

Good News Family Care (Homes) Ltd

Oldfield Farm

Inspection report

Taxal
Whaley Bridge
High Peak
SK23 7EA
Tel: 01663734532
www.gnfc.org.uk

Date of inspection visit: 18 August 2021
Date of publication: 04/10/2021

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

Ratings


Overall rating for this location	Good	
----------------------------------	------	---

Are services safe?	Good	
--------------------	------	---

Are services effective?	Good	
-------------------------	------	---

Are services caring?	Good	
----------------------	------	---

Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
--	------	---

Are services well-led?	Good	
------------------------	------	---

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Our rating of this service improved. We rated it as good because:

The service provided safe care. The premises were safe and clean. Staff assessed and managed risk well and followed good practice with respect to safeguarding.

Staff developed holistic, recovery-oriented care plans informed by a comprehensive assessment. They provided a range of treatments suitable to the needs of the clients and in line with national guidance about best practice. Staff engaged in clinical audit to evaluate the quality of care they provided.

Managers ensured staff received training and supervision. Staff worked well together as a team and with relevant services outside the organisation.

Staff treated clients with compassion and kindness and understood the individual needs of clients. They actively involved clients in decisions and care planning.

The service was easy to access. Staff planned and managed discharge well and had alternative pathways for people whose needs it could not meet.

The service was well led, and the governance processes ensured that its procedures ran smoothly.

However:

The service did not have enough staff although this was covered by staff working extra hours and the vacant post had been advertised.

Staff were overdue their annual appraisals although this was arranged for September.

Clients did not know about the 'recovery phone' they could take when going out unescorted by staff to ensure their safety.

Records did not show that regular house meetings were held to gain the views of clients and staff.

Summary of findings

Our judgements about each of the main services

Service

Residential substance misuse services

Rating

Good



Summary of each main service

Our rating of this service improved. We rated it as good because:

The service provided safe care. The premises were safe and clean. Staff assessed and managed risk well and followed good practice with respect to safeguarding. Staff developed holistic, recovery-oriented care plans informed by a comprehensive assessment. They provided a range of treatments suitable to the needs of the clients and in line with national guidance about best practice. Staff engaged in clinical audit to evaluate the quality of care they provided.

Managers ensured staff received training and supervision. Staff worked well together as a team and with relevant services outside the organisation. Staff treated clients with compassion and kindness and understood the individual needs of clients. They actively involved clients in decisions and care planning.

The service was easy to access. Staff planned and managed discharge well and had alternative pathways for people whose needs it could not meet.

The service was well led, and the governance processes ensured that its procedures ran smoothly. However:

The service did not have enough staff although this was covered by staff working extra hours and the vacant post had been advertised.

Staff were overdue their annual appraisals although this was arranged for September.

Clients did not know about the 'recovery phone' they could take when going out unescorted by staff to ensure their safety.

Records did not show that regular house meetings were held to gain the views of clients and staff.

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

Background to Oldfield Farm	5
Information about Oldfield Farm	6

Our findings from this inspection

Overview of ratings	7
Our findings by main service	8

Summary of this inspection

Background to Oldfield Farm

Good News Family Care (Homes) Ltd, a Christian based registered charity, provides services at Oldfield Farm.

Oldfield Farm registered with CQC in November 2014 to provide the regulated activity:

- Accommodation for persons who require treatment for substance misuse.

Oldfield Farm has a CQC registered manager and an accountable controlled drugs officer.

Oldfield Farm provides accommodation and substance misuse rehabilitation interventions for up to four women, aged over 18 years. Women can also be accompanied by children aged up to seven years old. Clients had been assessed as needing residential support to assist their recovery from addiction to drugs, alcohol, or other addictive behaviours. The service offers a structured recovery programme including relapse prevention, life skills, individual targeted recovery support, and skills for work training projects. Principles of Christian spirituality and faith run through the structured recovery programme. The service does not offer detoxification treatment interventions. The structured recovery programme runs for six months. Clients can reside at Oldfield Farm for up to nine months as required, with the option of residing at the provider's step-down facility for up to two years. Placements at Oldfield Farm can be funded through local authorities, state benefits, or privately. When we inspected, Oldfield Farm had two clients admitted.

This inspection was the fourth inspection of Oldfield Farm. At our previous inspection in December 2018 we issued the provider with five requirement notices with action the provider must take to meet:

Regulation 12 Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 - Safe care and treatment

Regulation 15 Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 Premises and equipment

Regulation 17 Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014- Good governance

Regulation 18 Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 – Staffing

Regulation 19 Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 Fit and proper persons employed.

During this inspection, the CQC found the provider had made improvements to meet the Regulations.

