

Runwood Homes Limited

Broomhills

Inspection report

Stambridge Road
Rochford
Essex
SS4 2AQ

Tel: 01702542630
Website: www.runwoodhomes.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
22 February 2017
28 February 2017

Date of publication:
20 April 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

Broomhills is a residential care home for up to 47 older people some of whom may be living with dementia. When we inspected there were 42 people living in the service.

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

People received a consistently 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. Risks were well managed. Medication management was good and people received their medication as prescribed.

People were cared for by supported, 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 plenty of good quality food and drink to meet their needs and preferences and their healthcare needs were met.

Staff knew the people they cared for very well and were consistently kind, caring and compassionate in their approach. People felt that all of the staff were 'the tops' 'couldn't be better' and, 'treated with dignity'. People said the staff were wonderful and treated them 'perfectly' always respecting their privacy and maintaining their dignity. People were encouraged and supported to remain as independent as was possible.

People and their relatives were fully involved in their assessment process and their care plans had been tailored to meet their needs and preferences. People participated in regular reviews to ensure their care plans reflected their changing needs. There were plenty of activities available to suit people's individual needs and tastes. People told us they had regular trips out to local pubs for a meal and to family gatherings such as weddings. Staff encouraged and supported people to participate in activities that suited their interests. Complaints were dealt with appropriately, they were fully investigated and responded to in a timely way.

All of the people we spoke with 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, wishes 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.

Broomhills

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 22 February 2017 and 28 February 2017 and was unannounced. 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.

We reviewed 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, three of their relatives, the registered manager, the deputy manager, and seven members of staff. We reviewed four people's care files, four 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 consistently told us they felt safe living at the service, one person said, "I have complete faith in the staff here, they all care for us in a professional manner." A visiting relative told us, "I don't have to worry about [person's name] when I am not here, staff are kind and I know that my relative is safe and happy." Staff demonstrated a good understanding of how to protect people from the risk of harm and there were clear guidelines for them to refer to when needed. Safeguarding issues had been dealt with appropriately. Staff described how they kept people safe. One staff member said, "The care plans have good information in them about how to keep people safe." Another said, "I know the people I care for quite well and am aware of their risks and how to manage them." There were risk assessments and management plans in place to minimise any risks to people's health, safety and welfare.

There were sufficient numbers of suitably skilled and experienced staff to meet people's assessed needs. People consistently told us that there were enough staff to meet their needs and that they never felt rushed. One person said, "They [staff] don't take very long if I press my call bell. If I press it at night they're just as good." Another person told us, "They [staff] come quite quickly if I need them." Another person said, "They [staff] don't rush in and out, they take their time, and always have a nice little chat." Staff told us, and the duty rotas confirmed that there were enough of them to care for people safely. There was a robust recruitment process where all appropriate checks were carried out before staff started work at the service.

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.

People were cared for by staff who felt supported and valued. Staff told us, and the records confirmed that they had regular supervision and annual appraisals. One staff member said, "I have plenty of opportunity to discuss anything at my supervision, at team meetings and whenever I feel the need to." Other staff told us that they were supported well and had access to appropriate guidance and support when needed. Staff had the knowledge and skills to care for people effectively. People told us they felt that staff were well trained. One person said, "I think the staff are well trained here, they all do their very best for us." Another told us, "Nothing ever seems to faze them [staff] and I don't know how they do it." Other people and their visiting relatives told us that the staff showed high levels of professionalism in the care they provided. People said staff were quick to notice when people needed support. 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, "People's capacity to consent sometimes changes and we have to make sure that we work together with others to ensure that decisions are made in people'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 and condiments and sauces were offered. We observed staff and residents chatting and laughing together showing a very easy and natural rapport. People told us that their food was always appetising and hot. One person said, "For breakfast I have a pot of tea – a pot of tea not a cup because I like more than one. Normally I have egg, bacon, mushrooms, tomatoes and bread. I could have whatever I liked. Where people needed support with their meal staff supported them in a friendly, helpful manner. Drinks were readily available throughout the home and there was also a drinks station in the hallway downstairs and people could help themselves to one if they wished. 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 told us that staff supported them to remain healthy. One person said, "They'd [staff] notice if I was unwell. On Monday I got up late with a headache, and they kept a close eye on me...they gave me some

