

Care Quality draft assessment for St Vincent's Nursing Home - Care Homes

Overview

Overall Rating: Good ●

The service is performing well and meeting our expectations.

Summary

Safe	Good 	Read this section
Effective	Good 	Read this section
Caring	Good 	Read this section
Responsive	Good 	Read this section
Well-led	Good 	Read this section

Overall Service Commentary

Date of assessment 12 – 23 September 2024. We carried out an unannounced visit to the service on 17 September 2024. The assessment took place because we had received concerns about safety of care and treatment provided to people using the service. During the assessment, we found the provider had made improvements to the service and learnt from things that had gone wrong. We found people received good quality care, they were safe, and their needs were met. St Vincent's Nursing Home is a care home with nursing for up to 62 older people. At the time of our assessment, 59 people were living at the service. The service was well-led, and leaders worked with external partners to review and improve the service. The rating at the last inspection was good (published 23 February 2022). Following this assessment, the service has remained good. We did not assess all quality statements. We did not identify concerns relating to these areas which we judged as being met at our last inspection.

Overall People's Experience

We met with 13 people who lived at the service and 5 visiting relatives. We also spoke with the staff on duty, who included the registered manager, clinical lead, nurses, healthcare assistants and activity staff. We received written feedback from an external professional who worked closely with the service. We observed how people were being cared for and supported. Our observations included the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). SOFI is a way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us. The -assessment team included 5 inspectors, a member of the CQC medicines team and an Expert by Experience. An Expert by Experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service. People told us they felt safe and well looked after. They said there were enough staff. They felt their needs were well met and staff were suitably trained. People took part in a range of activities. People's health care needs were met, and they were able to make choices about their care and support. We saw staff were kind, respectful and knew people well.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 72.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is safe

Commentary

The provider had systems to learn when things went wrong. Learning was shared with staff and there had been improvements to safety and people's care as a result of this. Medicines were managed in a safe way. There were enough staff deployed to provide safe and effective care. Staff received a range of suitable training and support to help make sure they knew how to meet people's needs. There were systems designed to safeguard people from abuse and improper treatment. Risks to people's safety and wellbeing had been assessed and planned for. The environment was safely maintained and clean. We did not assess all the quality statements within this key question. We did not identify concerns relating to these areas which we judged as being met at our last inspection.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Learning culture

Overall Score



[▶ How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score:    

People told us they felt the provider learnt when things went wrong. They explained that the provider apologised and asked for their views to help improve the service.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score:    

Staff were able to describe the process for responding to accidents, incidents and concerns. They told us these were recorded, investigated and they had discussions with managers to help them learn how to make improvements.

Processes

Score:    

There were clear records to show how all adverse events had been investigated and responded to. The provider had systems to oversee all events and to identify any themes. There were clear systems to learn from these and make improvements. The provider had met with staff and provided them with training and guidance following incidents. They had made referrals to external professionals when needed. Care plans and assessments had been updated and the management team liaised with people using the service and their representatives to involve them in making the improvements.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Safeguarding

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience



People using the service and their relatives felt safe. They told us staff were supportive, knew them well and carried out good quality care. People said there was good security. People knew what to do if they had concerns and who to speak with.

Feedback from staff and leaders



Staff supported people in a safe way.

Observation

Score: 1 2 3 4

Staff told us they had undertaken training around safeguarding people from abuse. They knew what to do if they had safeguarding concerns and how to report these.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

There were systems and procedures to safeguard people from abuse. Following concerns, the provider had worked with the local authority and other agencies to investigate these and help put in place measures to protect people. Following other concerns earlier in 2024, the provider had undertaken large scale improvements to help protect everyone from the concerns that had been identified. These included training staff, liaising with other professionals, improving reporting systems and improving care plans and record keeping. They had also reviewed their systems for communicating with relatives to make sure people felt heard and had opportunities to speak up.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Involving people to manage risks

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score:    

People felt risks were well managed. They told us they had been consulted about their assessments and felt safe systems were in place. Some people told us they wore pendant alarms, and this helped them to feel secure because the staff were attentive and responded quickly when needed.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score:    

Staff told us they had undertaken training about safe moving and handling and how to support people in a safe way. Staff understood about how to help prevent falls and identify when people's needs changed and they were placed at risk.

Observation

Score:    

We saw staff supporting people to move safely. People were supported with eating and drinking in a safe way.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The staff assessed risks to people's safety and wellbeing. They created risk management plans. These were personalised. Plans and assessments were regularly reviewed and updated when needed.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe environments

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 3 4

People told us they liked the environment. They said it was well designed, clean and comfortable.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score:

1

2

3

4

Staff explained they carried out checks on the environment and equipment.