What people who use the service say

People said they felt safe at Oldfield Farm.

People told us they could personalise their bedrooms.

One person said, "I wouldn't be where I am without staff at Oldfield Farm, I have learned to love myself, have learned strategies to cope and have a toolkit, I am in touch with Alcoholics Anonymous group and now have a routine and structure to my life."

Summary of this inspection

People said this was the best rehabilitation service they had been to and would recommend it, they said it was more relaxed and homely than previous services they had been to.

People told us that there were not enough staff which meant they got bored and frustrated.

How we carried out this inspection

During the inspection visit, the inspection team:

visited Oldfield Farm, looked at the quality of the environment and observed how staff were caring for clients

spoke with the registered manager

spoke with two other members of staff

spoke with two clients who were using the service and one client who had previously used the service

reviewed two client care records

looked at a range of policies, procedures and other documents relating to the running of the service

spoke with a social worker who had placed clients at Oldfield Farm.

You can find information about how we carry out our inspections on our website: <https://www.cqc.org.uk/what-we-do/how-we-do-our-job/what-we-do-inspection>.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve:

The service should ensure that all staff have an annual appraisal. (Regulation 18)

The service should ensure they recruit to the vacant post. (Regulation 18)

The service should consider using a checklist when clients go out unescorted by staff to ensure their safety to include, for example, have they got the phone.

The service should ensure that all house meetings are recorded. (Regulation 17)

Our findings






Overview of ratings

Our ratings for this location are:

	Safe	Effective	Caring	Responsive	Well-led	Overall
Residential substance misuse services	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Overall	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good

Residential substance misuse services

Good 

Safe	Good 
Effective	Good 
Caring	Good 
Responsive	Good 
Well-led	Good 

Are Residential substance misuse services safe?

Good 

Our rating of safe improved. We rated it as good.

Safe and clean environment

The premises where clients received care were safe, clean, well equipped, well furnished, well maintained and fit for purpose.

Oldfield Farm was a modernised Grade II listed farmhouse providing accommodation to clients across two floors. The ground floor provided a communal lounge, craft room, toilet, utility room, locked cupboard containing cleaning equipment, and a large kitchen and dining room. The first floor provided one communal bathroom, three single rooms, and one single room with ensuite facilities. The staff office was located on the ground floor and included a sleeping area for staff. Adjacent to the house was a livery that clients could safely access as part of their recovery programme.

The layout of the service did not allow staff to observe all areas from a central location. Staff managed this with detailed admission and exclusion criteria for accessing the service, and regular risk assessments with existing clients. This was safe for the clients admitted to the service, and the interventions staff provided.

Oldfield Farm was in a rural location. The provider positioned closed circuit television cameras outside of the building as an additional security measure. Staff used 'what 3 words' application on their mobile phones to ensure emergency services could find the location and had a grid reference which they gave to visitors to help find the service.

Staff regularly tested the equipment needed, for example, personal alarms and first aid equipment which was an improvement from our previous inspection.

Infection control

Residential substance misuse services

Staff and clients had regular COVID-19 tests and visitors to the service were expected to have proof of a negative test before entering the service. There was adequate hand sanitiser on entry to and around the service and adequate supplies of personal protective equipment. Staff and clients told us this had been provided throughout the pandemic. On the outside of the house there was a thermal camera which automatically tested the temperature of all visitors to the farm and adjoining livery.

Safe staffing

The service did not have enough staff as a staff member had left suddenly the week before which meant there was a 40-hour vacancy. This was being covered by other staff and staff from another of the provider's locations who knew the clients from groups they attended there. The manager was recruiting to the vacant post. Clients told us there was a shortage of staff which meant they sometimes got bored and frustrated. The registered manager showed us rotas which showed there was always one staff member on duty and sometimes two if clients had appointments or groups they needed to be escorted to.

Staff knew the clients and received basic training to keep them safe from avoidable harm.

Assessing and managing risk to patients and staff

Staff screened clients before admission and only admitted them if it was safe to do so.

Staff completed risk assessments for each client on admission, however they had not updated one client's risk assessment since their admission in May 2021, but staff knew the risks of this client and how to manage these. Staff managed risks to clients and themselves well.

Clients told us they did not have a phone to use in an emergency when going out unescorted by staff. However, staff showed us the 'recovery phone' and this was used during our inspection. There was no formal checklist in place to check that clients always had this before going out.

Staff were aware of signs to look for in deterioration in clients' physical and mental health so they could respond promptly if needed.

