

East Living Limited Breakaway

Inspection report

23 Park Lane, Averley, South Ockendon,
Essex, RM15 4UB
Tel: 01708 861520
Website:

Date of inspection visit: To Be Confirmed
Date of publication: 18/12/2015

Ratings

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 

Overall summary

The Inspection took place on the 06 November 2015.

Breakaway provides accommodation and personal care without nursing for up to four people who have a physical disability or learning disability. The service offers short breaks and respite care. There were two people using the service on the day of our inspection.

The service did have a 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.

Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that was intended to ensure people's safety and welfare. People were cared for safely by staff who had been recruited and employed after appropriate checks had been completed. People's needs were met by sufficient numbers of staff. Medication was dispensed by staff who had received training to do so.

People were safeguarded from the potential of harm and their freedoms were protected. Staff were provided with training in Safeguarding Adults from abuse, Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Summary of findings

People had sufficient amounts to eat and drink to ensure that their dietary and nutritional needs were met. The service worked well with other professionals to ensure that people's health needs were met. People's care records showed that, where appropriate, support and guidance was sought from health care professionals, including a doctor and district nurse.

Staff were attentive to people's needs. Staff were able to demonstrate that they knew people well. Staff treated people with dignity and respect.

People were provided with the opportunity to participate in activities which interested them. These activities were diverse to meet people's social needs. People knew how to make a complaint and complaints had been resolved efficiently.

The service had a number of ways of gathering people's views including using surveys and by talking with people, staff and relatives. The manager carried out a number of quality monitoring audits to help ensure the service was running effectively and to make improvements.

Summary of findings

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 were recruited and employed after appropriate checks were completed. The service had the correct level of staff on duty to meet people's needs.

People were protected from the risk of harm because staff were trained and knew how to respond to any concerns.

Medication was stored appropriately and dispensed in a timely manner when people required it.

Good



Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

Staff received an induction when they came to work at the service. Staff attended various training courses to support them to deliver care and fulfil their role. Staff had sought people's consent to care and treatment.

People's food choices were responded to and there was adequate diet and nutrition available.

People had access to healthcare professionals when they needed to see them.

Good



Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

Staff knew people well and what their preferred routines were. Staff showed compassion towards people.

Staff treated people with dignity and respect.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

Care plans were individualised to meet people's needs. There were varied activities to support people's social and well-being needs.

Complaints and concerns were responded to in a timely manner.

Good



Is the service well-led?

The service was well led.

Staff were provided with the support and guidance to provide a high standard of care and support.

There were systems in place to seek the views of people who used the service and others and to use their feedback to make improvements.

The service had a number of quality monitoring processes in place to ensure the service maintained its standards.

Good



Breakaway

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

This inspection took place on the 06 November 2015 and was unannounced.

The inspection team consisted of one inspector. Before the inspection we reviewed previous reports and notifications that are held on the CQC database. Notifications are important events that the service has to let the CQC know about by law.

We spent time observing care and used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). This is a specific way of observing care to help us understand the experiences of people who were unable to talk to us, due to their complex health needs.

During our inspection we spoke with two people and three relatives, we also spoke with the registered manager, quality assurance manager and three care staff. We reviewed four care files, three staff recruitment files and their support records and audits and policies that were held at the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People felt safe. One person said, “I love it here.” A relative told us, “My [relative] loves it there, he is absolutely safe there and I have no concerns with [relative’s name] safety whilst staying at Breakaway.”

Staff knew how to keep people safe and how to recognise safeguarding concerns. Staff were able to identify how people may be at risk of harm or abuse and what they could do to protect them. A staff member said, “If I had any concerns, I would report it to my manager or CQC or social services.” The service had a policy for staff to follow on ‘whistle blowing’. One member of staff told us, “I would contact CQC if I had any worries.” We saw a poster on the staff noticeboard clearly displayed with contact details for the local safeguarding team if they had any safeguarding concerns.

Staff had the information they needed to support people safely. Staff undertook risk assessments to keep people safe. These assessments identified how people could be supported to maintain their independence. The assessments covered moving and handling, prevention of falls, nutrition assessments and prevention of pressure sores. Staff were trained in first aid, should there be a medical emergency and they knew to call a doctor or paramedic if required.

People were cared for in a safe environment. The registered manager arranged for the maintenance of equipment used including the hoists, lift and fire equipment and held certificates to demonstrate these had been completed. Staff had emergency numbers to contact in the event of such things as a plumbing or electrical emergency.

