

Ark Care Homes Limited

Beachfield

Inspection report

42 Nelson Road
Westward Ho
Bideford
Devon
EX39 1LQ

Tel: 01237420777

Website: www.arknursing.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:

14 July 2016

19 July 2016

Date of publication:

15 August 2016

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

This unannounced inspection took place on 14 July 2016. We returned on 19 July 2016 as arranged with the registered manager to complete the inspection. At our last inspection in July 2014 we found the service was meeting the regulations of the Health and Social Care Act (2008) we inspected.

Beachfield is registered to accommodate six people who have a learning disability. At the time of our inspection there were five people living at Beachfield.

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.

People were safe and staff demonstrated a good understanding of what constituted abuse and how to report if concerns were raised. Measures to manage risk were as least restrictive as possible to protect people's freedom. People's rights were protected because the service followed the appropriate legal processes. Medicines were safely managed on people's behalf.

Care files were personalised to reflect people's personal preferences. Their views and suggestions were taken into account to improve the service. They were supported to maintain a balanced diet, which they enjoyed. Health and social care professionals were regularly involved in people's care to ensure they received the care and treatment which was right for them.

Staff relationships with people were caring and supportive. Staff were motivated and inspired to offer care that was kind and compassionate.

There were effective staff recruitment and selection processes in place. Staffing arrangements were flexible in order to meet people's individual needs. Staff received a range of training and regular support to keep their skills up to date in order to support people appropriately.

Staff spoke positively about communication and how the registered manager and home manager worked well with them and encouraged their professional development.

A number of effective methods were used to assess the quality and safety of the service people received and make continuous improvements.

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 was safe.

People were safe and staff were able to demonstrate a good understanding of what constituted abuse and how to report if concerns were raised.

People's risks were managed well to ensure their safety.

Staffing arrangements were flexible in order to meet people's individual needs.

There were effective recruitment and selection processes in place.

Medicines were safely managed.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Staff received a range of training and supervision which enabled them to feel confident in meeting people's needs and recognising changes in people's health.

People's health needs were managed well through regular contact with community health professionals.

People's rights were protected because the service followed the appropriate guidance.

People were supported to maintain a balanced diet, which they enjoyed.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

People said staff were caring and kind. One person commented: "The staff are lovely."

Staff relationships with people were caring and supportive. Staff

spoke confidently about people's specific needs and how they liked to be supported.

People were able to express their views and be actively involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

Care files were personalised to reflect people's personal preferences, which were met with staff support.

There were regular opportunities for people and people that matter to them to raise issues, concerns and compliments.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

Staff spoke positively about communication and how the registered manager and home manager worked well with them and encouraged their professional development.

People's views and suggestions were taken into account to improve the service.

The organisation's visions and values centred around the people they supported.

A number of effective methods were used to assess the quality and safety of the service people received.

Beachfield

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 was planned to check 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 unannounced inspection took place on 14 July 2016. We returned on 19 July 2016 as arranged with the registered manager to complete the inspection.

The inspection was completed by one adult social care inspector.

Prior to the inspection we reviewed the Provider Information Record (PIR) and previous inspection reports. The PIR is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We also reviewed the information we held about the service and notifications we had received. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law.

We spoke with four people receiving a service and six members of staff, which included the registered manager. After our visit we spoke with three relatives.

We reviewed two people's care files, three staff files, staff training records and a selection of policies, procedures and records relating to the management of the service. After our visit we sought feedback from health and social care professionals to obtain their views of the service provided to people. We received feedback from three professionals.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People living at the home were not able to comment directly on whether they felt safe. We spent time in communal areas and spoke with staff to help us make a judgement about whether people were protected from abuse. Staff responded appropriately to people's needs and interacted respectfully to ensure their human rights were upheld and respected. People's comments included: "I like living here" and "I would speak to staff if worried." Relatives commented: "I feel (relative) is safe and well cared for" and "(relative) is definitely safe." A professional commented: "I have had no concerns on any of my visits. Residents appeared happy.... I would be happy to consider placements at Beachfield as I feel they would be honest about whether they can meet a person's needs and consider the current mix of residents and how much impact a new person would have."

Staff demonstrated an understanding of what might constitute abuse and knew how to report any concerns they might have. For example, staff knew how to report concerns within the organisation and externally such as the local authority, police and to the Care Quality Commission. Staff records confirmed staff had received safeguarding training to ensure they had up to date information about the protection of vulnerable people.

The registered manager demonstrated an understanding of their safeguarding roles and responsibilities. They explained the importance of working closely with commissioners, the local authority and relevant health and social care professionals on an on-going basis. There were clear policies for staff to follow. Staff confirmed they knew about the provider's safeguarding adults' policy and procedure and where to locate it if needed.

