Sanctuary Care Limited
Broadmeadow Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region:</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Location address:| London Road
                 Chesterton
                 Stoke-on-Trent
                 Staffordshire
                 ST5 7JG                 |
| Type of service: | Care home service without nursing |
| Date of Publication: | June 2012                   |
| Overview of the service: | Broadmeadow Court provides care for a maximum of 32 people who do not require nursing care. The types of people who may wish to live at Broadmeadow Court includes older people and people with a physical disability |
Our current overall judgement

Broadmeadow Court was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety.

The summary below describes why we carried out this review, what we found and any action required.

Why we carried out this review

We carried out this review as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews.

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, observed how people were being cared for, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

We visited Broadmeadow Court on 15 March 2012, on the day of our visit we spoke with five people who lived at Broadmeadow Court and two relatives. We also spoke with three members of staff and the registered manager.

People we spoke with during our visit were overall happy with their care. People told us they were comfortable. People reported staff were caring and they could approach them with a concern. One person commented "staff look after me very well".

People we spoke with said they were treated with dignity and respect. People told us there were activities they could participate in such as games and walks when the weather was good. People commented they did not have to take participate in activities that they did not like.

People said they enjoyed their meals and they were offered choice, one person told us the food was "very nice". We saw meal times were organised and relaxed. People were supported into the dining area. Staff ensured people were comfortable and had an adequate meal.

The relatives we spoke with were happy with the care received by their family members. Relatives said they felt involved and staff kept them informed of any changes which occurred.

We saw staff attended to people in a caring, considerate manner and responded appropriately to their needs. People's likes, dislikes and religious beliefs were known by staff and included in the delivery of care. For example one person preferred a bath on a particular day we saw evidence this occurred. Records included a section which detailed
individual preference to ensure people had their views considered.

Staff we spoke with showed understanding in areas of safeguarding, equality and diversity. Staff were aware of the management of falls and pressure sores. Staff told us they liked working at Broadmeadow Court. One staff we spoke with said there was a "positive attitude". Staff felt well trained and supported to provide good quality care. Staff understood what constituted abuse and said that they would be able to recognise and report poor practice. This demonstrated people were cared for by appropriately trained staff.

We found systems were in place to ensure the service was improving as a result of findings. For example as a result of feedback improvements had been made to the garden area.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Broadmeadow Court was meeting them

Outcome 01: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run

People living at Broadmeadow Court are treated with dignity and their preferred lifestyles are respected

Outcome 04: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights

People living at Broadmeadow Court experience good care that meets their individual needs and wishes and is delivered in a way they prefer

Outcome 07: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights

Arrangements are in place to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

Outcome 14: Staff should be properly trained and supervised, and have the chance to develop and improve their skills

Staff are trained, supported and supervised to provide care and treatment to people who use service in a competent manner

Outcome 16: The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care

People living at Broadmedow Court benefit from good care as a result of appropriate management of risks

Other information

Please see previous reports for more information about previous reviews.
What we found for each essential standard of quality and safety we reviewed
The following pages detail our findings and our regulatory judgement for each essential standard and outcome that we reviewed, linked to specific regulated activities where appropriate.

We will have reached one of the following judgements for each essential standard.

**Compliant** means that people who use services are experiencing the outcomes relating to the essential standard.

A **minor concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard.

A **moderate concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and there is an impact on their health and wellbeing because of this.

A **major concern** means that people who use services are not experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and are not protected from unsafe or inappropriate care, treatment and support.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary improvements are made. Where there are a number of concerns, we may look at them together to decide the level of action to take.

More information about each of the outcomes can be found in the *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*
Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

What the outcome says
This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:
* Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
* Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
* Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
* Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

What we found

Our judgement
The provider is compliant with Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People we spoke with said they were treated with dignity and respect, one person commented staff "knock on the door before they come into my bedroom". We saw staff knocked on doors before entering rooms. Another person told us "staff treat you as a person and give you respect".

