

Omega Elifar Limited

# Omega Elifar Limited - 53 Churchfields

## Inspection report

Headley  
Bordon  
Hampshire  
GU35 8PE

Tel: 01428713308  
Website: [www.omegaelifar.com](http://www.omegaelifar.com)

Date of inspection visit:  
10 October 2018

Date of publication:  
09 January 2019

## 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

Omega Elifar – 53 Churchfields is a residential care home for four adults with learning disabilities or autism. Throughout this report the service will be referred to as 53 Churchfields.

### Rating at last inspection

At our last inspection published on 17 September 2016 we rated the service good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

### Why the service is rated good

Staff had the knowledge and confidence to identify safeguarding concerns and had attended training in safeguarding people at risk.

The registered manager and staff had a robust approach to managing risks to people. There were comprehensive risk assessments in place to mitigate the risks.

Appropriate recruitment checks had taken place to prevent the recruitment of staff unsuitable to work with people at risk.

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

People were supported in a person-centred way and the service was developed and designed in line with Registering the Right Support guidance.

Staff knew people well including their preferences and personal histories.

People were supported to have a balanced diet with as much choice and participation in food preparation as possible.

The registered manager and staff made appropriate referrals to outside agencies or healthcare services to ensure positive outcomes for people.

Staff supported people in a kind and compassionate way. Feedback from relatives confirmed that the service was caring towards people using the service.

People were supported to be as independent as possible for example by accessing the local community.

There was an open culture in the service with consistently strong leadership from the registered manager.

There were systems and processes in place to monitor and improve the service.

People, relatives and staff were actively involved in the delivery and improvement of the service.

The service met all of the 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.

# Omega Elifar Limited - 53 Churchfields

## **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. The service was previously rated Good on 17 September 2016.

This inspection took place on 10 October 2018 and was unannounced. The inspection was completed by one inspector.

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.

Before the inspection, we reviewed all the information we held about the service including previous inspection reports and any notifications received by the Care Quality Commission. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to tell us about by law.

During the inspection there were four people living at 53 Churchfields. We spoke to one person, two relatives, three care staff, the registered manager and operations manager. We reviewed documentation including three people's care records; medication records; three employment files; training records; staff supervision; accidents and incidents; policies and procedures and safeguarding records. We received information about the service from two external agencies. Some people living at 53 Churchfields were unable to fully express their views of the service but we observed interactions between staff and people in the communal areas of the home.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

Some people were unable to tell us if they felt safe in the service but we observed people to appear comfortable and relaxed. Relatives told us that people were safe, one relative told us, "I don't have to worry anymore, It's like home from home".

Staff had received training in safeguarding adults and were confident on how to raise concerns. Staff knew the signs of potential abuse.

Care records included thorough information on how to care for people safely. Risks to people were thoroughly assessed and mitigated with very specific risk assessments in place. For example, a boat trip, accessing the stairs and accessing the kitchen. One relative confirmed, "Everything is risk assessed". Care records included detailed signs to inform staff when a person may be becoming distressed for example, 'Biting my fingernails".

The registered manager, staff and relatives told us that there was sufficient staff in place to support people safely. The service was using minimal agency staff.

Procedures were in place to prevent the employment of unsuitable staff. These included a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. The DBS helps employers make safer recruitment decisions and helps prevent the employment of staff who may be unsuitable to work with people who use care services. Identify checks and character references were obtained and candidates attended an interview to assess their suitability for the role. Applicants were asked to complete details of their full employment history.

We reviewed the medication records for all of the people living at 53 Churchfields. Medicines were appropriately acquired, stored, administered and disposed of. The provider sought support from Lloyds Pharmacy to undertake checks on the medicines administration when necessary.

Staff supported people by following infection control procedures. One relative told us, "[Person is] always clean and tidy". The service was clean, tidy and we did not detect any malodours.

The health and safety of the premises was monitored as part of weekly checks and the monthly audits that the registered manager completed. The registered manager informed us that the interior of 53 Churchfields was in need of renovation however, the whole service including the people being supported was due to move to another property in the near future. The registered manager told us that the new property would meet the needs of the people living in 53 Churchfields more effectively.

Incidents and accidents were analysed for areas of learning. This information was used to improve the service provided and promote positive outcomes for people.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

We received positive feedback about the effectiveness of the service from relatives and staff. One relative told us, "53 Churchfields is very much a "gold standard" residential establishment". Another relative told us, "They're so professional".

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 MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). We checked the service was working within the principles of the MCA and DoLS. Capacity assessments and best interest assessments had been carried out appropriately. Applications for DoLS authorisations were completed and monitored for when they expired.

People were supported to make as many decisions about their support as possible through their care plans and were involved in the development of their care plan as much as possible. There was a positive risk taking approach which allowed people to live their lives fully.

Staff had received training in a variety of relevant subjects to enable them to carry out their role competently. Staff received an induction and regular supervision during their employment. Staff we spoke to were positive about the training and support they had received. Staff had received training to enable them to manage behaviour that may challenge. One member of staff told us it was about "diffusing" the situation before behaviour becomes challenging.

Staff felt well supported by the manager and confirmed that they received supervision sessions to discuss their development.

