

<p>Wandsworth LINK</p> <p>Older People's Enter and View report following our visit to a service, including our observations and pulling together the comments made to us in interviews with patients/residents, their family and friends and with staff</p>
<p>Hospital ward/care home visited : Wood House Residential Home</p> <p>Date of visit(s): 04 and 11 November 2011</p>
<p>Interviewer(s) : Alison Tomlin, Jenny Purkis, Peter West</p>
<p>Summary - What we found that residents think of the service :</p> <p>Nearly all the 11 residents we spoke to were able to live independent lives within the bounds of their own particular physical and mental limitations, of which most were very aware. Respect for privacy and how they liked to do things were mentioned as positive aspects of living at Woodhouse by many.</p> <p>Some were very frustrated by their personal situation but thought staff tried very hard on their behalves.</p> <p>Residents generally thought the food was good with a good choice. Cleaning and laundry services were quoted as very good.</p> <p>Whilst there was praise for the efforts made by staff to tailor their daily routines, there was a significant minority of residents we spoke to for whom the activities arranged did not work – some found them boring or childish, appealing to the common denominator. Others mentioned entertainments and outings more positively than in-house activities.</p>
<p>Summary -What we found that friends/family think of the service :</p> <p>We were able to speak briefly to 3 relatives of residents we had spoken to. They were pretty happy with the care being given and found the staff and manager accessible.</p> <p>A relative of a resident who found the activities boring thought she should be nudged more to participate.</p>
<p>Summary - What we found that staff think of the service :</p> <p>We spoke to 7 members of staff and were struck by how long they had worked at Wood House and their almost universal commitment to the ethos of providing personalised care to the residents.</p> <p>Staff were proud about the choice, respect and privacy that they were able to provide residents. They were also positive about their team working, including the input of managers, who were found to be accessible, responsive and supportive.</p> <p>Some staff were aware of the dilemmas of getting more people involved in what was an extensive programme of activities – how much individual flexibility to allow vs how much cajoling. Others mentioned that they thought that the paperwork had got too much.</p>
<p>Summary of our general observations :</p>

We made observations at lunchtime and at other times and found positive and negative examples of care as follows:

+ve: There was a very nice atmosphere at lunchtime in some of the four units – it was personable, pleasant and homely. The TV was on but not watched in two units and not on in another. The specific needs of residents were responded to discreetly. There was good conversation and interaction between residents and between residents and staff, although less in the unit being covered by a new staff member. The food for one resident was kept warm for him until he wished to eat.

+ve: All rooms are light and cheerful, reflecting a good design. There are personal telephones in some rooms and rooms feel like residents' home territory, with some having their own key. Call bells were available and residents said that carers came promptly.

+ve: There were regular visits from Community Nursing.

+ve: Residents who were more able were gently prompted/persuaded to meet their own care needs such as washing, dressing and eating.

-ve: In one unit, meals were served according to a list, regardless of where people were sitting, meaning some residents were waiting at a table until the last diner had been served.

-ve: The activities organiser was distracted by requests for drinks whilst leading an activity.

-ve: There were two complaints about the slow handyman service.