People's individual risks were identified and risk assessment reviews were carried out to keep people safe. For example, risk assessments for behaviour management, epilepsy and accessing the local community. Risk management considered people's physical and mental health needs and showed that measures to manage risk were as least restrictive as possible. For example, people had positive behaviour support plans in place for staff to follow if an incident occurred. A positive behaviour support plan is a document created to help understand and manage behaviour in adults who have learning disabilities and display behaviour that others find challenging.

Staff confirmed that people's needs were met promptly and they felt there were sufficient staffing numbers. We observed this during our visit when people needed support or wanted to participate in particular activities. For example, staff spent time with people engaging in a range of activities both within the home and local community.

The registered manager explained that during the daytime everyone received at least one to one support. In addition, staffing levels increased dependent on what activities people had planned. At night there was one waking night staff and one staff member slept in. We asked how unforeseen shortfalls in staffing arrangements due to sickness were managed. The registered manager explained that regular staff or staff from the organisation's agency would fill in to cover the shortfall, so people's needs could be met by the

staff members that understood them. In addition, the service had on-call arrangements for staff to contact if concerns were evident during their shift. The on-call arrangements were shared between members of the organisation's management team.

There were effective recruitment and selection processes in place. Staff had completed application forms and interviews had been undertaken. In addition, pre-employment checks were done, which included references from previous employers and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks completed. This demonstrated that appropriate checks were undertaken before staff began work in line with the organisations policies and procedures. This was to help ensure staff were safe to work with vulnerable people.

People's medicines were managed so they received them safely. Appropriate arrangements were in place when obtaining medicine. The home received people's medicines from a local pharmacy on a monthly basis. When the home received the medicines from the pharmacy they had been checked in and the amount of stock documented to ensure accuracy.

Medicines were kept safely in a locked medicine cupboard. The cupboard was kept in an orderly way to reduce the possibility of mistakes happening. Medicines were safely administered. People were asked if they needed any medicines which were prescribed 'as needed' (known as PRN), such as pain relief. Medicines recording records were appropriately signed by staff when administering a person's medicines. Audits were undertaken to ensure people were receiving their medicines as prescribed. The checks also ensured medicines remained in date.

The premises were adequately maintained through a maintenance programme. Fire safety checks were completed on a daily, weekly, monthly and annual basis by staff employed by the service and external contractors. For example, fire alarm, fire extinguishers and electrical equipment checks. People had personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs), which are individual plans, detailing how people will be alerted to danger in an emergency, and how they will then be supported to reach safety. Staff had received health and safety and fire safety training to ensure they knew their roles and responsibilities when protecting people in their care. People were protected because the organisation took safety seriously and had appropriate procedures in place.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People did not comment directly on whether they thought staff were well trained. However, we observed people were happy with the staff who supported them. A relative commented: "The staff are competent and know what they are doing." A professional stated, "I found the staff professional and reliable and was impressed with the organisation and problem solving skills."

Staff knew how to respond to specific health and social care needs. For example, recognising changes in a person's physical or mental health. Staff spoke confidently about the care practices they delivered and understood how they contributed to people's health and wellbeing. For example, how people preferred to be supported with personal care. Staff felt people's care plans and risk assessments were really useful in helping them to provide appropriate care and support on a consistent basis.

People were supported to see appropriate health and social care professionals when they needed, to meet their healthcare needs. There was evidence of health and social care professional involvement in people's individual care on an on-going and timely basis. For example, GP, psychiatrist and learning disability practitioners. Records demonstrated how staff recognised changes in people's needs and ensured other health and social care professionals were involved to encourage health promotion. People also had hospital passports. The aim of the hospital passport is to assist people with learning disabilities to provide hospital staff with important information about them and their health when they are admitted to hospital.

Staff had completed an induction when they started work at the service, which included training. The induction required new members of staff to be supervised by more experienced staff to ensure they were safe and competent to carry out their roles before working alone. The induction enabled the organisation to assess staff competency and suitability to work for the service.

Care was taken to ensure staff were trained to a level to meet people's current and changing needs. Staff received a range of training, which enabled them to feel confident in meeting people's needs and recognising changes in people's health. They recognised that in order to support people appropriately, it was important for them to keep their skills up to date. Staff received training on subjects including, safeguarding vulnerable adults, the Mental Capacity Act (2005), behaviour management, autism awareness, epilepsy and rescue medicines and first aid. Staff had also completed varying levels of nationally recognised qualifications in health and social care. Staff commented: "The training and support is very good."

The organisation recognised the importance of staff receiving regular support to carry out their roles safely. Staff received on-going supervision and appraisals in order for them to feel supported in their roles and to identify any future professional development opportunities. Staff confirmed that they felt supported by the management team when it came to their professional development.

