vulnerable people.
- The registered manager demonstrated an understanding of their safeguarding role and responsibilities. They explained the importance of working closely with commissioners, the local authority and relevant health and social care professionals on an on-going basis. There were clear policies for staff to follow. Staff confirmed that they knew about the safeguarding adults' policy and procedure and where to locate it if needed.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Comprehensive risk assessments were in place. People's individual risks were identified, and the necessary risk assessment reviews were carried out to keep people safe. For example, risk assessments for moving and handling, falls and skin care.
- Risk management processes considered people's physical and mental health needs and showed that measures to manage risk were as least restrictive as possible. This included ensuring necessary equipment was available to increase a person's independence and ability to take informed risks.

Staffing and recruitment

- Staff confirmed that people's needs were met promptly, and they felt there were sufficient numbers of staff on duty to meet people's needs. We observed this during our inspection when people needed support or wanted to participate in activities. For example, staff spent time with people engaging in meaningful conversation and supporting them at their pace. People said: "The staff give me so much support" and "The staff will get me anything I want." A relative commented: "There are enough staff around to make sure mum is kept safe."
- Staff told us there were enough staff to support people and people were well cared for. In addition, the organisation employed an activities coordinator, cleaners, cooks and a maintenance person.

- We asked how unforeseen shortfalls in staffing arrangements due to sickness were managed. The registered manager explained that generally regular staff would fill in to cover the shortfall, so people's needs could be met by staff who knew them. In addition, the service had on-call arrangements for staff to contact if concerns were evident during their shift.
- There were effective recruitment and selection processes in place. This helped ensure staff were safe to work with vulnerable people.

Using medicines safely

- People's medicines were managed so they received them safely. A person commented: "Staff make sure I have my medication."
- Appropriate arrangements were in place when obtaining medicine. The home received people's medicines from a local pharmacy monthly. When the home received the medicines, they were checked, and the amount of stock documented to ensure a full audit trail could be completed.
- Medicines were kept safely in a locked medicine cupboard and trolley. The cupboard and trolley were kept in an orderly way to reduce the possibility of mistakes happening. Medicines were safely administered. Medicines administration records were appropriately signed by staff when administering a person's medicines. Audits were undertaken to ensure people were receiving their medicines as prescribed. The checks also ensured medicines remained in date.
- Staff had received medicine training and competency assessments to ensure they were safe to carry out this task. Staff confirmed they were confident supporting people with their medicines. The registered manager and deputy manager checked medicine practice whilst working alongside staff and via records, to ensure staff were administering medicines correctly.

Preventing and controlling infection

- We found all the areas of the home to be very clean, fresh and free of malodours. The housekeeping team said they had a good team and took pride in keeping the home nice for people.
- Staff ensured infection control procedures were in place. Personal protective equipment was readily available to staff when assisting people with personal care, for example, gloves and aprons. Staff had also completed infection control training.
- Housekeeping staff had a cleaning schedule to follow, to ensure every area of the home was kept clean on an on-going basis.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- There was evidence that learning from incidents and investigations took place and appropriate changes were implemented. For example, care plans and risk assessments were updated. Actions had been taken in line with the service's policies and procedures. Where incidents had taken place, involvement of other health and social care professionals was requested where needed to review people's plans of care and treatment.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as requires improvement. This was due to the need for staff to ensure they had the knowledge and skills to support people appropriately and the need for best interest decisions to be documented. This inspection found improvements had been made and this key question rating has now improved to good.

People's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People said the staff were well trained and competent in their jobs. One person commented: "The staff are good and know what they are doing."
- Staff had completed an induction when they started work at the service. The induction required new members of staff to be supervised by more experienced staff to ensure they were safe and competent to carry out their roles before working alone. The induction formed part of a probationary period, so the organisation could assess staff competency and suitability to work for the service.
- Staff received training, which enabled them to feel confident in meeting people's needs and recognising changes in people's health. They recognised that to support people appropriately, it was important for them to keep their skills up to date. Staff received training on a range of subjects including, safeguarding vulnerable adults, the Mental Capacity Act (2005), moving and positioning and a range of topics specific to people's individual needs. For example, diabetes, dementia, nutrition and hydration. Staff had also completed nationally recognised qualifications in health and social care, including the care certificate. The care certificate aims to equip health and social care staff with the knowledge and skills which they need to provide safe, compassionate care. Staff commented: "All my training is up to date" and "Very good training. The registered and deputy managers are always asking us what we would like to improve our knowledge of."
- Staff received on-going supervision and appraisals in order for them to feel supported in their roles and to identify any future professional development opportunities. Staff confirmed that they felt supported by the registered manager. A staff member commented: "Fantastic support." This showed that the organisation recognised the importance of staff receiving regular support to carry out their roles safely.

Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care; Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- Staff knew how to respond to people's specific health and social care needs. For example, recognising changes in a person's physical health.
- Staff were able to speak confidently about the care they delivered and understood how they contributed to people's health and well-being. For example, how people preferred to be supported with personal care. People were supported to see appropriate health and social care professionals when they needed to meet

their healthcare needs. One person commented: "If I am not well they (staff) will call the doctor." We saw evidence of health and social care professionals' involvement in people's individual care on an on-going and timely basis. For example, GP and district nurse. These records demonstrated how staff recognised changes in people's needs and ensured other health and social care professionals were involved to encourage health promotion.

Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance; Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law

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 made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty had the appropriate legal authority and were being met.

- Before people received any care and treatment they were asked for their consent and staff acted in accordance with their wishes. People's individual wishes were acted upon, such as how they wanted their personal care delivered. One person commented: "They (staff) always ask permission to do things."
- People's legal rights were protected because staff knew how to support people if they did not have the mental capacity to make decisions for themselves. People's capacity to make decisions about their care and support were assessed on an on-going basis in line with the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) (2005). People's capacity to consent to care had been assessed and best interests' discussions and meetings had taken place. For example, the need for a person to receive personal care due to them being at high risk of skin damage. This demonstrated that staff worked in accordance with the MCA.
- The registered manager had liaised appropriately with the local authority where it had been identified that people were being deprived of their liberty. The registered manager was aware that authorisations required regular review.

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet

- People were supported to maintain a nutritious and balanced diet. People commented: "The food is absolutely fine, nothing to complain about"; "I didn't fancy what was on offer today, so I had a jacket potato instead" and "There is always a good range of meals for us to choose from."
- Care plans and staff guidance emphasised the importance of people having a balanced and nutritious diet to maintain their general well-being. People's weights were monitored on a regular basis. Where a person's ability to eat or drink changed, staff consulted with health professionals. For example, speech and language therapists had been involved with people who had issues with communication and/or eating and drinking. As a result, people were prescribed specific diets to reduce any risks, and staff followed the guidance.
- The cook was aware of who needed soft diets and ensured food was separated so they could appreciate the different tastes and textures. A relative commented: "They provide my relative with pureed meals due to her change of health in her swallowing needs."

- People were offered a variety of hot and cold drinks throughout the day.

Adapting service, design, decoration to meet people's needs

- People's individual needs were met by the adaptation, design and decoration of the premises. The home was set over two floors and was accessible by a stair lift. This was regularly serviced. People had a variety of spaces in which they could spend their time, such as the lounge and dining room, and their bedrooms were personalised. Reasonable adjustments had been made to enable people to move around as independently as possible, such as grab rails and ramps.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained good.

Good: This meant people were supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; respecting equality and diversity; Supporting people to express their views and be involved in making decisions about their care; Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People said staff were kind and compassionate and treated them with respect. People commented: "The staff really do care about us" and "All of the staff are so kind and caring."
- Staff relationships with people were caring and supportive. A person commented: "Nothing is too much trouble." Staff spoke confidently about people's specific needs and how they liked to be supported. Through our conversations with staff it was clear they were committed and kind and compassionate towards people they supported. They described how they observed people's moods and responded appropriately.
- There was a strong, visible person-centred culture. This was evident from all staff within all roles. The person-centred culture was embedded at all levels. For example, staff valued people and knew their preferred daily routines, likes, and dislikes. The service ensured that staff focused on building and maintaining open and honest relationships with people and their families, friends and other carers. This helped to promote and ensure the service was person centred.
- Staff adopted a strong and visible personalised approach in how they worked with people. Staff spoke of the importance of empowering people to be involved in their day to day lives. People were involved in their care planning.
- People informed us that the staff treated them with dignity and respect when helping them with daily living tasks.
- Staff told us how they maintained people's privacy and dignity when assisting with personal care. For example, asking what support they required before providing care and explaining what needed to be done so that the person knew what was happening.
- Staff adopted a positive approach in the way they involved people and respected their independence. For example, encouraging people to do as much as possible in relation to their personal care. One person commented: "They (staff) encourage me to be as independent as possible. They encourage me to wash myself as much as possible."
- Staff were aware of the need to ensure people's diversity was respected. They told us how they supported people with different likes and dislikes. For example, who liked a particular routine and the preferred gender of staff when receiving personal care.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the service met people's needs.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained good.

Good: This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to ensure people have choice and control and to meet their needs and preferences; Supporting people to develop and maintain relationships to avoid social isolation; support to follow interests and to take part in activities that are socially and culturally relevant to them

- Staff knew people very well and provided care and support which was person centred and took account of their needs and wishes. Care files included personal information and identified the relevant professionals involved in people's care, such as their GP. The care files were presented in an orderly and easy to follow format, which staff could refer to when providing care and support to ensure it was appropriate.
- Relevant assessments were completed and up-to-date, from initial planning through to on-going reviews of care. Staff commented that the information contained in people's care files enabled them to support them appropriately in line with their likes, dislikes and preferences. Care files contained information about people's history, which provided a timeline of significant events which had impacted on them, such as their physical and mental health. This demonstrated that when staff were assisting people they would know what kinds of things they liked and disliked. This helped them to provide appropriate care and support.
- Care plans were up-to-date and were clearly laid out. They were broken down into sections, making it easier to find relevant information. Examples included, physical and mental health, nutrition, continence, skin care, mobility and personal care. Staff said they found the care plans helpful and were able to refer to them at times when they recognised changes in a person's physical or mental health.
- Activities formed an important part of people's lives. The service employed an activities coordinator who enabled people to engage in a variety of activities and spend time in the local community. For example, outside entertainers, arts and crafts, singalongs, cooking and quizzes. One person commented: "I enjoyed the armchair activity today, the person who does it is lovely." People were encouraged to maintain relationships with their friends and family. For example, care plans documented the importance to people of seeing their family and friends.

