

The Stable Family Home Trust

Pinehaven

Inspection report

23 Parkwood Road
Boscombe
Dorset
BH5 2BS

Tel: 01202427941

Date of inspection visit:
09 August 2017
10 August 2017

Date of publication:
13 September 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

Pinehaven is a care home registered to accommodate a maximum of nine people with learning disabilities. At the time of the inspection eight people were living there.

At the last inspection, the service was rated Good.

At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

Why the service is rated Good

Is the service Safe?

People were protected from potential abuse and avoidable harm by staff who were knowledgeable about recognising and reporting different signs of abuse. There were sufficient numbers of appropriately qualified staff available on each shift to ensure people were cared and supported safely. Risks to people were well managed and medicines were stored appropriately and managed effectively. People were protected by the prevention and control of infection.

Is the service effective?

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff support them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service support this practice. People had access to a variety of health care professionals who provided care and support to people at the home. Staff received quality training which they found effective and useful. Staff were well supported with a clear system of supervision meetings.

Is the service caring?

People and relatives told us they found the staff to be kind, caring, friendly and patient. Staff spoke knowledgeably about people and showed they knew how people preferred to be given their care and support. People were treated with dignity and respect and supported to maintain their independence and make their own choices about how they spent their day. People's privacy was respected.

Is the service responsive?

People received person centred care from a team of staff who knew them and their health needs well. People's needs were re-assessed when their health needs changed and relatives were kept informed and included. People were supported to take part in a range of interesting activities that helped them to maintain their independence. People knew how to complain if they needed to and there was a clear complaints process available.

Is the service well led?

There was an open, honest, friendly culture and relatives told us they had confidence in the management team and the staff. People and their relatives were consulted and involved in their care and support. There was a programme of quality checks and audits to ensure the quality of the service was maintained.

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.

Pinehaven

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 comprehensive inspection took place on 9 and 10 August 2017 and was unannounced. The inspection was completed by one CQC Inspector.

Before the inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service. This included information about incidents the provider had notified us of. We also asked the local authority who commission the service and various health professionals who regularly visited the service for their views on the care and service given by the home.

During the inspection we met and spoke with three of the people living at the service. Following the inspection we spoke with two relatives on the telephone and requested written feedback from the service's GP. We spoke with the manager and three members of care staff.

We observed how people were supported and to establish the quality of care people received we looked in depth at three people's care, treatment and support records and all of the Medicine Administration Records (MARS). We also looked at records relating to the management of the service including staffing rota's, staff recruitment, supervision and training records, premises maintenance records, quality assurance records, staff and resident/relative meeting minutes and a range of the providers policies and procedures.

The provider had completed a Provider Information Return (PIR) before the inspection. This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they planned to make. We used the information in the PIR to plan and undertake the inspection.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People told us they felt safe living at Pinehaven. One person said, "I like the staff, they are really friendly." Relatives said, "We are very happy, everyone is so supportive, we don't have to worry and feel they are very safe."

Staff spoke knowledgeably about how to ensure people were safeguarded from potential abuse. There was up to date information and telephone numbers displayed at the home for people to use if they needed to report potential abuse.

Risk assessments had been completed before people started living at Pinehaven. The manager told us the provider had recently reviewed their pre assessment procedure and would shortly be introducing a revised version.

There was a detailed, clear risk analysis system in place. This was colour coded for ease of use and covered a range of areas for each person. Areas of risk included, isolation, neglect, dietary needs, communication and mobility. This helped ensure people were supported to take responsible risks as part of their daily lifestyles with the minimum of restrictions. For example one person had a condition that meant they could have difficulty swallowing. Their support plan identified the risks involved and gave staff clear guidance on supporting the person whilst maintaining their independence. The support plan stated, "Encourage eating slowly and not too much food in one mouthful...ensure food is soft not chewy or tough, provide constant supervision at mealtimes." And, "I use ordinary cutlery, but sometimes need staff to recentralise my food on my plate to help me visually."

People had been individually assessed and plans made for their safe evacuation from the premises in an emergency situation such as a fire. These were completed in a pictorial easy read version so that people living at Pinehaven could read them.

The provider had a system in place to ensure the premises were maintained safely. Up to date service and maintenance certificates and records relating to fire, electric, gas, water systems and hoists were available. Water system checks were regularly completed and a legionella test had been scheduled for completion in August. Legionella is a water borne bacteria that can be harmful to people's health.

There were systems in place to record, review and analyse any incidents and accidents that took place. The incidents and accidents were analysed each month to identify any trends to enable pre-emptive action to be taken to reduce the risk of reoccurrence.

Recruitment practices were safe and the relevant checks had been completed before staff worked unsupervised at the home. These checks included the use of application forms, an interview, reference checks and criminal record checks. This made sure that people were protected as far as possible from staff who were known to be unsuitable. Staff told us they had found the induction process to be thorough and useful and said they had been well supported throughout their induction.