Observation

Score:

1

2

3

4

The home was set in attractive grounds with well kept gardens. The corridors and communal rooms were light, airy and ventilated. People were able to personalise their rooms. There were 4 'Wings' of accommodation. People had ensuite facilities and each Wing had a lounge and dining area. There was also a chapel and rooms for socialising, meetings and prayer.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The provider had systems for checking the environment and equipment were safe and met people's needs.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe and effective staffing

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience



People told us there were enough staff to meet their needs and keep them safe. They explained staff came quickly when they needed help. They liked the staff and felt they had good skills.

Feedback from staff and leaders



Staff told us they were well supported. They explained they had inductions and a range of training to help them understand their roles and responsibilities.

Observation

Score:

1

2

3

4

We saw there were enough staff on duty and people received care when needed.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The provider employed nursing staff who worked with care assistants to help meet people's needs. The systems for selecting and recruiting staff were robust and included a range of checks on their suitability and competencies. Staff undertook training and had regular meetings with the management team.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Infection prevention and control

Overall Score

1

2

3

4

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with

them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 3 4

People told us the environment was kept clean.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score: 1 2 3 4

Staff explained they had undertaken training regarding infection prevention and control. They told us there was enough personal protective equipment (PPE).

Observation

Score: 1 2 3 4

We saw the environment was clean. There were allocated staff employed to keep the service clean and to manage laundry.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider carried out checks on infection control and cleanliness. There were suitable systems for managing laundry, waste and cleaning.

Safe

Medicines optimisation

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience



People received their medicines safely and as prescribed. Their medicines were regularly reviewed by GPs working alongside staff. Medicines were administered in a timely way and people were happy with the support they received.

Feedback from staff and leaders



The staff and managers responsible for managing medicines understood the principle of medicines optimisation and said they helped people get medicine

reviews. Staff said they were given an induction, training and were competency assessed to handle medicines safely.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

Medicines were stored securely and safely. People were prescribed medicines for pain relief, rescue medicines for seizures, and medicines for constipation to be taken on a when required (PRN) basis. Guidance in the form of PRN protocols were in place to help staff give these medicines safely. The medicines administration recording system was fit for purpose and stocks of prescribed medicines were managed appropriately. The staff recorded the date of opening for liquid medicines. There was a medicine policy in place and staff were aware of this. The staff carried out regular medicine audits. They identified concerns related to medicines management and the actions that were taken to improve practice.

Effective

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is effective

Commentary

People's needs and choices were assessed. These assessments were regularly reviewed, and staff created care plans to show how people's needs should be met. The staff worked closely with external professionals to assess, monitor and meet people's healthcare needs. People had consented to their care and treatment. We did not assess all the quality statements within this key question. We did not identify concerns relating to these areas which we judged as being met at our last inspection.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Effective

Assessing needs

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score:

1

2

3

4

People told us their needs were assessed and they were consulted about their care and treatment.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score:

1

2

3

4

Staff understood and read care plans and assessments. They told us this helped them to know people's needs.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The provider had improved their preadmission process to help make sure more thorough assessments were undertaken. We saw these were comprehensive and looked at a range of needs. Care plans included guidance on how to meet people's needs and these care plans reflected good practice guidance.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Effective

Delivering evidence-based care and treatment

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience



People were happy with the care they received. They were able to see external healthcare professionals when needed.

Feedback from staff and leaders



Staff had a good understanding of best practice guidance and how to provide good care and support. They were able to tell us about this.

Processes



The provider monitored people's health and wellbeing. Staff kept records of changes in their conditions, food and fluid intake and other aspects of their care. They had

effective systems for identifying and responding to changes to make sure people stayed safe and well. The provider worked with other professionals. There were examples of how the support people had received had helped people to increase their mobility, gain weight and improve their health.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Effective

Consent to care and treatment

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience



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 MCA 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 make 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

Mental Capacity Act (MCA). In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). People told us they had consented to care. Their relatives told us they were involved in making decisions in people's best interests.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score: 1 2 3 4

Staff understood how people communicated. They explained about the care they were providing so people understood this. Staff undertook training about the MCA.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider had followed the MCA. They had assessed people's capacity and applied for DoLS when needed. The provider monitored when DoLS needed renewing and made sure conditions with these were monitored and met.

Caring

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is caring

Commentary

People were treated with kindness and had good relationships with staff. They were able to make choices and were supported with a range of activities as well as to pursue their personal interests and faith. We did not assess all the quality statements within this key question. We did not identify concerns relating to these areas which we judged as being met at our last inspection.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Caring

Kindness, compassion and dignity

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience



People using the service and their relatives told us they were well treated. They said staff were kind, caring and considerate. Their comments included, "The care is wonderful" and "I think it is a lovely place."

