

Runwood Homes Limited

Longview

Inspection report

Little Gypps Road
Canvey Island
Essex
SS8 9HG

Tel: 01268682906
Website: www.runwoodhomes.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
18 January 2017
25 January 2017

Date of publication:
10 February 2017

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 ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

This inspection took place on 18 and 25 January 2017. Longview is a residential care home for up to 70 older people some of whom may be living with dementia. When we inspected there were 68 people living in the service.

At our last inspection, the service was rated good and at this inspection we found the service remained good.

The service was safe. People received a safe service and were protected from the risk of harm. There were enough staff that had been safely recruited to help keep people safe and meet their needs. Medication management was good and people received their medication as prescribed.

The service was effective. People were cared for by experienced and well trained staff. The service ensured that people had the support they needed to have as much choice and control over their lives in the least restrictive way possible. People received sufficient food and drink to meet their needs and preferences and their healthcare needs were met.

The service was caring. Staff knew the people they cared for well and were kind, caring and compassionate in their approach. People were encouraged and supported to remain as independent as possible. Staff ensured that people were treated with dignity and respect and their privacy was maintained at all times.

The service was responsive. People were fully involved in the assessment and care planning process. Their care plans had been regularly reviewed to reflect their changing needs. People were encouraged and supported to participate in a range of activities to suit their individual interests. Complaints were dealt with appropriately in a timely way.

The service was well-led. People were positive about the quality of the service. The registered manager and staff were committed to providing people with good quality person centred care that met their needs and preferences. There were good systems in place to monitor the quality of the service and to drive improvements. The service met all relevant fundamental standards.

Further information is in the detailed findings below.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Good ●

The service remains good.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains good.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains good.

Longview

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 checked 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 18 and 25 January 2017 and it was unannounced on 18 January 2017 and announced on 25 January 2017. The inspection was carried out by two inspectors 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.

Before the inspection, the provider completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We also reviewed other information that we hold about the service such as safeguarding information and notifications. Notifications are the events happening in the service that the provider is required to tell us about. We used this information to plan what areas we were going to focus on during our inspection.

During the inspection we used 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.

We spoke with 12 people, six of their relatives, the registered manger, the deputy manager, a visiting hairdresser and 12 members of staff. We reviewed seven people's care files, seven staff recruitment and support files, training records and quality assurance information.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At this inspection we found the same level of protection from abuse, harm and risks to people's safety as at the previous inspection and the rating continues to be good.

People repeatedly told us they felt safe living at the service, one person said, "I feel that the staff look after me well and keep me and my property safe." A relative told us, "I have peace of mind when I am not here because they [staff] care for my relative wonderfully." Staff demonstrated a good understanding of how to protect people from the risk of harm. There were clear policies, procedures and guidelines for staff to refer to when needed and safeguarding issues had been dealt with appropriately.

Staff described how they kept people safe. One staff member said, "I always ensure that I support people to move as independently as they can." A visiting relative told us, "The staff do their best to protect my relative as they can no longer walk very well and are prone to falling. They take it very seriously and took action to help protect them, they do their very best." There were risk assessments and management plans in place to minimise any risks to people's health, safety and welfare.

People told us there were enough staff and that they never felt rushed. Staff told us, and the duty rotas confirmed that there were enough of them to care for people safely. The service employed sufficient numbers of skilled and experienced staff to meet people's assessed needs. There was a robust recruitment process where all appropriate checks were carried out before staff started work at the service. Two people told us that the registered manager 'did a good job getting nice staff'. One of them said, "I think they employ the right sort of people here – it's not a job for everyone."

There was a safe system in place for managing medication. People told us that they received their medication in good time and that staff never rushed them. We carried out a random check of the medication system and observed a medication round. We found that the system was in good order with clearly completed records and we saw that medication was administered appropriately. Staff had been trained and had their competence to administer medication regularly assessed. People received their medication as prescribed.

The service was clean and hygienic and regular checks had been carried out to ensure that infection control practices were adhered to.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At this inspection we found staff had the same level of skills, experience and support as they did at the previous inspection and the rating continues to be good.

Views on how supported staff felt varied. Most staff said they felt supported; however a number of staff members told us they did not. All of the staff spoken with said that people always received good care but their needs were greater and more people needed higher levels of support. One staff member said, "It is hard work as there are more people that need two staff to support them to get up in the morning. It is difficult to get everyone up, washed and dressed and in the lounge at a reasonable time. I find it hard to do all what needs to be done, including all of the paperwork." We discussed this issue with the registered manager and the deputy manager and they told us, and the meeting notes confirmed that staff had the opportunity to discuss any issues under 'any other business' at staff meetings. The registered manager and deputy manager immediately took action by adding staff's issues as an agenda item rather than asking them under any other business. They said the new format would be used at the planned January 2017 staff meetings so that any areas of staff concern could be fully discussed and addressed.

All of the staff told us, and the records confirmed that they had regular supervision, appraisal and team meetings. One staff member said, "I have regular meetings with my line manager where I can discuss any issues and any training that I need and the manager and deputy are supportive." Another staff member told us, "I get on with my work and like working here. We have plenty of opportunity to raise any issues at staff meetings and the manager's door is always open."

Staff had the knowledge and skills to care for people effectively. People told us they felt that staff were well trained. People told us, 'Staff can deal with anything here'. 'Nothing seems to phase them', and, 'They always know what to do'. Visiting relatives told us they felt that staff were well trained and, 'knew their job'. Staff told us, and the records confirmed that they had received a wide range of training appropriate for their role which had been regularly updated. They said they had been encouraged and supported to attain a qualification in care. People were cared for by well trained staff.