The service had an effective recruitment process in place, including dealing with applications and conducting employment interviews. Relevant checks were carried out before a new member of staff started working at the service. These included obtaining references, ensuring that the applicant provided proof of their identity and undertaking a criminal record check with the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS).

There were sufficient staff to meet people’s needs. A member of staff told us, “We have enough staff on shifts to make sure everyone is cared for well.” Another said “There is always enough of us on shift as it changes depending who is staying at the time as we know people’s needs well and the manager makes sure there is enough staff.”

Staffing levels were matched to the needs of people living there. On the day of the inspection we observed staff attending to people’s needs in a timely way.

People received their medications safely and as prescribed. Care staff who had received training in medication administration and management dispensed the medication to people. We found that people’s medication was stored in their designated rooms, in a locked wall mounted cabinet. There were systems in place for staff to audit people’s medication, this included people’s medication being ‘checked in’ on their arrival and ‘checked out’ on their departure. This was to minimise any discrepancies of medication during people’s stay at Breakaway.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People were observed with staff and were able to show that they were happy with the care provided. Staff had a good understanding of people's care needs and were able to demonstrate they knew people well and ensured that their care needs were met. A relative told us, "The staff are fantastic, they know [relative's name] ways and what he needs support with." Another relative said, "The staff are great, they have the knowledge to make sure [relative's name] is assisted in everything he needs."

New staff had an induction to help them get to know their role and the people they were supporting. Staff said when they first started at the service they completed their training then worked 'shadowing' more experienced staff. This gave them an opportunity to get to know people and how to best support their needs. One member of staff said, "The induction was very good, I have had lots of training here which has helped me learn my role." This enabled staff who were new to care to gain the knowledge and skills to support them within their role. Records reviewed confirmed what we had been told by staff and the registered manager.

People received effective care from staff who were supported to obtain the knowledge and skills to provide good care. Training was robust and updated as required for all staff. Staff told us that they had been supported to achieve nationally recognised qualifications in care. One staff member told us, "We definitely have enough training here." Another staff member told us, "We have good training here, we have on-line training, face to face training and we also go to head office for training too." Staff were very positive about their training and the support they received from the registered manager to complete this. All the records we reviewed confirmed what we observed and had been told.

Staff felt supported at the service. Staff received regular supervision and support through team meetings. A staff member said, "We have supervision at least every other month if not sooner. If we have any problems or worries the manager always listens and is quick to act on getting things done." The manager told us that they completed observations of staff practice and worked alongside staff to feedback on their skills and performance. Staff said they had regular team meetings to discuss any issues and to learn from any events and share information.

Staff understood how to help people make choices on a day to day basis and how to support them in making decisions. Staff told us that they always consulted with people and supported them with making choices on how they wished to spend their time. People at the service had varying levels of capacity. CQC is required by law to monitor the operation of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The registered manager understood their responsibilities and where appropriate had made applications under the act. Where assessments indicated a person did not have the capacity to make a particular decision, there were processes in place for others to make a decision in the person's best interests.

People were supported to eat and drink enough and their nutritional needs were met. A menu was displayed on a chalkboard and the service also had the menus in a pictorial format for people. Staff and relatives said people had plenty of choice over what they wanted to eat and if they did not like the choices on the menu they could have an alternative. One person was observed to make a choice of the food they wanted and was given the support by staff to prepare the meal of their choice. This meant that staff were actively involving the person and promoted their independence. We saw throughout the day people were provided with food and drinks. The registered manager told us that the service had recently held 'cooking nights' for people. These had included a Mexican and Nigerian theme, this gave people the opportunity to taste different foods if they wished to. One relative told us, "[Relative's name] loved the Nigerian night, he really enjoyed the food."

People generally gained support for their health within the community whilst living at home although the service had contacted professionals that had been involved with people and gained advice regarding the person's needs. For example, the service had been in contact with behavioural therapists and GPs. Information about people's health and general needs had been gained as part of the assessment process, which helped staff to ensure appropriate support could be maintained during their stay. People told us that the service requested written information from their GP about all aspects of their health and medication needs before they came to stay in the service for the first time and requested updates for the person for any subsequent stays.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Staff had positive relationships with people. They showed kindness and compassion when speaking with them. Staff took their time to talk with people and showed them that they were important. Staff had a very good knowledge of people's needs, likes and preferences. A relative told us, "They [staff] have built a great rapport with [relative's name] and know exactly how he likes things done."

