

Mrs Beverley M Winchester

Upfield

Inspection report

1 Upfield
Horley
Surrey
RH6 7JY

Tel: 01293782396
Website: www.cavendishcare.com

Date of inspection visit:
20 June 2017

Date of publication:
08 August 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

Upfield is a residential home which provides care and accommodation for up to six adults with learning disabilities including autism. On the day of our inspection six people were living in the home. People had varied communication needs and abilities. Some people were able to express themselves verbally; others used body language to communicate their needs. Some of the people needed more support as they could become distressed and anxious.

There was a registered manager in place. 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 the provider was the same person. The registered manager was not present on the day of the inspection as she was supporting people on holiday. Instead we were supported by a manger from another of the Providers service

At the last inspection on 15 May 2015, the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

Why the service is rated Good

People were safe because staff understood risks involved in people's care and took action to minimise these risks. There were sufficient staff on duty to ensure that people received the care they needed and to keep people safe. Staff understood their roles and responsibilities in keeping people safe and protecting them from harm and abuse. The registered manager carried out appropriate pre-employment checks before staff started work.

Medicines were managed, stored and administered safely. Accidents and incidents were recorded and reviewed with a plan in place to minimise the risk of them occurring again.

People's care was provided by regular staff that knew their needs well and provided support in a consistent way. Staff had access to the induction, training and support they needed to do their jobs. People's choices and views were respected. Care was provided in the least restrictive way to people.

People were supported to eat food they enjoyed and were encouraged to maintain a healthy diet. Staff were aware of dietary restrictions involved in people's care. People's health and well being were managed as they had access to the appropriate health and social care professionals. People who had on-going conditions were supported to see specialist healthcare professionals regularly.

People enjoyed living at the home and had developed positive relationships with staff. Staff treated people with respect and maintained their privacy and dignity. People were supported to maintain relationships

with their friends and families and were able to invite guests whenever they wished. People were encouraged to be independent and were supported by staff to learn and develop new skills.

People and their relatives were encouraged to give their views about the service they received and the registered manager responded positively to feedback. People had access to activities they enjoyed and had opportunities to enjoy an active social life. People were involved in their local community.

The registered manager provided good leadership for the service. They were experienced in their role and communicated well with people, relatives and staff. Staff felt valued and had access to support and advice from the registered manager if they needed it. Staff shared important information about people's needs effectively. Team meetings were used to ensure staff provided consistent care that reflected good practice.

The registered manager's quality monitoring checks ensured people received safe and effective care and support. Staff worked co-operatively with other professionals to ensure people received the care and treatment they needed. Records were well organised and up to date.

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

Risks to people were identified and managed appropriately. Staff were aware of individual risks and how to keep people safe.

Staff understood and recognised what abuse was and knew how to report it if this was required.

There were enough staff to meet the needs of people. All staff underwent complete recruitment checks to make sure that they were suitable before they started work.

Medicines were administered, stored and disposed of safely.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Mental Capacity Assessments had been completed for people where they lacked capacity. Applications had been submitted to the local authority where people who were unable to consent were being deprived of their liberty.

Staff had the knowledge and skills to support people. Staff received regular supervision.

People had a choice of healthy and balanced food and drink. People's weight was monitored and effectively managed for any changes.

Staff supported people to attend healthcare and social care appointments to maintain their health and wellbeing.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good

People were well cared for, they were treated with kindness. People's dignity and privacy were respected.

Staff interacted with people in a respectful, caring and positive

way and used individual communication methods to engage with people.

People, relatives and appropriate health and social care professionals were involved in their plan of care.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Care plans were person centred. Care needs and plans were assessed regularly.

There were choice activities on offer for people. People enjoyed the way they spent their time.

People and their relatives told us they felt listened to. Complaints were responded to in line with the home's complaints policy.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good

There was an open, positive and person centred culture.

There were robust procedures in place to monitor the quality of the service. Where issues were identified, actions plans ensured these had been addressed.

Staff and relatives said that they felt supported and that the management was approachable. There were systems in place to listen to staff, people and their relatives.

Upfield

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.

The inspection took place on 20 June 2017 and was unannounced. This was a comprehensive inspection carried out by one inspector.

Before the inspection we reviewed the evidence we had about the service. This included any notifications of significant events, such as serious injuries or safeguarding referrals. Notifications are information about important events which the registered manager is required to send us by law. The registered manager had completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the registered manager to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make.

