

Bowmans Lodge Limited







Bowmans Lodge

Inspection report

46 Coombes Road
Bowmans Lodge
London Colney
St Albans
AL2 1ND
Tel: 01727 822666

Date of inspection visit: 2 June 2015
Date of publication: 07/07/2015

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

We undertook an unannounced inspection of Bowmans Lodge Residential Care Home on 2 June 2015. The home provides accommodation and personal care for up to three people who have mental health needs. At the time of our inspection there were two people living in the home.

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.

CQC is required to monitor the operation of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) and to report on what we find. DoLS are in place to protect people where they do not have capacity to make decisions and where it is considered

Summary of findings

necessary to restrict their freedom in some way, usually to protect themselves or others. The manager reported that no one living at the service was restricted in anyway under this act.

People were kept safe and free from harm. There were appropriate numbers of staff employed to meet people's needs and provide a flexible service. Staff were aware of people's choices and provided people with support in a person centred way.

The provider had an appropriate recruitment process which ensured that qualified and experience staff were employed at the home. The provider was in the process of reviewing the process around the validation and verification of references to ensure the procedure was as robust as possible. Staff received training and support and were aware of their responsibilities when providing care and support to people at the service.

Detailed support plans were in place detailing how people wished to be supported. People were involved in making decisions about their care where possible. Care and support was reviewed regularly with the person, or whenever there was a change of need.

People were supported to eat and drink well and were supported to access healthcare professionals such as the GP as they were required. Staff responded appropriately to people's changing needs and accessing support as required.

Medication was administered by staff who had received training on the safe administration of medication.

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 had been trained in safeguarding and were aware of the processes that were to be followed if abuse was suspected.

Staffing levels were appropriate to meet the needs of people who used the service.

Medicines were managed appropriately.

Good



Is the service effective?

The service was effective

Staff had the skills and knowledge to meet people's needs.

Staff were aware of the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

People were supported to eat and drink to maintain good health.

Good



Is the service caring?

The service was caring

People who used the service had developed positive relationships with staff at the service.

People's privacy and dignity were maintained.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive

Staff were aware of people's support needs, their interests and preferences and were therefore able to provide a personalised service.

People were provided with regular opportunities to raise any concerns that they may have.

Good



Is the service well-led?

The service was well led

The provider and manager demonstrated open and transparent leadership.

Staff felt comfortable discussing any concerns with their manager.

The manager regularly checked the quality of the service provided.

Good



Bowmans Lodge

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 2 June 2015 and was unannounced. The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

We reviewed information we held about the service this included information we had received from the local

authority and the provider since the last inspection, including notifications of incidents and action plans. A notification is information about important events which the provider is required to send us by law.

During our inspection we spoke with two people who used the service, the provider, home manager and four care and support staff. We reviewed the care records of the two people who lived at Bowmans Lodge, reviewed the records for three staff and records relating to the management of the service.

We contacted two healthcare professionals involved with the service in order to gain feedback from them on the quality of care provided by the home. We received positive feedback and a copy of their latest contract monitoring report.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

A person told us they had “lived at Bowmans lodge for many years and would not have stayed there so long if they did not feel totally comfortable in the home”. Another person said “it was a safe and secure environment and they felt at ease in their surroundings”.

People told us that they their own key and could come and go as they wished. The house was secure and locked at night People said they felt safe in the local area as they were very familiar with their local surroundings. People told us they attended a variety of projects and amenities which gave them independence and built their confidence. Risk assessments were in place to support activities and events away from the home. This demonstrated that people were encouraged to take risks but in a balanced way which ensured people’s safety was maintained.

People using the service told us they felt the management and staff took their safety seriously. A person told us not only were they safe in the home, but they felt safe in the local area and frequently visited the local shops.

People who lived at Bowmans Lodge told us they were protected from harm by staff and other people who used the service and that they all got on well in the house, and they all looked out for each other.