tablets to ease the pain." There were clear records that showed people had attended routine health appointments as needed. They detailed the outcomes of the appointment and any follow up action required.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection we found that people were consistently cared for by kind, caring and compassionate staff and the rating remains 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. Without exception all of the people we spoke with were complimentary about the service. One person put their thumbs up, saying, "They're [staff] the tops, couldn't be better." Another person told us, "Staff are very kind, polite and friendly. I've never seen them behave in any other way." A visiting relative said, "The staff are very attentive in the way they treat people. I marvel at their patience, I could never do it. They [staff] treat my relative wonderfully."

Staff knew the people they cared for really well and described how they met individual's diverse needs such as their religious, cultural, dietary and mobility requirements. For example staff told us, and people confirmed that they were supported to follow their individual religious faith. People said that the foods offered suited their individual cultural and dietary needs and choices. People shared their views and opinions and were consulted at every stage of their care. They told us that they were always offered choice and that they had been actively involved in making decisions about their care and support. We saw this in practice throughout our inspection visits. Staff carefully explained choices to people in a way they could understand. There was friendly banter and lots of laughter between staff and residents. There was an easy rapport between them and they talked about various different subjects, rather than task-based conversations. Staff told us they enjoyed their job and we could see that people received person centred care that was built around their individual aspirations, wishes and preferences. For example staff supported people to attend family events that they would not have been able to attend otherwise due to the distance of the event. The service provided people with a supportive and caring place to live.

People consistently told us that staff were respectful, treated them with dignity, and were kind, caring and patient. One person said, "They [staff] treat me perfectly. If I ask for anything they don't make me feel that I am a nuisance. All of them are good." Another person told us, "Staff always knock on my door, they don't just walk in. All the staff are friendly, caring and understanding. The night staff are just as good. They are all wonderful, I never feel rushed by any of them." A visiting relative said, "All the staff are very engaging and friendly. They will stop to have a little chat, or give us news of people." We heard this in practice throughout our visits. For example one person was heard to be very upset and anxious and we saw a member of staff crouching down next to them. They said, "It's alright [person's name] I'm here and I'm not leaving you." This reassured the person and we noticed soon after that they were calmer and more settled.

People's person centred care plans included detailed information about their likes and dislikes and described how they wanted to be cared for. Each person had a named key worker who had the responsibility to ensure that they had everything they wanted to meet their diverse needs. Staff encouraged and supported people to retain their independence as much as was possible. We saw people moving around the service independently and heard staff offering them support when needed.

People were supported and encouraged to maintain relationships with their families and friends. Visiting relatives told us they were always made to feel welcome, offered a drink and kept updated about their relative's health and welfare. One relative said, "We always feel welcomed as a family, they'll make me a cup of tea, and if I'm here a long time they'll offer me a sandwich too." Another relative told us, "The staff are very nice....If we've taken my relative out, they will greet them at the door, quickly offer them a cup of tea, and we leave them chatting with one of the staff about their day out." They added, "It's just like coming into a normal home."

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 consistently received personalised, responsive care that met their individual needs and aspirations and the rating remains 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 consistently told us, and the records confirmed that they had been fully involved in the assessment and care planning process. One relative told us, "When my relative first came to the home the manager told me that they wanted this to be their home. I told them that when we were at home my relative had a small glass of brandy and I had a small glass of scotch together and that we would like to continue doing so. It has never been a problem we keep our drinks in my relative's room and it's just like it's always been." The care plans viewed described people's likes and dislikes, a detailed life history to inform staff of people's background and good information about how to care for them. This included all areas of identified risk and how to manage them. One staff member said, "The care plans are very detailed and provide a lot of information about people's family life, their work life and their interests."