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score: 1 2 3 4

The staff spoke about people with fondness and compassion.

Feedback from Partners

Score: 1 2 3 4

We received feedback from an external professional who had regular contact with the service. They told us they were "confident residents are being well looked after and they consistently appear clean, tidy and well cared for."

Observation

Score: 1 2 3 4

We witnessed kind and considerate care. Staff responded swiftly when people needed them. They used polite and gentle language. People were not rushed and were supported to make choices. Staff made sure they respected people's privacy when talking about them, talking with them and when providing care. Staff asked for people's permission before supporting them and explained what they were doing.

Treating people as individuals

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience



People told us they were treated as individuals. Staff used their preferred names, titles and pronouns.

Feedback from staff and leaders



Staff were able to describe about people's individual needs and how they supported them to meet these.

Observation

Score:

1

2

3

4

People's bedrooms were personalised and reflected their interests. People's dietary preferences and how they liked to spend their time were known and respected. Staff were prompt to respond to individual needs and requests for attention or support.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The staff had created personalised care plans which described people's individual needs and preferences. These were regularly reviewed and updated.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Caring

Independence, choice and control

Overall Score

1

2

3

4

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score:

1

2

3

4

People had been asked whether they had preferences about the gender of the staff supporting them. People told us they were able to make decisions about their care. People were given choices and supported to maintain independence. We saw people were offered choices by staff. For example, what they wanted to do, where they wanted to spend time and what they wanted to eat and drink.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score:

1

2

3

4

Staff told us they understood about people's different communication needs and how to offer them meaningful choices. The activities lead told us about how they spoke with people to identify their interests and hobbies. They organised events and activities to reflect these.

Observation

Score:

1

2

3

4

We saw people were offered choices by staff. People were supported to take part in a range of activities.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The provider employed a team of staff to organise and facilitate activities. They were also looking at ways to increase all staff involvement in this to help people meet their social and leisure needs outside of organised activities. We saw people were encouraged to be independent.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Caring

Workforce wellbeing and enablement

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Feedback from staff and leaders



The staff told us they felt well supported. They said the management team cared about their wellbeing and did their best to support them.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The provider had various processes to support staff wellbeing. They had an employee 'wellness' package which included confidential counselling and support to staff who needed this and their relatives. The organisation had improved some terms and conditions for staff. The registered manager told us they were looking at ways to support employees to feel more valued and to speak up. These included empowering staff to speak up in team meetings and providing information to help them learn and be part of service improvements.

Responsive

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is responsive

Commentary

People received personalised care which met their needs and reflected their preferences. There were examples of how people's health and wellbeing had improved since they moved to the service. People's diverse needs were assessed and met. The service was a Catholic community. The majority of people living at the service were practicing Catholics. There were opportunities for worship and there was full time priest working at the home. People of all faiths were welcome and had

opportunities to celebrate their culture and religion. We did not assess all the quality statements within this key question. We did not identify concerns relating to these areas which we judged as being met at our last inspection.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Person-centred Care

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience



Score: People told us they received personalised care which met their needs and reflected their preferences.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score: 1 2 3 4

Staff were able to tell us about the individual needs of people who they were caring for. They knew them well and knew about different aspects of their care. They were able to tell us how they liaised with multidisciplinary teams, including visiting nurses and therapists. They explained how they monitored people's conditions and how care plans were adjusted to reflect changes in their needs.

Observation

Score: 1 2 3 4

We observed staff were supportive and attentive. They gave people choices and provided personalised care. For example, we observed 1 person who was experiencing dementia spent a lot of the day walking around. The staff did not restrict them but monitored their wellbeing and made sure chairs were available for them to sit down if they needed. The staff also asked them to help with tasks including taking jugs of water into different rooms. This ensured the person was able move around freely and also felt valued because they were able to help staff.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Providing Information

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

► How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 3 4

People told us they had the information they needed about the service and were able to find out information. Menus and information about activities and religious events were displayed. Staff gave people verbal prompts and information about what was happening and helped people to understand this.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score: 1 2 3 4

Staff told us they had training around good communication. They demonstrated a good understanding about how to provide information to help people make meaningful choices.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

Care plans included information about how each person communicated and the support they needed to understand information. There were personalised instructions for staff, for example about checking and monitoring hearing aids and people's glasses.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Responsive

Listening to and involving people

Overall Score

1

2

3

4

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score:

1

2

3

4

People told us there were opportunities for them to provide feedback to staff and managers.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score:

1

2

3

4

Staff were able to explain how people were involved and encouraged to speak up about their experiences. People were supported by the same regular staff and were familiar with them. The staff explained that each month they met with people to review their care plans and discuss how they felt about the service.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

There were processes for listening to people. These included managers regularly spending time on the wings where people lived and speaking with them, formal meetings and feedback forms about specific areas of care. For example, there were daily feedback forms regarding food. Relatives and visitors were invited to social events and informal 'drop in' sessions to talk with the management team.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Responsive

Equity in experiences and outcomes

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

People and their relatives told us they were encouraged to participate in a wide range of activities. These reflected their individual interests and needs. The service was a Catholic care home and there was provision for people to worship with each other and the priest. There were daily masses, and these were live streamed into bedrooms for people who could not attend the chapel. There was also a range of other organised events and opportunities for praise. People were supported to celebrate special events, festivals and feast days. People and their relatives told us the religious support they received was important to them. Some of their comments included, "I attend mass every day" and "The staff know and understand my religious needs and this is important to me." People from other faiths were welcome and the registered manager told us they were looking at ways to provide a more diverse range of worship opportunities for people to celebrate different faiths. The provider ensured people's individual needs were considered when planning care. For example, they had recently changed the type of lightbulbs in one person's room because they had limited sight.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score: 1 2 3 4

Staff told us supported people with diverse needs. Some staff told us about the support they offered people with their cultural needs. One staff member described how they provided care and support to a person who was blind. They explained how they offered plates of food and described where the food items were for the person to be independent.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider had procedures to help ensure people using the service and staff were treated equitably and their individual needs and diversity were respected. Staff came from a range of different cultural backgrounds. We saw some staff shared a cultural heritage with people and were able to utilise their experience to offer personalised care. There was a resident chaplain who lived within the grounds and provided support to meet people's religious needs. The building was designed to enable people to move around independently and without restrictions, apart from where there was a safety risk, such as access to stairwells without support. The provider had produced information for people about different parts of the service, such as the food being offered and leaflets about how to use telephones for people who were struggling with these.

Well-led

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is well-led

Commentary

The provider's visions and values were aligned to the religious community. Staff felt well supported and that the service was well-led. There were effective systems for monitoring and improving the quality of the service and learning when things went wrong. We did not assess all the quality statements within this key question. We did not identify concerns relating to these areas which we judged as being met at our last inspection.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Shared direction and culture

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score:

1

2

3

4

Staff told us they understood and were happy to work towards the values of the organisation. They felt there was a good culture and positive leadership. Some of the comments from staff included, "The managers and staff team are very supportive, and I feel comfortable doing my job", "Communication is very good", "People are happy to come to work" and "There is a good environment and relationships between residents and staff."

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The provider had values which were closely aligned to the Catholic faith as well as principles of individualised care and support. They provided staff with a range of training and support opportunities to help them to work to these values.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Well-led

Capable, compassionate and inclusive leaders

Overall Score

1

2

3

4

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Feedback from staff and leaders

Score:

1

2

3

4

Staff felt supported by the management team. They told us the managers were open and approachable.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The registered manager was supported by a senior leadership team. They knew the service well including individual people living there and staff. They were proactive in identifying problems and improving these. The registered manager told us they involved staff in understanding and making improvements. The staff confirmed this and felt they were involved and supported by the leadership team.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Freedom to speak up

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Feedback from staff and leaders



Staff told us they felt able to speak up. They said that people living at the service, families and other staff felt able to raise concerns and felt listened to. They told us they were not fearful of negative consequences.

Processes



There were processes to allow staff to speak up if they had concerns. The management team were accessible and worked alongside staff. There were regular meetings with staff. There were also systems for staff to raise concerns anonymously and speak in private to senior leaders.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Governance, management and sustainability

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Feedback from staff and leaders



Staff told us they understood their roles and responsibilities.

Processes



There were effective systems for monitoring and improving the quality of the service. These included dealing with complaints and adverse events as well as a range of audits. The management team had developed action plans to show how and when improvements would be made. The managers regularly met to review the service and discuss improvements. The provider had systems to help stakeholders share their feedback. These included surveys and meetings. There were a range of policies and procedures. These reflected good practice and legislation. They were regularly reviewed and updated.

Well-led

Learning, improvement and innovation

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Feedback from staff and leaders



Staff told us they had opportunities to learn and be part of making improvements. They explained how they had been given guidance and training following incidents and when things went wrong.

Processes



The managers produced a regular update for staff to help them learn develop shared learning. This included best practice guidance, feedback from stakeholders and

themes for learning where the management team had identified a need for improvement. The managers had systems to monitor and evaluate the service, including reviewing policies and procedures, record keeping and staff practice.