Meeting people's communication needs

Since 2016 onwards all organisations that provide publicly funded adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). The standard was introduced to make sure people are given information in a way they can understand. The standard applies to all people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss and in some circumstances to their carers.

- We looked at how the provider complied with the Accessible Information Standard. Staff were able to

communicate with and understand each person's requests and changing moods as they were aware of people's known communication preferences. Care records contained clear communication plans explaining how people communicated. For example, one care plan stated, 'speak clearly and slowly. Short sentences, eye contact and time to respond.'

End of life care and support

- People were supported to have peaceful, comfortable and dignified end of life care in line with national best practice guidance. At the time of the inspection there was no-one receiving this type of service. The registered manager said, in the event of this type of support, they worked closely with the community nursing team, GP's and family to ensure people's needs and wishes were met in a timely way. One compliment received regarding end of life care stated: 'I wanted to convey my personal and heartfelt thanks for the care you afforded my mother. She could not have been in a better place to spend her final years. ... your staff unfailingly delivered considerate, professional care.'

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- There were regular opportunities for people to raise issues, concerns and compliments. This was through on-going discussions with staff and members of the management team. People were made aware of the complaints process when they started using the service. They said they would have no hesitation in making a complaint if it was necessary. The complaints procedure set out the process which would be followed by the provider and included contact details of the provider and the Care Quality Commission. This ensured people were given enough information if they felt they needed to raise a concern or complaint.
- A system was in place to record complaints. Complaints were acknowledged and responded to in an appropriate time frame.

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 the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained good.

Good: This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Planning and promoting person-centred, high-quality care and support with openness; and how the provider understands and acts on their duty of candour responsibility; Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements; Continuous learning and improving care

- People, relatives and staff praised the service and the registered manager. Comments included: "The home is a lot better with the new manager"; "I wouldn't dream of taking my relative out of here"; "So much better now. Good morale and comradery" and "Much better now. Management are really supportive."
- The service had implemented a duty of candour policy to reflect the requirements of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014, Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) (Amendments) 2015. This set out how providers need to be open, honest and transparent with people if something goes wrong. The registered manager recognised the importance of this policy to ensure a service people could be confident in.
- Robust audits had been implemented following guidance from the Quality Assurance Improvement Team (QAIT) of the local authority. The QAIT team offers advice and support to providers to meet the quality standards and requirements of regulators and local authority. Audits reviewed people's care plans and risk assessments, incidents and accidents and health and safety. The provider's audit included safety of the premises, staffing needs, presentation of the home and cleanliness. This enabled any trends to be spotted to ensure the service was meeting the requirements and needs of people being supported. Where actions were needed, these had been followed up. For example, care plans had been updated and maintenance jobs completed.
- The registered manager had notified CQC appropriately about any significant events at the service. We use this information to monitor the service and ensure they respond appropriately to keep people safe. The provider had displayed the rating of their previous inspection in the home, which is a legal requirement as part of their registration.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- People's views and suggestions were taken into account to improve the service. Resident meetings took place which took into account people's views about the food, activities and preferences. Surveys had also

been completed by people using the service, relatives and staff. The surveys asked specific questions about the standards of the service and the support it gave people. All comments received were positive. However, where suggestions had been made these had been implemented. For example, a wider variety of activities implemented. The registered manager recognised the importance of ever improving the service to meet people's individual needs. This included the gathering of people's views to improve the quality and safety of the service and the care being provided.

- Staff spoke positively about communication and how the registered manager worked well with them and encouraged an open culture. Staff felt able to raise concerns and were listened to. Staff meetings occurred on a regular basis. Staff confirmed they were kept up to date with things affecting the overall service via team meetings and conversations. Additional meetings took place as part of the service's handover system which occurred at each shift change.

- People's equality, diversity and human rights were respected. The service's vision and values centred around the people they supported. The organisation's statement of purpose documented a philosophy of maximising people's life choices, encouraging independence and people having a sense of worth and value. Our inspection found that the organisation's philosophy was embedded in Southlands Court.

Working in partnership with others

- The service worked with other health and social care professionals in line with people's specific needs. People and staff commented that communication between other agencies was good and enabled people's needs to be met. Care files showed evidence of professionals working together. For example, GPs and district nurses. Regular reviews took place to ensure people's current and changing needs were being met.