

Summerley Care Homes LLP

# Summerley Care Home

## Inspection report

1 Southview Road  
Felpham  
Bognor Regis  
West Sussex  
PO22 7JA

Tel: 01243823330

Date of inspection visit:  
01 October 2019

Date of publication:  
06 November 2019

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement 

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement 

Is the service effective?

Requires Improvement 

Is the service caring?

Good 

Is the service responsive?

Good 

Is the service well-led?

Good 

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

About the service:

Summerley Care Home is a care home registered to provide residential care and accommodation for 21 people with various health conditions, including dementia and frailty. There were 19 people living at the service on the day of our inspection. Summerley Care Home is a large converted property located in Felpham, West Sussex.

People's experience of using this service:

Many people at the service were living with dementia. Feedback we received from people, their relatives and our own observations showed that people were happy with the care they received, felt relaxed with staff and told us they were treated with kindness.

However, we identified areas of practice needing improvement in relation to the management of medicines and people's mealtime experience.

We have made a recommendation in respect to the environment of the service being more appropriate for people living with dementia.

People said they felt safe, were well supported and there were sufficient staff to care for them. Our own observations supported this, and we saw friendly relationships had developed between people and staff. A relative told us, "The staff are amazing, they're so caring". People felt their healthcare needs were met and they had access to professionals should this be required.

People enjoyed an independent lifestyle and told us their choices and needs were met. They enjoyed the food, drink and activities that took place daily. One person told us, "I do enjoy the food they give us".

People felt the service was homely and welcoming to them and their visitors. A relative told us, "It's a lovely home, very friendly and homely". People told us they thought the service was well managed and they enjoyed living there. One person told us, "The man [registered manager] comes and talks to me, it's all very good".

Staff had received training considered essential by the provider. It was clear from observing the care delivered and the feedback people and staff gave us, that they knew the best way to care for people in line with their needs and preferences. People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

The provider had systems of quality assurance to measure and monitor the standard of the service and drive

improvement. These systems also supported people to stay safe by assessing and mitigating risks, ensuring that people were cared for in a person centred way and that the provider learned from any mistakes. Our own observations and the feedback we received supported this. People received high quality care from dedicated and enthusiastic staff that met their needs and improved their wellbeing. A member of staff said, "Everyone is really supportive here. I love caring for the residents".

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

Rating at last inspection: The last rating for this service was good (published 1 February 2018).

Why we inspected: The inspection was prompted in part due to concerns received about the quality of care delivery and people's safety. A decision was made for us to inspect and examine those risks.

Follow up: We will continue to monitor the intelligence we receive about this home and plan to inspect in line with our re-inspection schedule for those services rated Requires Improvement. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

## 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 not always safe.

Details are in our Safe findings below.

**Requires Improvement** ●

### Is the service effective?

The service was not always effective.

Details are in our Effective findings below.

**Requires Improvement** ●

### Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

Details are in our Caring findings below.

**Good** ●

### Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

Details are in our Responsive findings below.

**Good** ●

### Is the service well-led?

The service was well led.

Details are in our Well-Led findings below.

**Good** ●

# Summerley Care Home

## **Detailed findings**

### Background to this inspection

The 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.

Inspection team:

The inspection team consisted of two inspector's.

Service and service type:

Summerley Care Home is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

Notice of inspection:

This was an unannounced inspection, which meant the provider and staff were not aware that we were coming.

What we did:

The provider was not asked to complete a provider information return prior to this inspection. This is information we require providers to send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We took this into account when we inspected the service

and made the judgements in this report.

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service.

During the inspection:

We observed the support that people received, spoke with people and staff and gathered information relating to the management of the service. We used the short observational framework for inspection (SOFI), which is a way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us. We reviewed a range of records. This included four staff recruitment files, training records, records relating to the management of the service and a variety of policies and procedures and quality assurance processes developed and implemented by the provider. We reviewed six people's care records.

We spoke with four people living at the service and three visiting relatives. We also spoke with four members of staff, including the registered manager and care staff.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

Safe – this means people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has deteriorated to requires improvement. This meant some aspects of the service were not always safe and there was limited assurance about safety. There was an increased risk that people could be harmed.