The manager told us they were in the process of recruiting staff to work at Pinehaven. There was a selection of bank staff that could be called upon if Pinehaven required further staff to cover annual leave or unplanned staff sickness. Staff told us there were enough staff employed to meet people's needs. Staff rotas correctly reflected the levels of staff on duty during our inspection visit. The manager said they reviewed the needs of people on a daily basis to ensure the correct levels of staff were available on each shift.

Medicines were stored correctly and managed effectively. The stock of medicines recorded in the medicine stock book accurately reflected the stock of medicines held at the home. This showed returned medicines were accounted for accurately. The manager implemented a system for daily recording of the fridge and medicine area temperatures during our inspection. Staff were knowledgeable about the correct range of temperatures and told us the correct action they would take if the temperatures went out of range.

We reviewed all of the medicine administration records (MARs). MARs were correctly completed and provided relevant information to ensure people received their medicines as prescribed. Staff who administered medicines had received up to date medicine training.

There was a system in place for administering homely remedies and 'PRN' as needed medicines to people.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Relatives told us, "We find the staff very, very good, they keep us informed and any concerns at all they call us or e mail, we're kept fully informed." Another relative told us, "We have been really impressed with the service, the staff do everything they can to keep [person] as independent as possible and [person] is the happiest they have been...I would say the continuity of the staff has been the key." A member of staff said, "We work well as a team, we are all equal but not the same and it works so well...we are the dream team."

People were supported and cared for by staff who had received effective training and regular supervision. There was a clear programme of training in place with staff receiving refresher training in core subjects such as, safeguarding, infection control and fire safety as required. Staff told us, "The training has been very good, I particularly like the practical training, the trainers are excellent." Training was provided through a variety of methods, either delivered in house using the providers own staff or provided by a local independent training provider.

Staff received regular supervision sessions which were conducted in a positive way, encouraging staff to put forward areas they wished to develop. Staff said, "Supervisions are good, it's a two way street and I feel confident to talk about any issues or concerns." The manager told us the provider was currently developing a revised appraisal system that would be introduced later this year.

The Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 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 authorised under the MCA. The application procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The registered manager was knowledgeable regarding the application process for DoLS, however at the time of our inspection there was not anyone living at Pinehaven who required a DoLS.

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the Mental Capacity Act. We saw best interests decisions were undertaken following an assessment of the person's mental capacity and consultation with those people or representatives who knew them best. Where people were able to, they had signed consent for their care and support. Where people were unable to sign, a relative or representative had signed for them if they had the appropriate legal authority. The majority of people living at Pinehaven were able to make their own choices about how they would like their care and support to be provided. Staff knew people well and records showed people and their families were involved and consulted in their day to day care which ensured people were supported in their daily decision making process.

Staff supported people to prepare and cook their meals. People's dietary needs were assessed with their specific likes, dislikes and allergies recorded in their support plan. One person needed a soft/fork mashable diet to enable them to eat safely. Clear guidance for staff was included in the person's support plan with

pictures of specific high risk food to ensure safe meals were prepared. People were monitored each month to ensure they maintained a healthy weight.

People were supported to do their own shopping and make their meal choices for the week. Weekly menus were displayed in the kitchen so people could see what meals were planned. There were healthy snacks such as fruit and yoghurt available and people could buy their own snacks when they wanted.

There were systems in place to monitor people's on-going health needs. Records showed a range of professionals were involved in assessing, planning, implementing and evaluating people's care and treatment. Staff told us that the service regularly liaised with a range of health professionals such as, opticians, podiatrists, occupational therapists and GP's to assess and meet peoples' needs, records we reviewed showed this was the case.

Throughout the home posters and guidance information was displayed in an 'easy read' pictorial format. This ensured people could put their views across and feel involved in the running of the home.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

There was a relaxed, calm, friendly atmosphere at Pinehaven. People told us they liked living there, they said, "I like it here, everyone is really friendly, I like the staff they are very nice." Another person told us, "I love living here, everyone is so friendly." Relatives told us they were always made to feel welcome and felt the staff knew all the people really well. They told us, "We enjoy every visit, it's very pleasant, comfortable and accommodating, I have a lot of time for all the staff they are all very good."

We observed staff treated people with kindness and compassion and knew what people preferred to do during their day and what made them happy. Staff treated people with respect, they were aware of the importance in respecting people's privacy and treating them with dignity. Staff were friendly and approachable and people constantly sought staff out to chat with them. Staff spoke clearly to people and care was taken not to overload the person with too much information at one time.

People's privacy was respected. Bedrooms were lockable and people were offered their bedroom key and staff asked permission before they entered people's bedrooms. People could choose to spend time with others in the communal areas of the home. However, if people wanted quiet time there were areas in the home that could accommodate them.

Throughout the inspection we observed and read about many examples of staff respecting people's privacy and dignity. For example, clear guidance for staff was written in a person's support plan to ensure their dignity was preserved at all times should they have an epileptic fit.

People's personal preferences were detailed in their support plan and staff ensured these were met. For example, one person's plan included that their family visits were important to them and gave guidance for staff to follow. The plan stated, "On the day of the visit I need staff to wake me in plenty of time, I like to look smart and have my hair done nicely for each visit."