People were supported to maintain a healthy, balanced diet. Menus were discussed with people every four weeks and staff encouraged seasonal choices. Meals were prepared from scratch and people were encouraged to participate in this process as much as possible.

It was observed during the inspection that the registered manager and staff addressed healthcare needs for people promptly. People were supported to attend their annual reviews which promoted positive outcomes for people. The registered manager and staff made appropriate referrals to healthcare professionals or outside agencies in a timely manner. We observed records of communication or appointments with: speech and language therapists, community learning disability team, GPs, epilepsy and urology specialists.

The provider and registered manager had acknowledged that the design of the service was no longer optimal for the people living there and had purchased another property with a more suitable layout in order to improve the quality of life for people. This demonstrated that the provider and registered manager had recognised the changing needs of people living at 53 Churchfields and put plans in place to improve their environment.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

We observed interactions between people and staff throughout the inspection and found the approach of staff to be caring. One relative told us they were, "Blown away by the commitment, care and kindness shown by the staff". Another relative confirmed that staff cared for people and told us, "They're loved, It's not just a job".

The care service had been developed and designed in line with the values that underpin the Registering the Right Support and other best practice guidance. These values included choice, promotion of independence and inclusion. People with learning disabilities and autism using the service could live as ordinary a life as any citizen.

People were supported to express their views and opinions as much as able. For example, the provider was planning to move the service to another location and staff had supported people to create mood boards with colour and decoration ideas for their bedroom at the new property.

People were encouraged to be as independent as possible for example contributing to shopping, cooking, gardening and cleaning their bedroom. People were also supported to maintain activities and hobbies that were meaningful for them. For example, artwork and physical activity such as swimming or attending the local gym. One person had been supported to keep a paper round which had led to positive relationships for that person with people in the local community.

The registered manager told us that they encouraged people to do activities outside of the house as much as possible in order to encourage people to access the community as part of their everyday lives. Relatives confirmed that people had access to lots of activities and one member of staff told us that there were "always so many activities going on" for example a recent trip on a barge boat. People were supported to maintain the personal relationships that were important to them.

The privacy and dignity of people was protected. People were encouraged to complete as much of their personal care independently as possible. The registered manager told us it was important to "treat people how you would like to be treated". The staff team had a caring approach towards people and each other. One member of staff told us, ""As a team we have all pulled together".

The registered manager clearly cared very much for the people living at 53 Churchfields. Interactions between the registered manager and people demonstrated a caring relationship. One relative told us about their family member's relationship with the registered manager, "He loves [them], he adores [them]".



## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

We observed during the inspection that the support of the service had led to good outcomes for people. Relatives confirmed this and told us examples such as, "We would never have dreamt of taking [person] out but we can now" and that another person was now able to verbalise some words when they could not before.

Care records were thorough, person-centred and up to date. They contained detail about phases of behaviour and how staff should support the person during each phase. Care plans had relevant information about medical conditions such as epilepsy. One person had been supported to write their own support plan.

The registered manager and staff knew people very well. This enabled them to recognise subtle changes in the behaviour of people that may indicate that they are unwell or becoming unwell. One relative confirmed this and told us, "[Registered manager is] so tuned in, she's just knows when he's not going to be well"

The service was not supporting anyone at the end of their lives but quickly recognised any deterioration and changing physical or mental health needs of people.

The service was working within the principles of the Accessible Information Standard by working to minimise any barriers to effective communication with people. The service used visual aids, signs and easy read documents to support people. They also asked relatives or advocates for support with communication where necessary.

The registered manager welcomed feedback and one relative told us that they had not had to make a complaint but would feel comfortable to raise concerns with the manager. The service had not received any complaints since the last inspection.

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

We received positive feedback about the manager from relatives and staff. One relative described the registered manager as 'superb'.

The registered manager provided clear leadership to the staff team which achieved good outcomes for people. The registered manager told us, "I care about my job and this organisation".

The registered manager was carrying out comprehensive checks of all of the elements of the service and had effective oversight of the care being provided. The operations manager also completed audits of the service and planned to increase the frequency of this audit to monthly.

A culture of continuous improvement was embedded into the day to day running of the service. Where concerns or needs of people were identified, they were addressed promptly.

Staff attended team meetings where information that promoted safe and quality care was shared. Specific information about the needs of people were shared to promote person-centred care. Staff told us the registered manager was effective and always had an open door for them to speak with her. The registered manager told us where appropriate they carried out debriefing sessions with staff after incidents and learning from this was taken to the next team meeting.

Relatives told us that they were consistently involved in the care of their relative, one relative told us, "The communication is really good" and that the service "Has retained many excellent members of staff". The registered manager told us, "[Staff had] gone above and beyond" to support people.

We observed that people were supported according to their diverse needs without any discrimination. The principles of Equality, Diversity and Human Rights (EDHR) were embedded into day to day practice. The registered manager told us how they had supported someone regarding their sexuality. There were also themed nights at 53 Churchfields where different cultures were celebrated through food.

The registered person must notify the Commission without delay of certain types of incidents for example abuse or allegations of abuse. The service had notified us of any relevant incidents or concerns.