Safeguarding

Staff understood how to protect clients from abuse and the service worked well with other agencies to do so. Staff had training on how to recognise and report abuse, and they knew how to apply it. This included safeguarding children and child sexual exploitation. The registered manager has extensive experience in responding to safeguarding situations as a registered health visitor. The registered manager is the safeguarding lead for the provider. Client's children could stay at Oldfield Farm with their parent if this is assessed as needed and is appropriate with the other clients. Children could also visit their parents following risk assessment.

Staff access to essential information

All staff that worked there had easy access to information about each client and kept paper and electronic records.

Medicines management

Residential substance misuse services

The service used systems and processes to safely administer, record and store medicines.

Staff tested and recorded the temperature of the office where they stored medicines which was an improvement from our previous inspection.

Staff assessed clients as able to self-administer their own medicines and gave them a seven-day supply if assessed as safe which they kept in a locked cabinet in their bedroom.

Track record on safety

The service had a good track record on safety.

Reporting incidents and learning from when things go wrong

The service managed client safety incidents well. Staff recognised incidents and reported them appropriately and lessons learned were shared as a team.

Since our previous inspection, the registered manager had updated the incident form to identify actions and learning lessons. Staff knew what to report and how to do this. They said that following any incidents they reflected on how they had responded and if they could respond or do things differently in the future.

Are Residential substance misuse services effective?

Our rating of effective stayed the same. We rated it as good.

Assessment of needs and planning of care

Staff completed comprehensive assessments with clients before and on admission to the service. The registered manager said that through assessment before admission they agreed if the placement was suitable for the client or not. Staff worked with clients to develop individual care plans and updated them as needed. Care plans reflected the assessed needs, were personalised, holistic and recovery-oriented. On admission staff developed a care plan with each client however one client told us they had not seen their care plan but had discussed their risk assessment.

Best practice in treatment and care

Staff provided a range of care and treatment interventions suitable for the client group and consistent with national guidance on best practice. Clients took part in the twelve-step programme, attended local Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous groups via zoom or in person and used You Tube to access programmes to support their recovery. Clients also had access to psychological therapies, support for self-care and the development of everyday living skills and meaningful occupation.

Residential substance misuse services

Staff ensured that clients had good access to physical healthcare and supported clients to live healthier lives. Each client was registered with a local GP and staff supported them to attend appointments where needed and ensure their physical health needs were met.

Staff used recognised rating scales to assess and record severity and outcomes. They also participated in clinical audit, benchmarking and quality improvement initiatives.

Skilled staff to deliver care

The registered manager made sure that staff had the range of skills needed to provide high quality care. They had access to courses provided by Derbyshire County Council on a wide range of topics specific to the needs of clients and staff accessed these.

The registered manager supported staff with supervision although they had not had their appraisal this year, but this was planned for September. Records showed that staff had their previous appraisal in August 2020.

Multidisciplinary and inter-agency teamwork

Staff had effective working relationships with relevant services outside the organisation. A commissioner told us that staff from Oldfield Farm had attended multidisciplinary team planning and reviewing meetings so that information was shared, and they worked in partnership to deliver person-centred outcomes for clients.

Staff liaise with client's local mental health teams, drug and alcohol teams and clients had access to local counselling services.

Good practice in applying the MCA

Staff supported clients to make decisions on their care for themselves. They understood the provider's policy on the Mental Capacity Act 2015 and knew what to do if a client's capacity to make decisions about their care might be impaired.

Staff said that if a person was assessed as not having the capacity to decide about admission to Oldfield Farm, they would not be suitable to be admitted as they need to participate in their recovery.

Staff received training in the Mental Capacity Act and had the knowledge and understanding needed to ensure clients were supported to make decisions.

Are Residential substance misuse services caring?

Our rating of caring stayed the same. We rated it as good.

Kindness, privacy, dignity, respect, compassion and support

Residential substance misuse services

Staff treated clients with compassion and kindness. They respected patients' privacy and dignity. Clients told us that staff treated them in a kind and respectful way and supported them in their recovery and we observed this during our inspection. Staff had received training on 'compassionate care' and spoke of how this had challenged their thinking about how to support the clients in their recovery.

Staff understood the individual needs of clients and supported them to manage their care and treatment. Staff supported clients to go to a local pub and order a soft drink. This enabled clients to have confidence to do this in a safe way to progress their recovery.

At the end of each client's stay at Oldfield Farm there was a 'celebration of recovery'. The client chose who to invite and this could be virtually or in person. This helped to give the client closure to this stage of their recovery and a recognition of how well they had done.

Involvement in care

Staff involved clients in care planning and risk assessment. One client told us that they did not know had not been involved in their care plan but had been involved in their risk assessment and had signed to say they agreed with this.

Staff ensured that clients had easy access to additional support. Clients could access a local advocacy service if they needed to.