People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty were being met. Staff had been trained in MCA and DoLS and they had a good understanding of how to support people in making decisions. One staff member said, "I have had training and know that decisions need to be made in a person's best interests." Where necessary appropriate DoLS applications had been made to the local authority and there were authorisations in place where needed.

People were supported to have sufficient to eat and drink and to maintain a balanced diet. The lunchtime experience was a pleasant one. The tables were nicely laid out with condiments and we observed friendly

banter between residents and staff throughout the mealtime. People repeatedly told us they were given a wide choice of food that it was very tasty. One person said, "The food is good. I give it nine out of 10." Where people needed support with their meal staff supported them in a sensitive and respectful way. Where necessary people's dietary intake had been recorded and their weight monitored to ensure that had enough food and drink to keep them healthy.

People's healthcare needs were met. They shared many examples with us such as how they were supported to attend dental, opticians and GP appointments. People told us that staff knew when they were unwell and took the necessary action. One person said, "My health has improved so much since I came to live here. I have gained weight and more independence." There were clear records of health related visits together with the outcomes and any further actions needed.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection we found that people were still cared for by kind, caring and compassionate staff and the rating continues to be good.

People consistently told us they were treated with kindness by all of the staff and we observed compassionate, caring staff interaction throughout our visits. One person said, "Staff always stop and have a laugh with me, it's really nice." Another person said, "It just feels good here – staff are very kind. I've never seen anybody cross or nasty with people." A visiting relative told us, "The staff are very caring, nothing is too much trouble." Staff provided people with a supportive and caring place to live.

People and their relatives were actively involved in making decisions about their care and support. Relatives told us they were kept fully involved. One relative said, "They [staff] really encourage relatives to visit and get involved with the home, they seem to understand that it is tough for us too." People's care plans provided detailed information about their likes and dislikes and described how they wanted to be cared for.

People had a named key worker who was responsible for ensuring that they had everything they needed and that their diverse needs were met and respected by the staff team. Staff respected people's privacy and made sure they had consent before entering their rooms. People told us that staff were very respectful. One person said, "They [staff] are very polite – always knock first before they come in, they say it is my room, and they have to ask permission before coming in."

Staff promoted people's independence and encouraged and supported them to retain this as much as possible. People told us how the service supported them to maintain their independence and we saw this in practice throughout our visits. We observed people moving around the service independently and heard staff supporting them appropriately when needed. For example one person was observed being supported to mobilise along the corridor and the staff member treated them with great kindness and patience.

People were supported and encouraged to maintain relationships with their families and friends. We spoke with many visitors throughout our visits and they told us that they were always made to feel welcome. One relative said, "I always feel very welcome when I visit, and am able to help myself to drinks and biscuits in the café."

Where people did not have family members to support them to have a voice, they had access to advocacy services. An advocate supports a person to have an independent voice and enables them to express their views when they are unable to do so for themselves.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At this inspection we found that people still received personalised, responsive care that met their individual needs and the rating continues to be good.

People's needs had been fully assessed and their care plans had been developed from the process and updated regularly to reflect their changing needs. People told us that their care plans met their needs. They said that they had been asked for their views, opinions and preferences on many occasions and that staff regularly checked to make sure they had what they needed. The care plans viewed described people's likes and dislikes, gave a brief history to inform staff of people's background and clear information about how to care for them. This included all areas of identified risk and how to manage them. One staff member said, "People's care plans give me the information I need to help me to get to know the person better. This means I can support them in a way that is best for them."

The service offered people a range of activities to suit their individual preferences. There were group activities such as bingo, music and entertainers and individual activities such as knitting and painting. On the first day of the inspection people were enjoying a line dancing session where staff were dressed up as cowboys. People told us they had plenty to do. One person said, "Sometimes we go out to the pub, we go on a bus, and [staff member's name] drives us. We went to a garden centre last week. It's lovely going out." Staff said they loved working at Longview, going out with people and seeing them enjoy the themed activities.

People were confident that their concerns would be listened to and acted upon swiftly. One person said, "I have just recently spoken to the registered manager about the food. I would like Chinese food more regularly and I know that they will sort it for me." Another person told us, "Complaints? – I have none, but they'd take it seriously if I did." Relatives told us they had no cause for complaint but if they did, they were assured it would be dealt with to their satisfaction. There was a good complaints process in place and complaints had been fully investigated and responded to in a timely way. The service monitored complaints and looked for any trends to enable them to take appropriate action to rectify the issue.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At this inspection we found that the service still provided people with a well led good quality service and the rating continues to be good.

There was 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. The service promoted a positive person-centred culture. Staff shared the registered manager's vision to provide people with good quality person-centred care. There was an open and inclusive culture where people, their relatives and staff could raise any issue with the management team. Most staff said they felt well supported and the registered manager had taken action to ensure that all staff had the support they needed. One staff member said, "I feel very well supported here, the manager is very good, their door is always open to us." A relative told us, "We can come and see the manager when we want – they are very approachable and do what they promise to do."

There was an effective quality monitoring system in place. The registered manager held regular open door surgeries which gave people the opportunity to discuss issues on a one to one basis. People told us, and the records confirmed that regular meetings were held for people using the service, their relatives and for staff.

People's views are sought and analysed and regular audits on systems and processes had taken place. The registered manager sends quarterly questionnaires to people to seek their views on activities, catering arrangements, staffing and the service in general. One staff member said, "We all work together to provide people with the best possible experience as they are the most important people, and we all know that."

People's personal records had been stored safely in locked offices when not in use but they were readily accessible to staff, when needed. The registered manager had access to up to date information and shared this with staff to ensure that they had the knowledge to keep people safe and provide a good quality service.