People were unable to express themselves verbally, on the day of the inspection we observed the care they received and the interactions they had with staff. We spoke with the manager of a different service and two members of staff. We looked at the care records for two people. We looked at how medicines were managed and the records relating to this. We looked at records relating to staff, including recruitment and training. We reviewed four weeks of duty rotas, some health and safety records and quality assurance records. We also looked at a range of the service policy documents. We asked the registered manager to send us some additional information following our visit, which they did. We spoke with the registered manager after the inspection.

After the inspection we received feedback from two relatives.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Relatives told us that their loved one were safe. One relative said, "Yes x is safe. I don't have any problems."

People were kept safe from avoidable harm. Risk assessments had been carried out to keep people safe while supporting them to be independent. Staff had considered the risks people faced and identified measures that could be taken to reduce these risks. For people who became distressed or anxious there were guidelines in place to tell staff what people's triggers were and how to support them. We saw staff follow people's guidelines and supported people positively when they became anxious or distressed.

There were enough staff to keep people safe and meet their needs. The rota was planned to ensure that people received the one to one care they needed. There was sufficient staff with appropriate skills and experience on each shift.

People were protected from abuse because staff understood their roles in keeping people safe. Staff had attended safeguarding training and knew how to raise concerns if they witnessed abuse or poor practice. A staff member told us "There is verbal, physical, sexual, institutional and financial. Effects on people can range from being withdrawn, aggressive and depressed. Everyone is different. I would talk to the manager; highlight is as quickly as possible to Surrey safe guards."

Staff were recruited safely. The registered manager obtained references, proof of identity, proof of address and a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) certificate before staff started work. DBS checks identify if prospective staff have a criminal record or are barred from working with people who use care and support services.

Any accidents or incidents were recorded in detail by staff. The registered manager reviewed all accident and incident reports to check that any actions identified as necessary to prevent a similar event occurring in the future had been implemented.

People's medicines were managed safely. All staff authorised to administer medicines had attended training in this area and their competency had been assessed. Medicines were stored, recorded and disposed of appropriately. There were detailed guidelines in place that told staff when an 'as required' (PRN) medicine should be administered. Staff had a good understanding of what the medicines were for that people were prescribed.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Relatives and staff told us that they thought staff had the right training and skills to support people. One staff member said, "We have extensive training."

People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). People's freedom had been restricted to keep them safe, some people need continuous supervision and the front door was locked. Where people lacked capacity to understand why they needed to be kept safe the registered manager had made the necessary DoLS applications to the relevant authorities to ensure that their liberty was being deprived in the least restrictive way possible.

Staff understood their responsibilities under the MCA. A staff member told us "It varies greatly. It is a measure of how able someone is to make a decision. If a person is unable, then other people can make a decision in their best interests, such as staff, managers, relatives or health professionals. We saw that mental capacity assessments and best interest decisions had been made for decisions regarding care, finances and medicines. Staff sought consent of people before providing care and support.

People received support from staff that were skilled and knowledgeable. Relatives confirmed that staff were well trained to care for their loved one. A relative said, "Yes the staff are defiantly trained, all good." There is a lot of opportunity to learn." Staff received supervision regularly. Appraisals had just been undertaken by the registered manager. New staff received an induction and shadowed existing staff for a few weeks until people and the staff member were comfortable. The registered manager had ensured that staff had the skills and competencies to support people effectively.

People were supported to maintain healthy, balanced diets. People could help themselves to food that was healthy. Some people ate out for lunch on the day of inspection, whilst another person ate lunch at home, they chose the meal themselves. People were supported to make their own drinks and snacks. Staff were aware of any dietary restrictions involved in people's care. People's weights were monitored frequently and where necessary dietary controls were in place.

People were supported to maintain their health and wellbeing. When there was an identified need, people had access to a range of health professionals such as dietician, psychiatrist, dentists and optician. A relative told us that they take their loved one to GP appointments or to hospital if they were hurt. People had hospital passports in place. These provide hospital staff with important information about people's health needs if they were admitted to hospital. People had health action plans in place. This is a tool that tells staff and health professionals what is needed to keep the person healthy.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Relatives told us that staff were caring. A relative said, "Always good, staff are helpful. You couldn't ask for better care" Another relative said that they were "Very impressed" with the staff. A staff member said, "I am happy to come to work. We are here to support people and make sure they get what they want and need."