Staff files and staff confirmed that supervision sessions and appraisals took place on both a formal and informal basis. Appraisals were structured and covered a review of the year, overall performance rating, a personal development plan and comments from both the appraiser and appraisee.

Before people received any care and treatment they were asked for their consent and staff acted in accordance with their wishes. Throughout our visit we saw staff involving people in their care and allowing them time to make their wishes known through the use of individual cues, such as looking for a person's facial expressions, body language and spoken word. People's individual wishes were acted upon, such as how they wanted to spend their time.

Staff demonstrated an understanding of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) (MCA) and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) and how these applied to their practice. For example, what actions they would take if they felt people were being deprived of their freedom to keep them safe. The MCA provides the legal framework to assess people's capacity to make certain decisions, at a certain time. When people are assessed as not having the capacity to make a decision, a best interest decision is made involving people who know the person well and other professionals, where relevant. DoLS provide legal protection for those vulnerable people who are, or may become, deprived of their liberty. The safeguards exist to provide a proper legal process and suitable protection in those circumstances where deprivation of liberty appears to be unavoidable and, in a person's own best interests. Five people were awaiting assessment for DoLS at the time of our visit.

People's capacity to make decisions about their care and support were assessed on an on-going basis in line with the MCA. For example, where staff were concerned about a person's behaviour and their lack of capacity to make decisions and manage their emotions, they had worked closely with other health and social care professionals. People's capacity to consent had been assessed and best interest discussions and meetings had taken place. For example, for medicines changes, healthy eating plans and dental work needed.

People were supported to maintain a balanced diet. One person told us, "Going out for sausage and chips." People were actively involved in choosing the menu with staff support to meet their individual preferences. People had preferred meals documented, which also helped inform the menu. A staff member commented: "People are involved in choosing the menu. There are always alternatives." Care plans and staff guidance emphasised the importance of people having a balanced and nutritious diet to maintain their general well-being. Staff recognised changes in people's nutrition with the need to consult with health professionals involved in people's care. People's weights were monitored on a consistent basis to ensure their general well-being.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

We spent time talking with people and observing the interactions between them and staff. Interactions were good humoured and caring. In one of the lounges, staff were having fun with one person talking about a recent activity holiday. The atmosphere was relaxed and happy with the person involving us in the fun. We observed how staff involved people in their care and supported them to make decisions. For example, how they wanted to spend their day. One person commented: "The staff are lovely." Another person agreed staff were caring and kind. A relative commented: "The staff are fantastic, can't speak highly enough. (Relative) is extremely happy and has come on leaps and bounds."

Staff treated people with dignity and respect when helping them with daily living tasks. People were keen to show us their bedrooms. These gave them privacy and space to spend time on their own if they wished. Bedrooms reflected people's specific interests, such as DVD's and posters on the walls. One person commented: "I am happy here, this is my home." Staff told us how they maintained people's privacy and dignity when assisting with intimate care. For example by knocking on bedroom doors before entering, being discreet such as closing the curtains and gaining consent before providing care. A professional commented: "People are respected and included in decision making. I was welcomed and felt very comfortable with the staff recognition that it was people's home and their privacy and rights should be respected."

Staff adopted a positive approach in the way they involved people and respected their independence. For example, supporting people to make specific activity decisions. People were completing a variety of activities and accessing the local community during our inspection.

Staff supported people in an empathic way. They demonstrated this empathy in their conversations with people they cared for and in their discussions with us about people. Staff showed an understanding of the need to encourage people to be involved in their care. For example, one person enjoyed staff talking to them about things of interest to them; this provided them with reassurance.

Staff involved people in their care through the use of individual cues, and looking for a person's facial expressions, body language, spoken word and objects of reference. The service had used a variety of communication tools in the past to enable interactions to be led by people receiving care and support. However, it had been found that people preferred to communicate verbally to express their needs.

Staff gave information to people, such as when activities were due to take place. Staff communicated with people in a respectful way. Staff relationships with people were caring and supportive. Staff spoke confidently about people's specific needs and how they liked to be supported. Staff were motivated and inspired to offer care that was kind and compassionate. For example, staff demonstrated how they were observant to people's changing moods and responded appropriately. For example, if a person was feeling anxious. They explained the importance of supporting them in a caring and calm manner by talking with them about things which interested them and made them happy. Staff recognised effective communication as an important way of supporting people, to aid their general wellbeing.

Staff showed a commitment to working in partnership with people. Staff spoke about the importance of involving people in their care to ensure they felt consulted, empowered, listened to and valued. Staff spoke of the importance of empowering people to be involved in their day to day lives. They were able to speak confidently about the people living at Beachfield and each person's specific interests. They explained that it was important that people were at the heart of planning their care and support needs and how people were at the centre of everything.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People received personalised care and support specific to their needs, preferences and diversity. Care plans reflected people's health and social care needs and demonstrated that other health and social care professionals were involved. The service had responded to a person's request to move bedrooms which enabled them to have a patio. They showed us their patio area, which had lots of flowers planted and garden ornaments.

