

Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council

Bluebell Centre

Inspection report

North Solihull Council House
West Mall
Chelmsley Wood
West Midlands
B37 5TX

Tel: 01217097012
Website: www.solihull.gov.uk

Date of inspection visit:
16 March 2017

Date of publication:
10 May 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

The Bluebell Centre is a reablement service which provides support to people in their own homes. At the time of our visit 35 people were using the service. The reablement service involves a multi-disciplinary approach involving support workers, social workers and occupational therapists agreeing a programme of intensive support for people with the aim of skilling them or re-skilling them to manage the activities of daily living. It is particularly used for people who need support to help regain skills and confidence after being discharged from hospital. The service is generally provided for a period of six weeks to 12 weeks dependent on the individual's needs.

We visited the offices of the Bluebell Centre on 16 March 2017. We last inspected this service on 10 September 2015 and rated the service as Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

Pre-employment checks were completed for all new staff to check that they were suitable to work with people who used the service. There were enough staff employed to meet people's needs and to attend each call. People were kept safe by support workers who had received training on how to recognise and report any suspected abuse. Risks related to people's care were assessed and procedures were put in place to minimise the risks. Procedures were in place to support people safely when they took their medicines.

Support workers received training to support people effectively. The registered manager understood the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and support workers understood the need to gain people's consent before providing care. Referrals were made to health and social care professionals when needed to make sure people received the support they needed.

People received support from support workers that they described as kind who helped them to achieve their goals to regain their independence. Support workers understood the importance of respecting people's dignity.

People were involved in planning their care and this was reviewed continually to meet their needs. Support workers had good knowledge of people's preferences and offered choices. People knew how to raise concerns and felt confident to do so however no complaints had been received by the service in the 12 months prior to our visit.

Support workers received support from the registered manager to deliver high quality care. People were given opportunities to give their feedback about the service and this was analysed to make sure that the service continued to meet people's needs. The registered manager completed regular quality assurance checks to promote continual improvement within the service.

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

Bluebell Centre

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 was a comprehensive inspection.

We visited the offices of the Bluebell Centre on 16 March 2017. This inspection was announced to the provider 48 hours before our visit so that they could arrange for staff to be available to talk to us about the service.

This inspection was carried out by an inspector, an inspector manager 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.

Prior to our inspection visit, we reviewed the information we held about the service. We looked at the information received from the statutory notifications the service had sent us. A statutory notification is information about important events which the provider is required to send to us by law. We also reviewed the information in the provider's information return (PIR). This is a form we asked the provider to send to us before we visited. The PIR asked the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they planned to make. The information contained within the PIR was accurate to what we saw during our inspection visit.

We contacted people who used the service by telephone and spoke with six people. During our inspection visit we spoke with six members of staff including the registered manager and support workers.

We reviewed five people's care plans to see how their care and support was planned and delivered. We checked whether staff had been recruited safely and were trained to deliver the care and support people required. We looked at other records related to people's care and how the service operated including the service's quality assurance audits and records of complaints.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At this inspection visit we found staff had the same level of knowledge and skill to support people safely. The rating continues to be Good.

People told us they felt safe with their support workers. One person told us "I definitely felt safe. They was ever so nice to me, they helped me with everything, whatever I asked for."

Staff told us they received training about how to recognise signs of abuse and they felt confident in raising any concerns with their supervisor. A support worker told us that they had previously identified a person was being neglected. They told us that they reported this to their supervisor who made a safeguarding referral. This assured us staff understood their responsibilities to keep people safe.

Before a person began working with the provider's service an assessment of their needs was completed. The information gathered was then used to complete risk assessments which gave support workers instructions on how to support the person. Support workers told us that these assessments were available in each person's home. People told us that staff identified risks within their home and offered advice on how to reduce the risk. One person said "They (support worker) said 'don't put a mat there by the bed' as I might slip. It was little things that I wouldn't have thought about."

People told us that they were supported by staff they knew and who had been introduced to them. A person told us "I felt safe. I knew they were coming and if I was stuck with anything, I knew they'd help me." They went on to say that their calls were always on time and this helped to reassure them as they regained their independence and confidence. The registered manager explained that the number of calls a person needed and the length of these were determined by their social care assessment. We saw that staff rota's included enough staff to attend each call and that if a member of staff was unexpectedly absent, for example through illness, the calls were covered by other members of staff.

People who received support from the provider's service were able to administer their own medicines however staff sometimes prompted them as a reminder. Staff told us that they received medicine training so if they supported a person who was unable to take medicines independently they could support them with this. The registered manager told us, "If we were supporting someone with their medicine and there was a medication error the support worker would have to redo the medication training to refresh their knowledge."

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At this inspection visit, we found staff had the same level of skill, experience and support to enable them to meet people's needs as effectively as we found at the previous inspection. People continued to have freedom of choice and were supported with their dietary and health needs. The rating continues to be Good. People told us that staff understood how to support them. One person told us, "They knew what they were doing, I had no complaints." Staff told us that when they first started working with the service they received an induction which included completing training and working alongside an experienced worker until they were confident in providing support alone. Following their induction staff received additional training and regular updates to make sure their knowledge remained up to date with recommended practice. This meant people had the skills to care for people effectively.

We checked whether the provider was working within the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). 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.

Staff told us the people they supported usually had capacity to make their own decisions but if it was identified that a person may not have capacity this was reported to their supervisor who would arrange for a capacity assessment to be completed. A support worker told us that one person they supported had dementia but still had capacity to make their own decisions.