Staff had received training in safeguarding people from abuse and staff were able to describe their responsibilities to keep people protected from avoidable harm. We saw that procedures for safeguarding and whistleblowing were discussed in staff meetings and supervision to make sure staff were aware of what to do if they suspected people were being abused or mistreated.

We saw that each person had individual risk assessments, which contained information on risks specific to them. Where risks were identified a risk management plan was put in place, showing the measures staff should take to reduce and or minimise the risk to the person.

There were weekly communication records which were completed for people and these also documented any risks and showed that staff followed risk management plans to keep people safe.

People who lived at Bowmans Lodge were encouraged to be as independent as they could in a safe environment. People required minimal support from staff. This was

demonstrated in their risk assessments and they were supported to maintain their independence whilst keeping safe. Staff told us that the management tried to promote a balance between managing risk and independence

Accident and incident records showed that the provider responded appropriately to incidents and used the information to update risk assessments and management plans where necessary.

We saw that staff held regular meetings to share information at the beginning and end of each shift. This ensured that staff were aware of any change in people’s health or risk and helped to keep people safe.

We saw that the provider had environmental risk assessments in place including fire risk assessments. The provider had arrangements in place for people who used the service to be provided with local shelter and the continuity of care in the event of fire or flood damage to the home.

There were sufficient numbers of staff available to meet people’s needs safely. People told us that there were “enough staff in the home to support them”. We observed this to be the case. People told us that staff were available by phone if they were not at the service and could get to the service within a few minutes. This process ensured people’s continued safety while allowing people personal space to develop their abilities with a view of moving to a more independent living resource in the future.

The provider had recruitment procedures in place to make sure appropriate checks were carried out before new staff started work. This process included the completion of an application form, disclosure and barring checks (DBS), and references from previous employers. The provider was in the process of reviewing the process around the validation and verification of references to strengthen the recruitment policy. These checks by the provider helped to protect people from the risks of being cared for by unsuitable staff, and ensured potential staff were suitable and qualified for the roles they were being recruited to.

We were told that medication was only administered by staff who had received training on the safe administration of medication. The provider and manager talked us through the process for the safe administration of medication. We saw that staff had twice yearly ‘competency checks’ to ensure they were still competent to administer medication. People’s medication records had been

Is the service safe?

appropriately completed to show when medication was given to people in accordance with the prescriber's instructions. Medication was stored safely in locked cabinets. There had been a recent audit of medication and no issues of concern were identified.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People spoke positively about the support they received. One person told us that staff were “efficient and effective and said you only ask once and they are there”. People spoke positively about staff and their experience of being supported by staff who knew them well and provided “individualised support”.

People received care and support from staff that were knowledgeable about their needs. The manager told us about their in-depth knowledge, experience and interest in the care of people with mental health or associated conditions. This reinforced an effective and appropriate approach in the delivery of care and support.

Staff told us they were “satisfied with their training which they had received”, which gave them the skills to provide care and support to people which they said was effective. Another person told us the training was “relevant to their roles”. Staff told us they received regular updates in training for topics such as health & safety, mental health awareness and MCA/DoLS.

We saw evidence that staff received supervision approximately two-monthly, in which they discussed their responsibilities, performance, objectives and training requirements. These all helped to ensure that staff were equipped with the right knowledge and skills to do their jobs.

Staff and people told us they had access to other professionals and were able to make referrals if required. An example of this was support from the local community health colleagues, GP’s and dentists. We saw evidence that people were supported to attend healthcare and Hospital appointments.

Staff were aware of their responsibilities under the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS), as to when a person can be considered to be deprived of their liberty and the action the provider is required to take. The provider had a policy and procedure that covered the

importance of considering less restrictive alternatives and the reporting and recording that would need to take place. The provider told us that there was no one living at the service was being deprived of their liberty.