Staff were caring towards people when supporting them to meet their needs. Throughout our observations there were positive interactions between staff and people. One person was seen to be looking through a book with a member of staff. The person had communication difficulties although it was clear that the person was enjoying this interaction and the staff member was communicating in a way that the person could understand and this was seen to have a positive outcome. A relative told us, "The staff are all very caring, they make sure that [relative's name] is cared for very well."

People's needs were attended to in a timely manner by staff. We saw staff quickly diffuse a situation when one person became agitated. The staff demonstrated good skills and knowledge of the person and how to manage their anxieties in a caring way.

People and their relatives were actively involved in making decisions about their care. A relative told us, "They [staff] always ask us if anything has changed with [relative's name]." Staff reviewed people's care plans and discussed these with people and their relatives as appropriate, this was done prior to the planned stay at Breakaway. One member of staff said they reviewed people's care plans on a regular basis to make sure that the information held for people was current and reflected their needs fully.

People's diverse needs were respected. People had access to individual religious support should they require this.

Staff treated people with dignity and respect. We saw that staff always respected their privacy. Staff knew the preferred way people liked to be addressed and we saw staff were respectful in their interactions with people.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

The service was responsive to people's needs. People and their relatives were involved in planning and reviewing their care needs. People were supported as individuals, including looking after their social interests and well-being. A relative told us, "The staff always let me know if there are any concerns regarding [relative's name]."

Before people came to the service for their planned break their needs were assessed to see if they could be met. One relative said, "[relative's name] has been going there [the service] for many years, but they still call to see if there have been any changes to his needs before he goes back again."

Staff had a good understanding of people's care needs and routines. They were able to describe how people liked to be supported and what their preferred routines were. Staff had a good understanding of person centred care. The care plans were reviewed prior to people staying at Breakaway. The registered manager told us that a call to the person and their families were made one week prior to their planned stay, this was to discuss if there had been any changes to the person's health or care needs. The manager confirmed that if there had been significant changes a home visit to the person would be carried out and a full

assessment was completed to ensure the service could meet the person's current needs. This told us that the care provided by staff was up to date and relevant to people's needs.

People were encouraged to follow their own interests at the service or in the community. People were supported to keep community contacts. For example; People were supported to attend activities of their interest in the community.

People enjoyed varied pastimes and the management and staff engaged with people to ensure their lives were enjoyable and meaningful. We saw that the service had access to the internet for people during their stay and also games consoles were available for use. The registered manager explained that there were no planned activities as people were asked individually on a daily basis what they would like to do.

The service had a robust complaints process in place that was accessible and all complaints were dealt with effectively. Relatives said if they had any concerns or complaints they would raise these with the manager. One relative said, "If I had concerns or worries I would call the manager and I know that I would be listened to, but I have never had to complain to be honest."

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The service had a registered manager in post. The registered manager was visible within the service and would be available for people to meet with. They had a very good knowledge of all the people staying at the service and their relatives.

People and relatives felt at ease discussing any issues with the manager. One person said, “You can always speak to [manager], they will always have time to listen to you.”

Staff felt the manager was very supportive to their roles and said, “If I have any worries or problems, I can always go to them and they will help.” Staff also said they felt that their opinions were listened to, one said, “We are involved in what happens here and we can have our say in things too.” Another staff member said, “[manager] is very supportive with me.”

Staff had regular supervision, observations of their practice, handover meetings and team meetings to discuss people’s care and the running of the service. Staff also had a handover meeting between each shift, to discuss any care needs or concerns that had happened and used a communication book to share information. One member of staff said, “We all work well together here to make sure everyone is safe and happy staying here.” This demonstrated that people were cared for by staff who were well supported in performing their role.

Staff shared the manager’s and provider’s vision for the service. Staff told us, “Everyone wants the same thing, for people to be happy and safe here.” The registered manager told us that their aim was to support both people and their family to ensure they felt at home and happy when staying at the service.

The registered manager gathered people’s views on the service through meetings with relatives and people and through the use of questionnaires. They gathered opinions on people’s care, the performance of the service and staff, and any changes or improvements that people felt were needed. The service sent monthly newsletters to people to keep them informed of upcoming events and also report on events that had recently happened. This showed that the management listened to people’s views and responded accordingly, to improve their experience at the service.

The registered manager had a number of quality monitoring systems in place to continually review and improve the quality of the service provided to people. For example they carried out regular audits on people’s care plans, medication management and infection control. They used this information as appropriate to improve and monitor the care people received.