Relatives we spoke with said they felt staff treated people well. We saw staff interacting with people in a kind and caring manner. In one example a member of staff took the opportunity to have their lunch with the residents. This created a friendly atmosphere to engage with people.

Staff we spoke with explained how they treated people with dignity and respect such as maintaining privacy and ensuring person centred care. Staff we spoke with said care and compassion was an important part of their role. One person we spoke with told us "its like how it would be if I was in my own home". This showed people were treated as individuals with their right to privacy and dignity respected.

People told us said they had choice in things like what they ate, clothes they wore and activities they took part in. People told us they were able to make decisions such as what activities they took part in. One person commented "you do what you want".
Another person said there was "no pressure to take part in activities". This demonstrated people had choices available and could make decisions based on them.

People we spoke with felt informed about their care, one person was able to tell us the name of their key worker and was aware of their care plan. Relatives we spoke with told us staff kept them informed of changes.

People we spoke with on the day of our visit said independence was promoted, one person said "staff encourage me to be independent". We saw people who were able encouraged to use walking aids and eat at their own pace. Staff we spoke with said they supported people to do as much as they can for themselves assisting as necessary. People told us they were able to express their views and staff listened.

We saw evidence that resident and relatives meetings took place. We found people had their views considered such as more outings were introduced as a result of feedback.

Other evidence
We do not have further evidence

Our judgement
People living at Broadmeadow Court are treated with dignity and their preferred lifestyles are respected
Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

What the outcome says
This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:
* Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

What we found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The provider is compliant with Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What people who use the service experienced and told us</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During our visit we looked at how people using the service experienced effective and appropriate care which met their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People we spoke with during our visit were overall happy with their care. People told us they were comfortable and felt safe. People reported staff were friendly and they could approach them with concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We saw staff interacting with people who were agitated or confused in a patient and considerate manner. For example one person needed encouragement with personal care, a member of staff approached the person and motivated them to wash and change. This was done in a sensitive manner and the person responded positively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People we spoke with on the day said they received appropriate care. One person we spoke with said the care is “very good”. Relatives we spoke with were overall happy with the delivery of care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People told us there were activities available at the home organised by the activities coordinator. One person said there were activities such as &quot;knitting and bingo&quot; and participating was optional. On the day of our visit we saw the activities co coordinator supporting people with knitting, reminiscence was used to engage with people. People told us there were events taking place such as music sessions which was popular. We saw an activities notice board with details of event and activities taking place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff we spoke with recognised the importance of religious and spiritual beliefs to the health and wellbeing of people. We saw people had items of religious importance within their rooms. People told us they were able to attend church services if they wished. Systems were in place to maintain and promote wellbeing taking into account individual needs, values and diversity.

We observed lunchtime to see how people received their meals and what information and options were available to them. We saw lunchtime was organised and relaxed. Menu cards were placed on each table with information on what was available. We saw choices were available to people, which included a vegetarian option. We saw people received their chosen meal.

One person decided to change what they had ordered and this was accommodated quickly. People we spoke with told us the food was good one person commented the food is "wonderful". We saw staff discussing the menu with people and assisting people who needed support. This ensured people received an adequate meal to maintain physical health.

Staff we spoke with showed understanding in areas relevant to the people they cared for such as the management of pressure sores and falls. We found care plans and risk assessments were in place to identify and manage risks.

People told us they were seen by other professionals such as the dentist and chiropodist to maintain their health. Care records we looked at showed people had input from other professionals. People told us they had medication they needed to prevent ill health, we saw evidence people had received appropriate medication. This demonstrated people received care and support to help meet their health and care needs.

On the day of our visit we found a satisfactory standard of care which ensured people had their care and welfare needs met.

Other evidence
We do not have further evidence

Our judgement
People living at Broadmeadow Court experience good care that meets their individual needs and wishes and is delivered in a way they prefer.
Outcome 07:
Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

What the outcome says
This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:
* Are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are respected and upheld.