People told us support workers always asked for their consent before they supported them, one person told us "Yes, they were very good about that, they never did anything I wasn't happy about and always checked I was okay with what they were doing."

People told us they were able to make their own decisions about what they wanted to eat and if it was needed support workers would help them to prepare it. We saw it was identified in one person's care plan that they were at risk of malnutrition. Support workers were instructed to encourage this person to eat regular meals. A food chart was completed to record what the person had eaten and staff regularly liaised with other health care professionals involved in the person's care to make sure that any concerns were followed up appropriately to maintain people's health.

A support worker told us they were able to refer to other healthcare professionals and arrange for required equipment to be ordered for a person. They went on to explain, "This is important because with the right equipment in place people can become independent more quickly. It can be very simple things like a handrail down a step, a zimmer frame or a shower chair." A person told us the positive impact the equipment provided had made for them, "They put a rail upstairs, gave me a stick for upstairs and one for downstairs. I can shower on my own now."

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection we found people enjoyed the same positive interactions with staff as they had during our previous inspection. The rating continues to be Good.

The Bluebell Centre offered short term support to people to regain their independence however in this time people told us they developed positive relationships with their support team. One person told us, "I couldn't wish for a nicer people." They went on to say the impact of the support they had received was "I was freer because I had people coming round to support me - they really, really helped me very, very well. It was emotional support - I liked them." A support worker told us, "I love my job, I get a feeling of pride when I see the changes our support can make to someone. They can come home from hospital and feel worried that they won't be able to cope but we can help them regain that confidence.

People told us that when they started with the service they met with a reablement care facilitator to create their care plan, this included what goals they wanted to achieve. We saw in one person's care plan their goal was to improve their mobility following a fall and regular support from physiotherapists had been arranged. We saw that people had signed their care plans to show they agreed with the plans.

People told us that support workers always treated them with dignity and respect. A support worker told us how they supported a person "If I help them with personal care I always ask them what they would like. This might be waiting for them outside the bathroom or covering them with a towel so they are not exposed. It's important to make sure the person is comfortable with you."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At this inspection we found people's care continued to be planned in a person centred way. Support workers continued to promote choice and encouraged people to provide feedback about the service. The registered manager had not received any complaints in the past 12 months. The rating continues to be Good.

People each had a care plan which included information about what support they wanted from the service and detailed their preferences. The registered manager told us that the care plans were reviewed continuously. Staff confirmed this and stated that if they identified any changes in a person's needs they contacted their supervisors who would immediately update the care plan.

Staff told us they were able to contact other services involved in a person's care to discuss any changes in their needs. The registered manager explained that if it was identified that a person was not going to be able to reach their independence goals in the time frame they were supported by the Bluebell Centre the person was referred to other services who could offer them support over a longer period.

Every person who received support from the Bluebell Centre, received a service user pack which included a quality assurance questionnaire to provide feedback of the service. The results of these questionnaires were recorded and analysed by the registered manager to identify any area's the service could improve. In the 12 months prior to our inspection visit 76 questionnaires had been returned. The responses indicated a high level of satisfaction with the care provided and comments included, "Very helpful carers, wonderful service to help people in need." and "Excellent service always recommend you to others, keep up this very important good work." No suggestions on how the service could improve had been made but the registered manager told us they would "Take on board any suggestions to improve the service."

Each person we spoke with was aware how to raise a complaint with the service however no one had felt the need to raise any concerns. This was reflected in the feedback received by the service. In the 12 months prior to our inspection visit no complaints had been received and 19 compliments had been received thanking the staff for the care provided.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At this inspection we found that the registered manager continued to have processes in place to monitor the quality of service provided and to identify areas of improvement. Staff continued to feel supported in their roles and told us they enjoyed their roles. The rating continues to be Good.

People told us they thought the service was well managed, one person said, "They were all approachable people. I was very, very pleased." Another person said, "I can't think of anything they could do better, it was a very good service." Members of staff told us that they enjoyed their jobs and were proud of the support they gave comments included, "I really enjoy my role" and, "My job is very rewarding, I love what I do."

Since our last inspection the service had undergone a restructure which included changes to the staff and to the registered manager. The current registered manager was previously a registered manager at another service owned by the provider and became the registered manager for the Bluebell Centre in October 2016. 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.

Members of staff told us that they felt during the restructuring process communication from the provider was not as effective as they would have liked however they had felt very supported by the new registered manager. A member of staff told us, "(Registered manager) is very approachable; I can go to them with any questions." Another member of staff explained that the registered manager had supported them in developing their skills within a new role and this had helped them to feel more confident.

The registered manager completed checks to assure the service being provided was of high quality, this included reviewing care plans and support documents, medicine records, feedback received, training records and observing staff delivering care. Any improvements required were included on an action plan. For example, in October 2016 it was identified that not all people using the service were aware on how to raise a complaint, steps taken to address this was staff informing people on their first visit how to make a complaint and providing people with leaflets explaining the process.

Staff received regular one to one meetings with their supervisor which gave them the opportunity to discuss their well-being and their roles. Staff told us they found these meetings beneficial and allowed them to plan any future training opportunities or to discuss any concerns. Staff also had regular team meetings which discussed various topics about the service and people were encouraged to provide any feedback or suggestions for improvement.