Care files gave information about people's health and social care needs. They were personalised and reflected the service's values that people should be at the heart of planning their care and support needs. For example, supporting people to identify specific activities to aid their wellbeing and sense of value. A staff member commented: "We work well as a team and create a light atmosphere where people are encouraged to set specific goals."

Care files included personal information and identified the relevant people involved in people's care, such as their GP. The care files were presented in an orderly and easy to follow format, which staff could refer to when providing care and support to ensure it was appropriate. Relevant assessments were completed and up-to-date, from initial planning through to on-going reviews of care. Staff commented that the information contained in people's care files enabled them to support them appropriately in line with their likes, dislikes and preferences. Care files included information about people's history, which provided a timeline of significant events which had impacted on them, such as, their physical and mental health. People's likes and dislikes were taken into account in care plans. This demonstrated that when staff were assisting people they would know what kinds of things they liked and disliked in order to provide appropriate care and support.

Care plans were up-to-date and were clearly laid out. They were broken down into separate sections, making it easier to find relevant information, for example, physical and mental health needs, personal care, communication, social activities and eating and drinking. Staff said they found the care plans helpful and were able to refer to them at times when they recognised changes in a person's physical or mental health.

Activities formed an important part of people's lives. People engaged in wide variety of activities and spent time in the local community going to specific places of interest. For example, shopping, meals out, arts and crafts, drama and swimming. People were encouraged to maintain relationships with their friends and family. For example, care plans documented the importance to people of seeing their family and friends. People's comments included: "Off to a garden centre this afternoon and then pet shop" and "I like playing on my laptop."

There were regular opportunities for people, and people that matter to them, to raise issues, concerns and compliments. This was through on-going discussions with them by staff and members of the management team. People were made aware of the complaints system. The complaints procedure set out the process which would be followed by the provider and included contact details of the provider and the Care Quality Commission. This ensured people were given enough information if they felt they needed to raise a concern

or complaint. The service had not received any complaints. However, the registered manager recognised that if they received a complaint, they would attend to it in line with the organisation's procedure.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Staff spoke positively about communication and how the registered manager and home manager worked well with them and encouraged their professional development. The registered manager oversaw the home and the home manager worked permanently at Beachfield alongside the staff team. Staff confirmed they were kept up to date with things affecting the overall service via team meetings and conversations on an on-going basis. Additional meetings took place on a regular basis as part of the service's handover system which occurred at each shift change. Relatives also commented that they found communication between the home and them was good.

People's views and suggestions were taken into account to improve the service. The home manager had implemented 'chatter books'. These involved the home manager spending time with people individually on a weekly basis to discuss any specific topics. For example, these sessions covered specific activities people wanted to take part in, holidays, food choices and new furniture for bedrooms. In addition, surveys had been completed by people using the service, relatives and health and social care professionals. The surveys asked specific questions about the standard of the service and the support it gave people. All comments received were positive. One particular compliment stated: 'We would just like to say thank you for the wonderful caring team you have at Beachfield.....The staff go over and beyond duty and in such a caring way.' The registered manager recognised the importance of continually improving the service to meet people's individual needs. This included the gathering of people's views to improve the quality and safety of the service and the care being provided.

The service's vision and values centred around the people they supported. The organisation's statement of purpose documented a philosophy of maximising people's life choices, encouraging independence and people having a sense of worth and value. Our inspection found that the organisations philosophy was embedded in Beachfield.

The service worked with other health and social care professionals in line with people's specific needs. This also enabled the staff to keep up to date with best practice, current guidance and legislation. Staff commented that communication between other agencies was good and enabled people's needs to be met. Care files showed evidence of professionals working together. For example, GP and psychiatrist. Regular medical reviews took place to ensure people's current and changing needs were being met. Professionals confirmed that the service worked well with them, were proactive in seeking advice and took on board things requested.

There was evidence that learning from incidents and investigations took place and appropriate changes were implemented. For example, changes to a person's care plan and risk assessment to reflect current circumstances. Actions had been taken in line with the service's policies and procedures. Where incidents had taken place, involvement of other health and social care professionals was requested to review people's plans of care and treatment. The service was both responsive and proactive in dealing with incidents which affected people.

Checks were completed on a regular basis as part of monitoring the service provided. For example, the checks reviewed people's care plans and risk assessments, medicines, incidents and accidents and health and safety. This enabled any trends to be spotted to ensure the service was meeting the requirements and needs of people being supported. Where actions were needed, these had been followed up. For example, care plans reviewed and maintenance jobs completed.