

The Percy Hedley Foundation

## Able 2

### Inspection summary

CQC carried out an inspection of this care service on 12 April 2016. This is a summary of what we found.

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 ●

Able 2 is operated by The Percy Hedley Foundation. The office is located within a day centre on a large site in Forest Hall, North Tyneside. The service provided care and support to eight adults in their own home who had physical and/or learning disabilities.

This inspection took place on the 12 April 2016 and was unannounced. We last inspected this service in May 2014, at which time we found them to be compliant against all of the regulations that we inspected.

The service had 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.

People told us they felt safe in their own home being supported by the staff from Able 2. Staff had a thorough understanding of safeguarding procedures. No concerns of a safeguarding nature had occurred, however the registered manager was fully aware of her responsibilities with regards to protecting people from harm or improper treatment. Other policies, procedures and systems were in place to ensure the service was operated well.

There were enough staff by the service to ensure it was run safely and effectively. Staff supported people on a one to one basis and regular cover was available from a bank of staff from across the Percy Hedley Foundation. We saw staff rotas were planned in advance and people received a consistent service.

Care plans were very person-centred. Care needs and risks were regularly reviewed and updated. Control measures and positive strategies were in place to direct staff in the event of an incident.

There had been no accidents or incidents since the last inspection. However the registered manager had a system in place to record, investigate and monitor these should an event occur. The registered manager was aware of her responsibility to report all incidents to external bodies as necessary.

Care records contained personal emergency evacuation plans. The staff we spoke with told us they were confident and trained to deal with emergencies.

Medicines were well managed and staff followed safe working practices. People were encouraged and supported by staff to self-medicate wherever possible. Medicine was administered safely and accurately recorded.

Annual surveys were used to gather the views and opinions of people, their supporters and staff about the service they received. Advocates were involved as necessary to ensure all people were able to engage with the service.

The registered manager and staff had an understanding of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) and their own responsibilities. Staff were trained in MCA principals and care records demonstrated the service worked within these principals.

Staff told us they received a thorough induction into the service and shadowed more experience workers. We saw evidence which showed on-going training took place. Formal supervision and appraisal had also taken place as well as informal supervisory discussions. The registered manager was in regular contact with the staff.

As staff mainly supported people to access the community, sometimes meals were eaten in café's or restaurants. One staff member told us they supported a person to cook and bake at home as this was their preference.

The staff we spoke with displayed genuine, kind and caring attitudes. They spoke about people as individuals and knew them very well. In the feedback we read from people who used the service, people said staff offered them choices and encouraged them to make decisions. People who responded to our survey said they were respected by staff and their privacy and dignity was maintained. The daily notes we reviewed reflected these values and behaviours.

People chose to take part in a range of activities that were personal and meaningful to them. The staff encouraged people to maintain community links by supporting people to access activities within their community as well as at home.

The complaints procedure was published within the 'service user' guide. People who responded to our survey said they'd had no cause to complain, but knew how to do so if necessary. The staff we spoke with told us they were very confident to approach the registered manager about anything.

All of the records we examined were comprehensive, up to date and well maintained. Regular audits of these records were carried out by the registered manager and the provider. This demonstrated the registered manager and the provider monitored the safety and quality of the service.

You can ask your care service for the full report, or find it on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk) or by telephoning **03000 616161**