What we found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The provider is compliant with Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What people who use the service experienced and told us
People we spoke with on the day of our visit did not report any concerns and said they were happy. Relatives we spoke with reported no issues and told us "staff are very nice" and their family members get the care they need.

We saw visitors signed in and out of the service to ensure safety and suitability of people entering the premises. We saw staff received adult protection training. Staff told us they were aware of the need to safeguard people from harm and were able to explain their role in protecting vulnerable people. Staff spoke with demonstrated how they would report and escalate concerns about poor practice. We saw evidence the service had a safeguarding policy in place so staff were clear about the process for reporting concerns.

Staff we spoke with on the day of our visit did not report any concerns to us. One staff told us they "work as a team "at Broadmeadow Court and people get a good standard of care. We were told by the manager the home had a robust system of recruitment in place. We looked at two staff records and found appropriate checks had been undertaken to ensure people were cared for by suitable staff.

We looked at how monies belonging to people were stored, we found systems were in place to ensure safe keeping. The manager told us they do not use any form of restraint and had not made recent applications for deprivation of liberties.

The manager informed us they do not undertake capacity assessments and no recent
training had been undertaken. We saw evidence some staff had previously received training but no further updates or training had been scheduled.

The manager said they would refer any capacity issues to relevant professionals when necessary. We saw capacity had been considered as part of care planning. We saw evidence people had been referred appropriately for further assessments. Family members were also kept informed and involved in care. Knowledge and awareness of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 ensures people lacking capacity are clearly identified. It also means people have their needs assessed and important decisions are made on their behalf.

Other evidence
We do not have further evidence

Our judgement
Arrangements are in place to safeguard people from the risk of abuse
Outcome 14: Supporting staff

What the outcome says
This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:
* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by competent staff.

What we found

Our judgement
The provider is compliant with Outcome 14: Supporting staff

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
During our visit the staff we spoke with told us they had training opportunities available to them. One member of staff told us they recently enrolled on a leadership course. Staff told us they received induction when they started their post and this prepared them for their role.

Staff said they received appropriate training to meet the needs of people using the service and respond to changes in health. Records indicated staff had referred people to health care professionals appropriately, such as continence services and chiropody. This demonstrated staff were able to recognise when specialist knowledge was required to ensure people had their health needs met.

We saw evidence a number of staff had undertaken training in topics such as dementia care and challenging behaviour. Staff we spoke with were able to explain their role in caring for people with dementia. We observed staff engaging in conversation with people who were distressed in a positive manner which people responded to.

We found staff did not receive formal training in areas such as falls although were able to demonstrate awareness of prevention. This demonstrated people were cared for by staff with the suitable knowledge to support their needs.

Staff we spoke with on the day were able to identify people who needed extra care and attention and explained how they met their care needs. Staff told us they had regular handovers, this ensured appropriate information was shared such as changes in health needs. This meant staff had relevant information for the people they cared for before
starting their shift. Staff said team meetings were infrequent but important information was communicated.

Staff we spoke with told us they had supervision by their manager to provide ongoing support and development. Staff told us they could approach the manager with any concerns. Staff said the manager was on duty regularly so any issues could be addressed quickly.

The manager told us a senior carer was always on duty and as the manager they were not included in staffing numbers. We looked at the staff rota which confirmed a senior care worker was always on duty. This meant staff received appropriate support when on duty. The manager explained the importance of team work and supporting staff to develop during supervision.

We were told by the manager staff shortages were covered by internal staff and if a shift was still not covered as the manager would come. This ensured the delivery of care was not compromised.

Staff said they work well together to provide good quality care. Staff we spoke with on the day were overall happy with the support they received.

People told us they felt comfortable and staff had suitable skills to care for them. Relatives we spoke with were also happy with staff attitude and behaviour and felt they had the appropriate skills to care for their family members.