### Using medicines safely

- Care staff were trained in the administration of medicines. However, we saw areas of practice that needed improvement.
- During the morning medicines round, we saw a member of staff leave the keys to the medicines trolley unattended for several minutes on top of the trolley whilst they went upstairs to administer a person's medicines. The unattended keys were eventually noticed by another member of staff who picked them up. When the original member of staff returned, they were unaware of where the keys were and were unable to access the trolley until the other member of staff informed them about the keys. This placed people at risk, as the keys could have been picked up by a person living with dementia at the service who could have accessed the medicines trolley or taken the keys away. Furthermore, we saw that daily temperature recording for the medicines room and fridge temperatures contained gaps and omissions. Nobody we spoke with expressed any concerns around their medicines, or had been harmed in light of these issues, however, we have identified this as an area of practice that needs improvement.
- A member of staff described how they completed the medicine administration records (MAR). We saw these were accurate. We observed a member of staff giving medicines sensitively and appropriately. We saw they administered medicines to people in a discreet and respectful way and stayed with them until they had taken them safely.
- Medicines were stored appropriately and securely and in line with legal requirements. We checked that medicines were ordered appropriately and medicines which were out of date or no longer needed were disposed of safely.

### Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People said they felt safe and staff made them feel comfortable, and that they had no concerns around safety. A relative told us, "If I didn't feel that [my relative] was safe at all times, then she wouldn't be here".
- Staff had a good awareness of safeguarding and could identify the different types of abuse and knew what to do if they had any concerns about people's safety.
- Information relating to safeguarding and what steps should be followed if people witnessed or suspected abuse was displayed around the service for staff and people.

### Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risks associated with the safety of the environment and equipment were identified and managed

appropriately.

- Regular checks to ensure fire safety had been undertaken and people had personal emergency evacuation plans, which informed staff of how to support people to evacuate the building in the event of an emergency.
- Equipment was regularly checked and maintained. This ensured that people were supported to use equipment that was safe.
- Risk assessments were reviewed regularly to ensure they provided current guidance for staff. Each person's care plan had a number of risk assessments completed which were specific to their needs, such as mobility, risk of falls and medicines. For example, some people were at risk of choking. Their care plans contained specific details for staff on how to manage the risks involved with their intake of food and drink.
- The assessments outlined the associated hazards and what measures could be taken to reduce or eliminate the risk.

#### Staffing and recruitment

- The deployment of staff met people's needs and kept them safe. Feedback from people and staff was they felt the service had enough staff and our own observations supported this. One person told us, "I have a button to push and they [staff] come to me".
- Staffing levels were assessed daily, or when the needs of people changed, to ensure people's safety. We were told existing staff would be contacted to cover shifts in circumstances such as sickness and annual leave.
- Records demonstrated staff were recruited in line with safe practice and equal opportunities protocols. For example, employment histories had been checked, suitable references obtained, and appropriate checks undertaken to ensure that potential staff were safe to work within the care sector.

#### Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Staff took appropriate action following accidents and incidents to ensure people's safety and this was recorded. For example, contacting relevant health professionals after any specific incidents.
- We saw specific details and any follow up action to prevent a re-occurrence was recorded, and any subsequent action was shared and analysed to look for any trends or patterns.

#### Preventing and controlling infection

- The service and its equipment were clean and well maintained. There was an infection control policy and other related policies in place. Relevant information was displayed around the service to remind people and staff of their responsibilities in respect to cleanliness and infection control.
- The laundry had appropriate systems and equipment to clean soiled washing, and we saw that any hazardous waste was stored securely and disposed of correctly.



# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

Effective – this means that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has deteriorated to requires improvement. This meant the effectiveness of people's care, treatment and support did not always achieve good outcomes or was inconsistent.

Adapting service, design, decoration to meet people's needs

- People's individual needs around their orientation and mobility were met not by the adaptation of the premises. The environment can have a huge impact on people living with dementia. The use of colour, contrast and familiar items or pictures can be really helpful for people with dementia to assist them to mobilise and orientate themselves.
- The service did not have handrails fitted throughout and people's bedroom doors were all the same colour. Some people's doors had their picture on them to assist them, but many other doors were plain. The service also did not have adequate dementia friendly and clear signage to enable people to orientate themselves around the service and locate any specific rooms they needed, such as toilets and bathrooms. The registered manager was aware that the environment needed to be improved to assist people living with dementia and was in the process of discussing improvements with the provider. We recommend the provider researches from a reputable source the importance of dementia friendly environments for people living in care homes.
- A passenger lift allowed people in wheelchairs to access all parts of the service, and there were adapted bathrooms and toilets.

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet

- The provider met people's nutrition and hydration needs. There was a varied menu, specialist diets were catered for and people were complimentary about the meals served. One person told us, "I like the food, especially breakfast".
- However, we identified areas for improvement in respect to the dining experience. The dining area was overcrowded with tables and chairs, which hindered the movement of people and staff. At one point during lunch, staff were needing to move people on their chairs whilst they were still eating and one person who had stood up was at risk of falling, as they had become stuck between two tables and chairs. The registered manager acknowledged the issue and informed us that a secondary dining area would be set up to increase the space available.
- The registered manager told us that any specialist or culturally appropriate diets would be available should they be needed or requested. Snacks were placed around the service for people to help themselves to and drinks were always available. People told us they chose foods they enjoyed. A relative said, "I eat here most days with my [relative] there's always a choice of two dishes".

## Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law

- Staff undertook assessments of people's care and support needs before they began using the service.
- Pre-admission assessments were used to develop a detailed care plan for each person. This included clear guidance for staff to help them understand how people liked and needed their care and support to be provided.
- Documentation confirmed people and relatives were involved in the formation of an initial care plan. This enabled staff to have the correct information, to ensure they could meet people's needs.

## Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- People told us they received effective care and their individual needs were met. A relative told us, "They do exactly what [my relative] needs, they understand her condition and how she's changed".
- Access was also provided to more specialist services, such as opticians and dentistry. The registered manager told us, "We assess people's health when they arrive, and we monitor that, including their oral health". Staff kept records about the healthcare appointments people had attended and implemented the guidance provided by healthcare professionals.

## Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care

- Staff liaised effectively with other organisations and teams and people received support from specialised healthcare professionals when required, such as GP's, chiropodists and social workers. Feedback from staff and documentation we saw supported this. We saw examples of how staff had recognised that people were poorly and had contacted the relevant professionals. A relative told us, "They always let me know if [my relative] is poorly and they are quick to call the doctor".

## Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- Staff had received training in looking after people, including safeguarding, food hygiene, fire evacuation, health and safety and equality and diversity. They were knowledgeable of relevant best practice and regulations, and we saw staff supporting people with confidence and professionalism. One member of staff told us, "I feel confident in my job, I've had full training".
- Staff completed an induction when they started working at the service and 'shadowed' experienced members of staff until they were assessed as competent to work unsupervised. Systems of staff development including one to one supervision meetings and annual appraisals were in place.

## Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance

The 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. People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment with appropriate legal authority. In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, whether any restrictions on people's liberty had been authorised and whether any conditions on such authorisations were being met.

- The provider had a good understanding of the Act and were working within the principles of the MCA. People were not unduly restricted and consent to care and treatment was routinely sought by staff.
- Staff understood when a DoLS application should be made and the process of submitting one.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

Caring – this means that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant people were supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; equality and diversity

- Peoples' equality and diversity was respected. Staff adapted their approach to meet people's individualised needs and preferences.
- People were attended to in a timely manner and were supported with kindness and compassion.
- We observed positive interactions, appropriate communication and staff appeared to enjoy delivering care to people. One person told us, "They are all kind to me, I like them and I like my room".
- People were encouraged to maintain relationships with their friends and families and to make new friends with people living in the service.
- Visitors could come to the service at any time and could stay as long as they wanted. A relative told us, "I've been coming here to visit my [relative] every day for years and I'm always made to feel welcome".
- Staff also recognised that people might need additional support to be involved in their care and information was available if people required the assistance of an advocate. An advocate is someone who can offer support to enable a person to express their views and concerns, access information and advice, explore choices and options and defend and promote their rights.

Supporting people to express their views and be involved in making decisions about their care

- Staff provided people with choice and control in the way their care was delivered.
- Throughout the inspection, we observed people being given a variety of choices of what they would like to do and where they would like to spend time. We observed people requesting to go to their rooms and move around the service. Staff were always available to support people to do this.
- People were empowered to make their own decisions. People told us they were free to do what they wanted throughout the day. A relative told us, "My [relative] has dementia, but they always offer her choice, as much as she can choose for herself".
- Staff were committed to ensuring people remained in control and received support that centred on them as an individual.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- Staff supported people and encouraged them, where they were able, to be as independent as possible.
- Care staff informed us that they always prompted people to remain active and carry out any personal care tasks for themselves, such as brushing their teeth and hair and mobilising around the service.

- Everyone we spoke with thought they or their relative were well cared for and treated with respect and dignity, and had their independence promoted. A relative told us, "The staff are amazing, always full of encouragement and praise".
- People's privacy and dignity was protected, and we saw staff knocking on doors before entering and talking with people in a respectful manner.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

Responsive – this means that services met people's needs

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Supporting people to develop and maintain relationships to avoid social isolation; support to follow interests and to take part in activities that are socially and culturally relevant to them

- The provider had a schedule of activities which included making time for staff to spend recreational time with people on a one to one basis. Our own observation supported this.
- People told us the service responded well to their care and recreational needs. One person told us, "Their are bits and pieces to do".
- We saw a varied range of activities on offer which included, music, arts and crafts, quizzes, exercise, themed events and visits from external entertainers. A relative said, "There's always something going on, I join in sometimes".
- We saw that people were given the opportunity to observe their faith and any religious or cultural requirements were recorded in their care plans. If requested, representatives of churches visited, so that people could observe their faith. The registered manager was also looking to develop further relationships with local places of worship.

