

Prime Life Limited







# Rutland Care Village

## Inspection report

Huntsmans Drive  
Barleythorpe Road  
Oakham  
Rutland  
LE15 6RP  
Tel: 01572 722350  
Website: www.prime-life.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 20 May 2015  
Date of publication: 16/07/2015

### Ratings

<b>Overall rating for this service</b>	<b>Good</b>	
Is the service safe?	<b>Good</b>	
Is the service effective?	<b>Good</b>	
Is the service caring?	<b>Good</b>	
Is the service responsive?	<b>Requires improvement</b>	
Is the service well-led?	<b>Good</b>	

### Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced inspection of the service on 20 May 2015.

Rutland Care Village provides nursing and personal care for up to 84 people. At the time of our inspection 76 people were using the service. Rutland Care Village is a purpose built home split into four units. The village includes a day care facility.

A registered manager left the service in January 2015 when an interim manager took over the management of the service. At the time of our inspection the interim

manager had applied to be the 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.

# Summary of findings

People were safe because staff knew how to recognise and report signs of abuse. People were supported to be as independent as possible. Enough suitably skilled and experienced staff were available to meet people's needs.

Staff used equipment safely when they transferred people or assisted them with their mobility.

The provider had robust recruitment procedures.

People received their medicines on time.

People using the service told us they felt staff were knowledgeable about their needs. Staff received relevant training and support to be able to meet the needs of people using the service.

The manager, deputy manager and senior staff had a good working knowledge of the relevance of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). Other staff had an awareness of the legislation.

People's nutritional needs were met. People had a choice of foods and drinks and spoke in complimentary terms about the meals that were provided. Staff were attentive to people's health needs and supported people to access health services when they needed them.

Staff were caring. We saw examples of staff showing kindness and compassion. People using the service and their relatives had opportunities to be involved in decisions about their care and support. People were treated with dignity and staff respected people's privacy.

People received care and support that was centred on their needs. However, we saw that recent changes to a person's care plan had not been implemented and they may have been at risk had we not brought the matter to the provider's attention. People had access to social activities and staff supported people to follow their interests and hobbies. The provider had begun to pilot a new programme to support people living with dementia by providing individually tailored activities for them.

People had opportunities to make suggestions and raise concerns. They told us they were confident about raising concerns and that they would be listened to. The provider had acted upon people's comments and feedback, for example in relation to social activities.

The management team were clearly visible and available to people using the service. The management team had clearly defined aims and objectives about what they wanted to achieve for the service. Staff felt well led. The provider had effective procedures for monitoring and assessing 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?

The service was safe.

Staff supported people to understand how they could stay safe. The provider deployed enough staff to ensure that people's needs were met. People received their medicines at the right times.

Good



### Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

Staff had received relevant training and development to be able to meet the needs of people using the service. People were supported with their nutritional needs and had access to health services when they needed them. Staff understood and put into practice the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.

Good



### Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

Staff understood people's needs and developed caring and supportive relationships with people. They supported people to be as independent as possible. People were encouraged to express their views and be involved in the planning and delivery of their care.

Good



### Is the service responsive?

The service was not consistently responsive.

People received care and support that met their individual needs, but changes to a person's care plan were not acted upon until we brought the matter to the manager's attention. Staff supported people to lead active lives based around their hobbies and interests. The provider sought people's views and acted upon their views.

Requires improvement



### Is the service well-led?

The service was well led.

People's views and experience were used to improve the service and staff were involved in developing the service. The provider had effective procedures for monitoring and assessing the quality of the service.

Good