Other evidence
We do not have further evidence

Our judgement
Staff are trained, supported and supervised to provide care and treatment to people who use service in a competent manner
Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

What the outcome says
This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:
* Benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support, due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

What we found

Our judgement
The provider is compliant with Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us
We saw a complaints procedure on display and contact details for the regional manager in the reception area. This meant people had the option to refer concerns to senior management. People told us they were aware of how to raise a concern or complaint. We were told the service made changes as a result of learning from complaints such as the way information was shared during handover.

We were told by the manager questionnaires were sent out by head office to people using the service for feedback. We saw findings from annual care satisfaction surveys on display. The survey indicated people were overall happy with their meals, this was reflected in what people told us.

Some of the data was not presented in an easy to read format this would have allowed more people to understand and interpret the information. We pointed this out to the manager for consideration. We saw minutes of resident and relatives meetings which had taken place and showed people had their views considered. Requests for trips out to the seaside and local areas were taken on board. People we spoke with told us trips were planned.

We found family members were included in care planning such as supporting people in decision making and consent. The manager told us referrals would be made to relevant professionals if there were concerns about an individual lacking capacity. Arrangements were in place to say who can make decisions that affect people living at Broadmeadow Court.
We saw individual risk assessments were carried out on people using the service in areas such as pressure sores and falls. Assessments were reviewed regularly and acted on appropriately. In one example the care plan for a person at risk of falls stated they needed reminding to use their walking aid. We saw the person had their walking aid near them and staff prompted the person to use it on their way to the dining area.

We saw evidence regular audits were undertaken with regards to keeping people safe. Accident/incidents were recorded and reported appropriately. We found the service was able to identify themes and trends such as falls. A monthly reporting tool was used which coded information such as the number of falls. Individuals at risk of falls had risk assessments and care plans in place to reduce the risk. This demonstrated systems were in place to improve and learn from adverse events.

We saw regular internal medication audits were undertaken to ensure standards were maintained. The medication administration charts we looked at we found to be correct.

We found fire safety audits had been undertaken to ensure health and safety; consideration had also been given to individual evacuation plans.

**Other evidence**
We do not have further evidence

**Our judgement**
People living at Broadmedow Court benefit from good care as a result of appropriate management of risks
What is a review of compliance?

By law, providers of certain adult social care and health care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has written guidance about what people who use services should experience when providers are meeting essential standards, called Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety.

CQC licenses services if they meet essential standards and will constantly monitor whether they continue to do so. We formally review services when we receive information that is of concern and as a result decide we need to check whether a service is still meeting one or more of the essential standards. We also formally review them at least every two years to check whether a service is meeting all of the essential standards in each of their locations. Our reviews include checking all available information and intelligence we hold about a provider. We may seek further information by contacting people who use services, public representative groups and organisations such as other regulators. We may also ask for further information from the provider and carry out a visit with direct observations of care.

When making our judgements about whether services are meeting essential standards, we decide whether we need to take further regulatory action. This might include discussions with the provider about how they could improve. We only use this approach where issues can be resolved quickly, easily and where there is no immediate risk of serious harm to people.

Where we have concerns that providers are not meeting essential standards, or where we judge that they are not going to keep meeting them, we may also set improvement actions or compliance actions, or take enforcement action:

**Improvement actions:** These are actions a provider should take so that they maintain continuous compliance with essential standards. Where a provider is complying with essential standards, but we are concerned that they will not be able to maintain this, we ask them to send us a report describing the improvements they will make to enable them to do so.

**Compliance actions:** These are actions a provider must take so that they achieve compliance with the essential standards. Where a provider is not meeting the essential standards but people are not at immediate risk of serious harm, we ask them to send us a report that says what they will do to make sure they comply. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action to make sure that essential standards are met.

**Enforcement action:** These are actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers are set out in the law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.
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