Planning personalised care to ensure people have choice and control and to meet their needs and preferences

- Detailed individual person-centred care plans had been developed, enabling staff to support people in a personalised way that was specific to their needs and preferences, including any individual religious beliefs. These included, people's choices around what they enjoyed doing during the day and their preferences around clothes and personal grooming.
- Care plans contained personal information, which recorded details about people and their lives. This information had been drawn together, where possible by the person, their family and staff. A relative told us, "They've asked me about reviewing [my relative's] care plan".
- Staff told us they knew people well and had a good understanding of their family history, individual personality, interests and preferences, which enabled them to engage effectively and provide meaningful, person centred care.
- Technology was used to support people to receive timely care and support. The service had a call bell system which enabled people to alert staff that they were needed.

Meeting people's communication needs

Since 2016 onwards all organisations that provide publicly funded adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). The standard was introduced to make sure people are

given information in a way they can understand. The standard applies to all people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss and in some circumstances to their carers.

- People's communication needs were identified, recorded and highlighted in care plans. These needs were shared appropriately with others.
- We saw evidence that the identified information and communication needs were met for individuals. Staff ensured that where required people's communication needs were assessed and met.

#### Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- People knew how to make a complaint and told us that they would be comfortable to do so if necessary. They were also confident that any issues raised would be addressed.
- The procedure for raising and investigating complaints was available for people, and staff told us they would be happy to support people to make a complaint if required.
- Records of complaints that we saw had been handled and responded to appropriately.

#### End of life care and support

- Peoples' end of life care was discussed and planned, and their wishes were respected. Nobody at the service was receiving palliative care, but people could remain at the service until the end of their lives should they want to. Documentation showed that peoples' wishes, about their end of life care, had been respected.
- Specific training and support was given to staff in order to care for people at the end of their life.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

Well-Led – this means that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- We received positive feedback in relation to how the service was run, and our own observations supported this. A relative told us, "The manager is available to me, it's a well run home. They cater to the individual. This place has taken away the guilt of me not being able to care for [my relative] any more".
- The provider had informed the CQC of significant events in a timely way, such as when people had passed away, where there had been suspected abuse and any significant injury. This meant we could check that appropriate action had been taken.
- People, relatives and staff spoke highly of the service. Staff commented they felt supported and had a good understanding of their roles and responsibilities. The registered manager and staff told us that the care of people living at the service was the most important aspect of their work and they strived to ensure that people received high quality care. Our own observations supported this, and a member of staff told us, "Everyone is safe here, everything is done in people's best interests".

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- People and staff were actively involved in developing the service. The provider had implemented systems and processes to consult with people, relatives, staff and healthcare professionals.
- Meetings were carried out, providing management with a mechanism for monitoring satisfaction with the service provided.

Managers and staff are clear about their roles, and understand quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- Policy and procedure documentation was up to date and was relevant to guide staff on how to carry out their roles.
- The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.
- The provider undertook a range of quality assurance audits to ensure a good level of quality was maintained.
- We saw audit activity which included health and safety and infection control. The results of which were



analysed to determine trends and introduce preventative measures. For example, an infection control audit resulted in furniture being replaced.

#### Continuous learning and improving care

- The service had a good emphasis on team work and communication sharing. Handover between shifts was thorough and staff had time to discuss matters relating to the previous shift.
- Staff commented that they all worked together and approached concerns as a team. A member of staff told us, "We are always trying to improve. The manager is a good listener and tries to sort things out".
- There was also a clear written set of values that staff were aware of, displayed in the service, so that people would know what to expect from the care delivered.
- Staff had a good understanding of equality, diversity and human rights and explained how they would make sure that nobody at the service suffered from any kind of discrimination. This was reinforced through training.
- Feedback from staff indicated that the protection of people's rights was embedded into practice, for both people and staff, living and working at the service.
- Up to date sector specific information was made available for staff including details of specific conditions, such as dementia, to ensure they understood and had knowledge of how to assist people.

#### Working in partnership with others

- The service liaised with organisations within the local community. For example, the Local Authority and Clinical Commissioning Group to share information and learning around local issues and best practice in care delivery.

How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong

- Staff knew about whistleblowing and said they would have no hesitation in reporting any concerns they had.
- The manager was aware of their responsibilities under the Duty of Candour. The Duty of Candour is a regulation that all providers must adhere to. Under the Duty of Candour, providers must be open and transparent, and it sets out specific guidelines providers must follow if things go wrong with care and treatment.