One person told us about their love of musicals and showed us their selection of DVD's. They said, "We're going to see Mama Mia on Saturday, I can't wait." One person particularly enjoyed anything to do with the Police service. A member of staff had arranged for them to spend the day with the local police, visiting behind the scenes at the police station and having their pictures taken. The person showed us pictures taken on the day, they said, "It was really good, I loved it."

People's views were respected and listened to. There were regular house meetings where people could discuss any concerns or issues as well as decide what meals to have and what outings and visits they could arrange.

Computers and internet access was available and staff were able to support people to use the internet and social media sites. One person spent time showing us their computer equipment, they said, "I love watching my TV and I can watch on my tablet as well now, it's really good."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

A relative told us, "We've found the staff to be extremely supportive and open, we feel absolutely involved all the time." Another relative told us, "I feel listened to, I have no concerns at all." One person told us, "The staff always help me, all the time."

Staff told us communication within the home was good. They said, "We all work really well together, we check the handover book and we always speak to each other all the time, we always know if there are any changes."

People's needs were assessed and support and care plans reflected their current needs. People and their relatives had been involved in the assessment process and plans were signed by people where possible. Support plans were updated every six months or more regularly if people's needs changed. Support plans were person centred and gave staff clear guidance on how to support people. For example one support plan stated, "I will brush my hair myself, however, if I find this difficult at the back I may need help to dry and style it...I love hair clips in my hair and need help with them." One person had epilepsy and their support plan gave detailed guidance for staff on how to recognise a seizure and what support they required, during and after the seizure to ensure they were reassured and kept calm and comfortable.

One person had a behaviour support plan in place. This enabled staff to be aware of the specific behaviours the person may present, and to understand and use appropriate strategies to support them with their behaviour. The plan covered appropriate de-escalation techniques to prevent and manage potentially challenging situations. Staff told us they had found the support plan to be useful and effective.

People received personalised, responsive care in accordance with their specific needs. Each person had an allocated member of staff, a keyworker, who supported them to ensure their wishes and preferences were identified and carried out.

People were supported in promoting their own independence and community involvement. There was a wide range and variety of activities that people could take part in if they wished. These involved attending a community day centre, working in charity shops, shopping and taking part in sports they enjoyed. Relatives told us they really valued the commitment staff showed to ensure people were supported to live as independent lives as possible. A recent residents meeting had resulted in people making many suggestions for future days out. Days out suggestions included, Longleat, Marwell Zoo, shopping in Southampton, the Bournemouth Air Show and Salisbury Cathedral. Suggestions for people's holidays had included Butlins and the Isle of Wight.

There was a pictorial "Making things better" complaint form that people could complete if they had any concerns or wished to complain about an aspect of living at Pinehaven. The form gave clear guidance about what people could expect to happen and the timeframes involved. The service had received one formal complaint since the last inspection that was completed in August 2015. The manager told us the action that had been taken to address the complaint which followed the provider's complaint policy. The provider's

complaint policy was up to date and covered all areas of dealing with complaints. Relatives told us they knew how to complain, although they had not yet had to make a complaint.

People were actively supported to maintain relationship with their families. One person was spending a week with their family during our inspection. Relatives told us they were always made to feel very welcome at Pinehaven when they visited.

People attended monthly resident meetings known as "Our voice, our say" that gave people the opportunity to talk with each other. People were able to discuss a wide range of topics from concerns and niggles to meal choices, outing choices and daily tasks to do with living at Pinehaven: such as clearing away dishes, keeping areas tidy and putting out the rubbish.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Pinehaven had 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.

People, staff and relatives spoke positively about the manager. People told us the manager and their team were open, honest, friendly and approachable. Relatives spoke of the open and friendly culture at the home and staff felt well supported and told us help and advice was always available.

The manager told us they were proud of their staff and how they showed such commitment and care for the people who lived at Pinehaven. They told us staff had improved in confidence and that Pinehaven was a happy, family focussed home to work in. They said, "We all work together to come up with solutions that are best for everyone."

Staff told us, "I'm very well supported with good management...they listen to us and we are always thanked, I feel appreciated. The manager is very approachable and easy to talk to...I would recommend working here it's nice." Staff told us they felt communication was very good, with management always prepared to listen and support people and staff. Staff said, "We are always welcome to approach the management team to talk...it's a pleasure coming to work here."

Staff had recently completed a questionnaire asking for their views on the home. The completed questionnaires showed positive views, comments included, "Very happy to be part of such a great organisation" and "I like the direction the organisation is heading towards. Professional and quality care combined with comfortable environment make the Stable Family Home Trust a great place to work."

A range of audits to assess the quality of the service were regularly completed. These audits included infection control, medication, accident and incidents, health and safety and environment, financial and petty cash and support plans.

The manager spoke knowledgeably about the notification procedure they followed when they were required to make notification to the Care Quality Commission as per the regulations.

The homes last inspection rating was displayed in the home in the communal area.