People were offered a wide range of activities to suit their individual preferences. Throughout the home we saw many areas of interest which demonstrated high levels of thoughtfulness and creativity. For example, in one corridor we saw a wall-mounted display of motoring memorabilia, including a steering wheel, car horn, oil cans and magazines and books about cars and sport. In another area there were two mannequins dressed as a bride and groom and people's wedding photographs were on the wall. We saw a sweet trolley in another area which had jars and packets of sweets that people could help themselves to. One person told us, "It's like visiting an old fashioned sweet shop." The service offered people planned activities in the morning, the afternoon and in the evening. Activities included, bingo, chair Zumba (exercise), cycle club (more exercise) and regular coffee mornings.

People were very positive about the activities on offer. They told us that the activities lady talked to them about the activities they wanted to do and explained what was planned and if they wanted to do it or do something else instead. One person said, "We go out to pub lunches and sometimes go bowling. I am never bored here. Even if I am in my room staff always speak to me as they're passing." We observed many activities throughout our visit including a game of bingo and noticed that most people were engaged and enthusiastic, and staff were on hand to support people who needed help. For example, one person said, "I won't play, I can't see the numbers." A member of staff quickly responded, saying, "Well, I can help you, if you would like, we'll play together, shall we?" Another person, who was very frail and unable to participate alone was supported by a member of staff to enable them to join in the game of bingo.

Another person told us about a recent outing to the Ritz Hotel to celebrate another person's 90th birthday. They said, "It was a joint operation between the home and the other person's family and it was a wonderful day out." The activities co-coordinator told us that they made every effort to accompany people when they were invited to an event such as a family wedding. They said, "I'll volunteer to go with them if I can organise transport as we don't want people to miss out on family occasions."

People consistently told us they were confident that their concerns would be listened to and acted upon swiftly. One person said, "I have brought complaints before, and it's been put right." Other people said that the registered manager was quick to respond to any concerns. One person told us, "I am confident that any issues would be taken seriously, and dealt with to my satisfaction. I am sure I would be listened to." A visiting relative told us that communication between residents, families and staff was very good. They said, "If I had any concerns I would take them, to the staff or the registered manager. They [staff] are all very good, they let me know if my relative is unwell, or if they need anything. When they [staff] phone they always say, "There's nothing to worry about, but..." They're very considerate and understanding."

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 registered manager and staff promoted a positive person-centred culture. Staff shared the registered manager's vision to provide people with the best possible 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. One relative told us, "We get on well with [registered manager's name]. They have changed a lot here – the café, the sweet shop etc. They have good ideas and makes them work." One person said, "We see a lot of the registered manager, they're always about checking up that we are happy about things."

People told us, and the records confirmed that regular meetings were held for people using the service, their relatives and for staff. One relative said, "There are regular resident and relatives meetings held, which are enjoyable, informative and useful." They told us that due to the registered manager and staff being so approachable and visible around the home, the meetings do not tend to be 'grumble times' as people are happy with the care provided. They also said that the meetings were useful for informing people about any planned changes being considered, and to ask for people's views about them.

There was an effective quality monitoring system in place. People's views had been sought and analysed and regular audits of the systems and processes had been carried out. People said that the registered manager had an open door policy and that they could to raise issues at any time. People said that staff were consistent and that there were not many changes. A member of staff told us they liked the service so much they couldn't wait to come back to work after a long break. They said the service was run for the people that use it and there was a feeling like 'one big happy family'. People and their relatives told us they would happily recommend the service. The registered manager told us there were a number of people waiting for a vacancy as they wanted to live in Broomhills.

People told us about the 'Employee of the month award'. They said that they together with their relatives and other staff had the opportunity to choose a member of staff and put their name forward for the award each month. We saw there was a framed photograph of the current month's winner on the notice board. Staff told us that the provider also had a 'dignity award' and that they had annual award ceremonies. People told us that the staff team were consistent and there were not many changes. We saw that everyone was on first names terms and people and their relatives were very comfortable and at ease with all of the staff. One person said, "I think the staff are happy here, they're not grumpy and they tend to stay here."

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.