The provider and registered manager told us that they assessed people’s capacity to make significant decisions about their care and acted accordingly. For example, if a person had the capacity to make most decisions, but needed support with other more complex decisions. A person told us that they were able to discuss these decisions with relevant healthcare professionals if required.

Staff told us they always sought people’s consent before carrying out care tasks and did not continue if the person had not given consent. People told us they were asked for their consent and were able to give consent verbally. They had written agreements on file showing they had discussed their care and support with managers and had agreed and consented to their support plans.

People told us they had “good home cooked food” which was mostly cooked by the manager. A person told us they also “enjoyed an occasional take away”.

There was not a specific menu but a choice of food was provided. People told us they were “encouraged to eat a nutritious and a balanced diet”. Breakfast was available on a self-service basis and people were able to help themselves to a selection of cereals and toast and a selection of hot and cold drinks. Drinks and snacks were available at all times and people were able to help themselves as required. People were provided with a hot home cooked evening meal daily. There were no people with special dietary requirements who used the service at the time of our inspection, but the manager told us they would cater for any special requirements if required.

The home was suited to the needs of the people who lived there, and was well maintained. There was a large garden, a small lounge with a television and a dining room. People could choose to spend their time with others or more privately. The manager told us people who used the service chose the décor in their bedrooms. We observed that people had personal items which identified individual’s personalities.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People told us they were “well looked after”. During our visit, we observed staff interacting positively with people, chatting and doing activities.

We noted that staff spoke with people in a respectful tone, and demonstrated equality giving them enough time to understand and respond. They asked questions that showed they were taking an interest in what people were doing, their plans for the day and their hobbies. Staff were aware of people’s preferences and interests, as well as their health and support needs. This showed that staff knew people well and were aware of the importance of making them feel valued.

We saw that staff acted in a compassionate way. People told us staff were very “supportive and kind”. People spoke about their experiences living at Bowmans Lodge and one person said staff were “very caring”.

Care plans contained detailed information about how people should be supported. The manager told us they were very aware of people’s changing care needs and also how best to identify changes to people’s care and support. This included observations around people’s behaviours and interactions within the home.

Care plans showed that staff responsible for care planning had obtained people’s views, and this was confirmed by people who used the service. People told us that they had been asked to read their care plan and if they were in agreement they were asked to sign it, if they did not agree they could request an amendment.

People could access advocacy services, although people told us that they had not required an advocate because staff had always supported them appropriately. We saw records of residents meetings where all aspects of people’s needs within the home were able to be discussed.

People told us that staff were respectful of people’s privacy and dignity. Staff told us people held keys to the home and their individual bedrooms, which were kept closed during our visit regardless of whether people were using their rooms. We observed that staff supported people to maintain a neat and tidy appearance.

People and staff at the service told us people were encouraged and supported to maintain relationships with family, friends and people who have been involved in their lives and with whom they wished to remain in contact with. There were no restrictions on visiting and staff told us that visitors were welcomed at all times.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

The home was responsive to people's changing care and social needs. A person told us "the staff were always on hand to support you with all your needs". People said they were confident that the staff had a good working knowledge of the needs of people who lived at Bowmans Lodge and "responded quickly to any changes".

Care and support was planned and delivered in accordance with their personalised care needs. People spoke of staff who were "readily available to support you, even if it was something that did not usually happen". The manager told us that the needs of people who used the service was very "specialised" and that staff had the skills and expertise to be responsive to needs that were consistently changing and under review.

We saw that people's needs had been assessed and the assessments were used to inform care plans. The manager told us they knew the people who lived at Bowmans Lodge very well and knew their every need. This was observed throughout the day and people who lived at the service confirmed this. When there was a change this was amended by way of review and was recorded in the weekly communication log in people's individual files. This meant staff had access to up to date information about people's needs.

People told us that they lived independently and that their care plans provided a "structure". Care plans did not contain much information about life histories. We asked staff whether it would be helpful to have this information and asked people who used the service if they had been asked about their life histories. A person told us they had not been asked but felt that this was not a negative factor, as their health was much better than it had been previously. Staff told us that as the people had lived at the service for many years their life histories were not relevant to their current situations.