Staff informed and involved families and carers appropriately. Clients said they could have visitors and were supported to keep in contact with or to regain contact with their family. Clients did not have access to their mobile phones, and this had been risk assessed. This was detailed in the restrictive interventions policy and in the information provided to clients before admission. Clients said they could make phone calls which staff sometimes supervised dependent on their individual risk assessment.

Clients said they had weekly check ins with their keyworker although one client said their key worker had recently left which had made them feel unsettled. Staff said there were regular house meetings with clients and staff. However, the minutes of these showed that only three meetings had been held in 2021.

Are Residential substance misuse services responsive?

Our rating of responsive stayed the same. We rated it as good.

Access and discharge

The service was easy to access. Before admission, the provider sent the handbook to the referrer or the client if self-referred. This clearly explained what the service provided and the recovery process and restrictions in place. The provider made potential clients aware of the restrictions in place and their rationale in supporting recovery. Referrals were completed by phone and the assessment was completed by phone or in person. The registered manager had made links with local authorities looking for placements. One commissioner said that Oldfield Farm were on their list of quality assured providers and had worked well with them to provide person centred outcomes for their clients.

Residential substance misuse services

Staff planned and managed discharge well. On referral the provider stated that the length of stay was usually six months, but this was flexible depending on individual need and assessment. The provider had a policy in place to enable a client to leave before the six month stay if this was what the client wished to do. Clients could move on to the providers step down service following their stay at Oldfield Farm and the provider also had supported living flats that they could move on to if appropriate. The registered manager said some clients move on to their own properties.

The facilities promote recovery, comfort, dignity and confidentiality

The design, layout, and furnishings of the service supported clients' treatment, privacy and dignity. The house was homely and promoted a home from home feel. Each client was risk assessed for access to their own mobile phone and clients had access to the recovery phone if they went out unescorted by staff. Clients could make phone calls in private if risk assessed as safe to do so.

Each client had their own bedroom and could keep their personal belongings safe. Client's bedrooms also included a sitting area, and one client had their own shower and toilet. Clients said they could personalise their bedrooms and were responsible for keeping them clean as part of their recovery programme.

Clients had a weekly food allowance used to buy and cook their own food from local supermarkets as part of their recovery programme. Clients could use the livery and as part of their recovery programme if they wanted could look after the chickens and rabbits on the farm.

Engagement with the wider community

Clients were offered an opportunity during their stay to engage with a local community arts project although face to face work was paused during the pandemic. Clients were given the opportunity to connect with local Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous and Cocaine Anonymous groups during their stay either virtually or face to face. Staff liaised with client's social workers and probation services and offered support at court where appropriate.

Meeting the needs of all people who use the service

The service met the needs of all clients, including those with a protected characteristic. The principles of the Christian faith ran through the recovery programme, and this was made clear to clients before admission. Clients said they were not forced to follow these principles. The registered manager said that clients could practice their own faith if they chose to, and they would make any necessary arrangements depending on individual choice. Before admission during the assessment process information was gathered as to the client's individual needs and preferences and how these could be met at Oldfield Farm.

Clients did not have any specific dietary needs, but staff said these could be catered for depending on individual need. Clients said there were no restrictions on food and if they wanted more than in their food allowance staff provided this.

The service was not accessible to those with mobility needs and this was made clear in the information provided to referrers.

Listening to and learning from concerns and complaints

The service had not received any complaints in the last year. Information was provided to clients as to how to make a complaint and clients said they knew how to raise concerns if they needed to.

Residential substance misuse services

Good 

Are Residential substance misuse services well-led?

Good 

Our rating of well-led improved. We rated it as good.

Leadership

The registered manager had the skills, knowledge and experience to perform their role and had a good understanding of the service. They were visible in the service and approachable for clients and staff. They worked as part of the rota where needed and led some of the recovery groups.

Vision and strategy

Staff knew and understood the provider's vision and values and how they were applied in their work.

Culture

Staff felt respected, supported and valued. They said they could raise concerns if they needed to and would not be afraid to do so if needed. Staff spoke positively about communication within the service and the organisation.

Governance

Our findings from the other key questions demonstrated that governance processes operated effectively, and that performance and risk were managed well. The breaches of regulation from our previous inspection had been met. The registered manager and staff completed regular audits and self-assessments that identified where improvements were needed, and these had been met.

Staff and director records included references and showed that Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were up to date, included risk assessments and showed staff were suitable to work with the clients at Oldfield Farm.

Information management

Staff had access to the information they needed to provide safe and effective care and used that information to good effect. Staff received training in information governance and knew how to keep clients records and information safe.