

Juniper Manton Limited

Castlerea House

Inspection report

18 Hope Street
Higher Broughton
Salford
Greater Manchester
M7 2ES

Tel: 01612780181

Date of inspection visit:
22 August 2023

Date of publication:
02 October 2023

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

About the service:

Castlerea House is a care home in Salford which is registered with CQC to provide care for a maximum of 10 people. There were 8 people using the service at the time of the inspection.

People's experience of using this service and what we found:

People living at the home and relatives said they felt the service was safe. There were enough staff to care for people safely and correct staff recruitment procedures were followed. Risks were effectively managed at the home and accidents and incidents were monitored.

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

Staff supervisions and appraisals took place and staff received enough training to support them in their roles. People were supported to maintain good nutrition, hydration and health.

We received positive feedback about the care provided from relatives and people living at the home. Staff were described as kind and caring and treated people well.

Systems were in place to manage complaints. The feedback we received was that the care was person centred and that people were able to participate in hobbies and activities of their choosing.

There were systems in place to monitor the quality of service through audits, meetings, surveys and competency checks.

Rating at last inspection:

The last rating for the service was good (published September 2018).

Why we inspected

This inspection was prompted by a review of the information we held about this service.

The rating remains good. This is based on the findings at this inspection.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Castlerea House on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Follow up:

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service, which will help inform when we next

inspect.

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 was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Details are in our effective findings below.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

Details are in our caring findings below.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

Details are in our responsive findings below.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

Details are in our well-led findings below.

Castlerea House

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection:

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

Inspection team:

The inspection was carried out by 1 inspector 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.

Service and service type:

Castlerea House is a care home without nursing care. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

Registered Manager:

This service is required to have a registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

At the time of our inspection, there was a registered manager in post.

Notice of inspection:

This inspection was unannounced. Inspection activity was carried out between 22 August and 14 September 2023. We visited the home on 22 August 2023.

What we did before the inspection:

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return (PIR). This is information providers are required to send us annually with key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make.

We used all this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection:

We spoke with 6 people who used the service and 2 relatives about their experience of the care provided. We also spoke with 5 members of staff including the registered manager and 4 support workers.

We reviewed a range of records. This included 3 people's care plans, 3 staff recruitment files, staff training records and records associated with the provider's quality monitoring systems.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At our last inspection this key question was rated good. At this inspection the rating remains good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse; learning lessons when things go wrong

- The provider had process in place to safeguard people. People living at the home and relatives said they felt the service was safe. One person said, "Staff are very fair, honest and reliable."
- Staff understood about safeguarding and said they had received training. One member of staff said, "Medication errors could be safeguarding concerns, or if there were problems with people's money."
- A safeguarding policy and procedure was in place, explaining what needed to be done if abuse was suspected.
- Accidents and safeguarding incidents were monitored and records maintained.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- The provider had systems to ensure the management of risks. People's care plans contained risk assessments regarding the care and support they received. Where any risks were identified, control measures were in place.
- Regular checks of the building were carried out including gas safety, electrical installation and PAT (Portable appliance testing).

Staffing and recruitment

- The provider ensured there were enough staff employed to care for people safely. Everyone we spoke with said there were enough staff to deliver the care people needed. A member of staff told us, "I feel there are enough staff and we are able to go out and support people to go to appointments and things as well." Another member of staff said, "We have enough staff and only ever really struggled during COVID."
- Staff were recruited safely, with all the necessary procedures followed including interviews, seeking references and carrying out DBS checks. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks provide information including details about convictions and cautions held on the Police National Computer. The information helps employers make safer recruitment decisions.

Using medicines safely

- There were arrangements in place for the safe management of medicines.
- Staff had received training in medicines administration and had their competency checked.
- Medicines were stored in a secure room which we saw was locked at all times.
- Medication records were completed accurately by staff with no missing signatures.
- When people needed medicines on an 'as and when required' basis (PRN), there were protocols in place.
- People living at the home said they received their medicines safely. One person said, "I take my own medication, but if I forget, staff bring them to me."

Preventing and controlling infection

- We were assured that the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.
- We were assured that the provider was meeting shielding and social distancing rules.
- We were assured that the provider was admitting people safely to the service.
- We were assured that the provider was using PPE effectively and safely.
- We were assured that the provider was accessing testing for people using the service and staff.
- We were assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises.
- We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.
- We were assured that the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.
- Relatives were encouraged to visit people at the home and people were supported to visit relatives and the local community.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence.

At our last inspection this key question was rated good. At this inspection the rating remains good. This meant people's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- The provider had a system for ensuring staff were trained and competent. People and relatives told us staff were well trained.
- Staff told us they were supported in their roles and were provided with the relevant training to enable them to care for people effectively. A training matrix detailed the training staff had undertaken. One member of staff said, "We use social care TV for a lot of training and we get enough."
- All staff completed an induction and this covered areas such as policies and procedures, relevant training and meeting people they would be supporting and caring for.
- Staff supervisions and appraisals were held to monitor staff development and performance.

Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law; supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- People's needs were assessed before moving into Castlerea House to ensure it was the most suitable place for them to live and to ensure the service could meet their needs. Copies of initial assessments were available in people's support plans.
- People were supported to attend appointments with various health professionals in the community. Records of appointments attended were in people's support plans. One person said, "The staff arrange appointments for me such as hospital, GP and every 3 months to see a psychologist."

Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance

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 Act 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 take particular 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 authorized under the MCA. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA.

- At the time of the inspection, people living at the home had capacity and were able to make their own choices and decisions and as such no DoLS authorisations were in place. The registered manager was aware of the process to follow should this change.
- People had signed consent forms in their support plans covering areas such as answering certain

questions, photographs and other professionals reviewing their information.

- Staff understood about the MCA/DoLS and its requirements. One member of staff said, "If a person lacks the capacity to make their own choices and decisions, then a DoLS would be required."

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet

- Each person living at the home had a nutrition support plan in place which detailed any support they required to eat and drink.
- People told us they received enough to eat and drink. One person said, "The meals here are nourishing and substantial."
- Kitchen facilities were available onsite at the home and some people were able to make their own meals which increased their independence.

Adapting service, design, decoration to meet people's needs

- People's bedrooms were personalised to suit them with their own belongings. Several people living at the home were talented artists and their artwork was displayed around the home.
- There were several lounge areas for people to sit and relax in, as well as tables for people to eat and drink at.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

At our last inspection this key question was rated good and has remained the same. This meant people were supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; respecting equality and diversity;

- During the inspection we observed staff interacting with people living at the home in kind and caring way. People appeared comfortable in the presence of staff who knew people well. There was a comfortable atmosphere with lots of smiles exchanged between staff and people living at the home.
- People living at the home and relatives told us they were happy with the care provided. One person said, "I have spent the happiest days of my life here." Another person said, "I really like it here and hope it is my forever home." A relative added, "(Person) is really settled here."
- Staff were described as kind and caring. One person said, "I get on with all the staff here, they are brilliant."

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People were treated with dignity, respect and given privacy when they needed it. One person said, "I am able to lock my bedroom door when I need to and staff always knock before entering."
- People were supported to maintain as much independence as possible. Staff knew people well and what they were able to do and what areas they required support with. One person said, "The staff let me be as independent as possible with my personal care."

Supporting people to express their views and be involved in making decisions about their care

- People and relatives were able to provide feedback about the service through regular conversations and reviews.
- People told us they were involved in decisions about their care and could contact the staff directly with any queries or concerns they had.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

At our last inspection this key question was rated good and has remained the same. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to ensure people have choice and control and to meet their needs and preferences; supporting people to develop and maintain relationships to avoid social isolation; support to follow interests and to take part in activities that are socially and culturally relevant to them

- Support plans were personalised and contained information for staff about how people wanted their care and support to be carried out.
- Staff knew the people they supported and had a good knowledge of their individual needs and preferences.
- People said the care provided was person centred and they were able to do activities of their choice and pursue any hobbies and interests. Some of the activities included art, music and poetry. Everyone we spoke with during the inspection said there was enough to keep them occupied, including being able to go out into the community. One person said, "We've been on trips out before to York and Blackpool."

Meeting people's communication needs

Since 2016 all organisations that provide publicly funded adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard. The Accessible Information Standard tells organisations what they have to do to help ensure people with a disability or sensory loss, and in some circumstances, their carers, get information in a way they can understand it. It also says that people should get the support they need in relation to communication.

- Information was available in different formats if and when required, although nobody required these at the time of the inspection. People's communication needs were also referenced in their support plans.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- The provider had a complaints policy and procedure in place, explaining what people needed to do if they were unhappy with the service.
- A complaints file was maintained, although not many complaints had been made. People we spoke with and relatives told us they hadn't had any complaints to make about Castlerea House.

End of life care and support

- At the time of our visit there was no one receiving end of life care. Policies and procedures were in place if people's needs were to change.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

At our last inspection this key question was rated requires improvement. At this inspection the rating has changed to good. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Continuous learning and improving care; engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics;

- There were systems in place to monitor the quality of service. Residents' meetings were held in order to gather people's views. People told us they were able to discuss any areas of concern and that staff were responsive. People living at the home confirmed these took place.
- The provider used satisfaction surveys to ask people for their views about areas including things to change, food and the environment.
- Staff meetings were also held to enable staff to discuss the problems they might have effecting their work.
- The management team carried out audits for example, to the building/environment, medication, food and support plans. If there were any shortfalls, these were clearly documented.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements; how the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong.

- At the time of the inspection, there was a registered manager in post who was responsible for the day to day running of the home. Additional support and oversight was also given by the provider.
- The provider knew to submit statutory notifications to CQC as required.
- It is a legal requirement for the ratings from the last inspection to be displayed on any websites operated by the provider and at the office location. We saw the ratings were displayed at the home, although a website was not in use at the time of the inspection.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- The staff team spoke of a positive culture at the service and said they enjoyed their roles. One member of staff said, "So far I am very happy. We all work so well together." Another member of staff said, "I love the job and we have a great team."
- Everybody we spoke with said they felt the service was well-led. One member of staff said, "There is good management here, absolutely." Another member of staff added, "There is good management and we are well supported."
- People living at the home and relatives spoke positively about the care provided which enabled good outcomes for people. People were able to learn and develop new living skills to increase their independence, whilst also receiving support from staff where needed.

Working in partnership with others

- The service worked in partnership with other agencies as required, including local authorities and social work teams. The home also had strong links with local universities and several members of staff had taken up full time positions at the home after initially working there as part of a student placement.
- Prior to our inspection, we sought feedback about the home from various health care professionals, who provided us with an update about their involvement with the home and any good practice they had identified. The feedback we received was largely positive.