The registered manager and staff knew people really well. A relative said, "They [staff] have a good rapport with him." Staff told us about people's likes, dislikes and about their personalities. One person liked to go to theme parks, their relative confirmed that they had recently been to one. Another person enjoyed cooking and they were supported to a cooking class that day. People's bedrooms reflected their personalities and were individualised. Staff respected people's wishes and choices. One relative told us that they were happy that there were plenty of male carers in the home to reflect that it was an all male house.

People were supported to maintain relationships with their friends and families. A relative told us that there was an 'open house' that they could come at any time to see their loved one. They went on to say staff always had time to chat to them. A relative told us that they felt welcomed into the home and was always offered a cup of tea. Relatives told us that communication was good between the home and relatives. A relative told us that they had been sent some pictures of their loved one of their recent holiday.

Staff had developed positive and caring relationships with people. Companionable, relaxed relationships were evident during the day of our inspection. People's dignity and privacy was respected. Staff supported people discreetly and staff support was available without being intrusive.

People were encouraged to make choices about their care and support. People, their relatives and health and social care professionals were involved in planning people's care. A relative said, "Yes they always get in touch. We are defiantly involved in his care." A person told the care staff what they wanted to do that morning and the care staff supported the person to do that activity.

People were encouraged to be independent. People were involved in the life of the home and were supported by staff to manage their own cleaning, laundry and some cooking.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

A relative said, "X is always busy. They are always doing things. X has just got back from holiday with the staff."

People received care that was personalised to their needs. A relative said, "They have managed to keep his care personalised." People's needs had been assessed before they moved into the home to ensure staff could provide the care and support they needed. We saw that people's needs were kept under review and that support plans were updated if their needs changed. A person-centred plan had been developed for each person. People's care needs were reviewed regularly. A relative told us, "X has his own ideas of what they want and staff respect that."

Staff promoted people's independence and enabled people to increase their skills. People had goals in place, for example, a staff member told us that they were supporting a person to use the stairs as this made them feel anxious. The staff member said that the person had used the stairs whilst on holiday to access some activities the person wanted to do. Staff had regular meetings with people to review their care and to ensure that they were being supported in a way that people needed and wanted the care.

People had personalised activities to do. The registered manager told us that they were working towards improving the range of opportunities for people to make activities more person centred. One person attended a horticultural session on the day of the inspection and another person was supported to do an activity they enjoyed such as going shopping and walking. Another person went to a cooking session. People were involved in daily activities of the home, such as cooking and cleaning.

Relatives told us that they felt listened too. One relative said, "Yes I feel listened too. If I have queries, the staff will come back to me." The home had a complaints policy in place which detailed how a complaint should be responded to. One complaint had been received since the last inspection and this had been managed within the home's policy. The person who complained was satisfied with the response.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Relatives told us that they thought that the home was well led. One relative said, "We really like the manager, she is really helpful."

There was an open and person centred culture in the home. A staff member said, "The atmosphere has improved. We get a lot of support from the manager and our opinions are taken seriously." When we arrived at the home, the staff ensured that we were introduced to the people who were at home; because they understood it was their home, and not just a place they stayed to get support.

The registered manager was experienced in their role and had an in-depth knowledge of the people living in the home. The staff told us that since the new manager was in post that there had been some positive changes. The registered manager told us after the inspection, "The key thing is person centred care. We have re-defined the keyworker to support staff to enable them to deliver person centred care."

Staff told us the registered manager provided good support to the staff team and to the people living at the home. They said they felt valued for the work they did and were encouraged to seek advice if they needed it. Staff meetings were regular, items such as training; people's needs, roles and activities were discussed.

There was an established system of quality monitoring that ensured people received good quality care and support. Staff completed regular audits of people's care plans, records and incidents. Regular and frequent checks were completed on health and safety, care records, medicines and infection control. Information obtained from these audits were used to improve the service or the home environment. For example it was noted that all communal areas and people's bedrooms needed re-decorating and new flooring. The majority of this work had been completed with the rest of the works to be finished by the end of the summer. Relatives told us that they were pleased that this had been done. Regular feedback was obtained from staff, relatives and people. The feedback was all positive.

Records provided evidence that staff liaised effectively with other professionals and agencies about people's care when required. People's care records were organised and up to date and stored securely in the home.

The registered manager was aware of their responsibilities with regards to reporting significant events, such as notifications to the CQC and other outside agencies. This meant we could check that appropriate action had been taken. Information for staff and others on whistle blowing was on display in the home, so they would know what to do if they had any concerns. The information that the registered manager provided on the PIR matched with what we found and saw on the day of our inspection.