The provider and manager demonstrated a person-centred strategy, which was intended to ensure that people who used the service received care and support that met their individual needs and enabled them to live their life in a non-restrictive way.

People told us they "go out and about all the time". We saw that people were supported to access voluntary work placements in the community and to attend a number of specialist projects which were of interest to them. For example one person attended a 'Gardening project', and another attended a voluntary work placement a couple of times a week. This reduced the risk of isolation and supported people with integration, and development of social skills.

The provider had also had Wi-Fi installed at the home to enable people to become computer literate and to be able to explore hobbies and opportunities that may be of interest to them.

Within the home activities were provided twice weekly, and people were able to watch TV, listen to radio or music or read. People told us they sometimes had events planned for them outside of the home which they enjoyed. A person told us the staff supported them to retain contact with family and this was in response to their needs. People told us they were supported with interests and hobbies.

People using the service were aware of the complaints procedure within the home. This was provided to them in the resident's information packs, when people came to live at the service.

People we spoke with told us that they had not had cause to complain but knew they would raise any concerns with the manager of the home and were confident that their concerns would be addressed quickly. One person told us that they had a small issue some time ago and had spoken to the manager about this. The person told us the issue had improved and was confident this was as a result of appropriate action by the manager. We saw that the provider had a detailed complaints policy in place and that people were kept informed of developments if complaints were received.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

People spoke positively about the home, manager and provider. They said “they ran a good home” Staff told us “they really do care about the people”. They are actively involved and it feels like “a family home” not a business”.

Staff told us that the service was “well led and well managed”. There were regular meetings for people who used the service and staff to attend to discuss anything they wanted to. This demonstrated a willingness by the provider and manager to involve staff and people and afforded them a meaningful opportunity to have their say and influence how the service was delivered.

A person told us “that they had been asked about the quality of support at the service” and that they were always given opportunities to express their views. Staff told us the home had a welcoming culture and that in particular the provider and manager led by example.

People told us that the provider and manager were approachable and that they “always listened to what people had to say”. Staff said they were able to raise any issues they wanted to discuss at staff meetings, for example, around planning events for people outside the home, and were provided with minutes and actions from the meetings.

Staff told us that it was a small family type home and management were very supportive. Staff said they were well supported and really enjoyed working at the home. Staff said they “worked well as a team” and were supportive of each other”.

The manager was able to demonstrate how they embedded a positive culture within the home, which was clearly visible during this inspection and from feedback received from people who lived at Bowmans lodge.

The philosophy of the home was to provide a fulfilling life by the development of personal skills and abilities and to ensure that people were at the centre of all decisions that were made regarding the running of the home.

The provider and manager were ‘open’ to improvements to the service. They demonstrated that they were consistently driving improvements to achieve a better standard of care for the people living within the home. For example, we saw that recruitment procedures were being reviewed as they had learned from previous experience and were committed to making the policy as robust as it could be. They also focused on accountability and ensured people were accountable and responsible for their actions.

Staff said they felt great job satisfaction working at the home. They said that they knew their roles within the home and the importance of providing a high standard of care. Staff were aware of the whistleblowing policy and were encouraged to speak out if there were any areas of concern.

The provider carried out regular quality checks within the home. These included checks of the premises, care plans and medicines administration records. Action plans were put in place to remedy anything that was below the expected standard.

Quality monitoring questionnaires had been given to people to enable them to share their views and experiences, and to provide feedback about the home. The provider had also recently carried out a quality audit on the home. The comments and feedback was positive and indicated that people felt they were listened to by the provider.

We saw that people knew the manager well and they were visible and accessible to people. They encouraged open and transparent communication within the home. The home had robust systems in place to ensure that documentation and records within the home was accessible and up to date.