

Mrs Mary McTeggart

# Upalong Residential Home

## Inspection report

16 Castle Road  
Camberley  
Surrey  
GU15 2DS

Tel: 0127631356

Date of inspection visit:  
09 January 2019

Date of publication:  
01 February 2019

### 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

### Care service description

Upalong Residential Home is a care home that provides care, support and accommodation for a maximum of nine older people some of whom were living with dementia. At the time of the inspection eight people were living at the service. The service did not require a registered manager to be in place and was managed by the registered provider.

### Rating at last inspection

At our last inspection we rated the service good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

### Why the service is rated good

People felt safe and staff were aware of the safeguarding procedure should there be a concern. Relatives also felt their family members were safe living at the service. There were sufficient levels of staff on duty to ensure that people's needs were met and who had been recruited appropriately.

Risks to people's care was managed well by staff and people received their medicines in a safe way. The registered provider had up-to date procedures to help ensure people remained safe in an emergency. Staff were effective in ensuring the service was clean and that they adhered to good infection control measures.

People's needs had been assessed before moving in to the service and care plans reflected those needs and preferences. Care plans were reviewed regularly and contained accurate information about people's current needs. People had access to health care professionals and staff followed the advice given by them. People were supported with their nutrition and hydration needs and told us the quality of the food was good.

People were treated in a kind and caring way by staff who respected their dignity. Staff spoke to people in a kind and considerate manner. People were supported with their independence and had choices around their delivery of care.

People chose how they spent their time and could take part in activities if they wanted to. Trips were arranged for people outside of the service. Staff worked well together and communicated changes to people's needs to each other. Improvements in how end of life care is discussed and recorded should be made. People told us that they would speak to staff if they had any concerns. There was a complaints procedure in place and complaints were investigated and responded to.

There was an experienced and well supported staff team employed at the service. The registered provider carried out quality assurance checks to ensure people received a good standard of care. Staff consulted with outside professionals to ensure the best delivery of care. People and staff had provided feedback when they were consulted about the service. Notification were sent to the CQC where appropriate.

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.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

### Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

### Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

### Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

# Upalong Residential Home

## **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 inspection site visit took place on 9 January 2019 and was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of two inspectors.

Prior to the inspection we reviewed the information we had about the service. We were unable to use any information the provider sent us in the Provider Information Return due to a technical issue. This is information we require providers to send us at least once annually to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make.

We reviewed notifications sent to us about significant events at the service. A notification is information about important events which the provider is required to tell us about by law.

During the visit we spoke with six people, two relatives, the registered provider, deputy manager and two members of staff. We observed care given by staff at the service and looked at two care plans. We reviewed medicine administration records and training, supervision, records of quality assurance checks completed and one staff recruitment file.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

When we last inspected Upalong Residential Home we found the service was safe and rated it good. Following this inspection, we found the service was still safe and our rating remains good.

People and relatives told us that they felt safe living at the service. One person said, "I feel safe, they [staff] look after us really well." One relative told us, "My mum is definitely safe." Staff were knowledgeable about how to keep people safe. Staff had safeguarding training every year and were aware of the different types of abuse and the reporting procedures to follow if they suspected or witnessed abuse. Information about safeguarding people was visibly displayed on a noticeboard in the communal area. There had not been any safeguarding incidents in the service since the last inspection.

Staffing levels had been maintained since the last inspection and were still appropriate to meet people's needs. One person told us, ""We just ask staff once and they do things straight away," whilst another person said there was, "Always staff to help." Relatives confirmed there were enough staff. On the day of the inspection there were two care staff working who were supported by the deputy manager and registered provider. Staff rotas detailed this was the usual staffing levels and that staff had been working at the service for a long time. Throughout the inspection we saw people were attended to promptly when they required help or support.

The provider operated robust recruitment practices when employing new staff. This included requesting and receiving references and checks with the disclosure and barring service (DBS). DBS checks are carried out to confirm whether prospective new staff had a criminal record or were barred from working with people.

Risks to people were identified and reviewed to help keep people safe. One relative told us their family member had been moved to the ground floor following a fall. They told us this, "Helped keep [person] safe." Assessments were completed covering risks such as nutrition and moving and handling. Other assessments had been made dependant on people's individual needs which described what staff should do to help keep people safe. These were reviewed regularly and updated as people's needs changed.

The environment that was clean and hygienic throughout. People told us the service was always clean and tidy and they helped staff to keep it that way. We were told, and observed, staff used personal protective equipment (PPE) when helping to support people as and when needed. All areas of the service were clean and tidy, with hand hygiene dispensers in place throughout the service. Personal protective equipment, such as aprons and gloves, were readily available to staff. Staff told us they had undertaken training in infection control which was updated yearly.

The registered provider continued to manage medicines safely. People told us they received their medicines on time and they knew what they were for. One person told us, "I always receive my medicine on time." All medicines received and returned to the pharmacy were clearly recorded. Staff received training and had six-monthly competency checks completed to ensure they followed best practice. People who required PRN

(as needed) medicines had protocols in place to guide staff on why and when it may be needed.

Checks were completed to maintain a safe environment. Personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) were in place to help ensure people continued to receive the care they needed in an emergency. Incidents and accidents were recorded and action taken and lessons learned where appropriate. All accidents and incidents were reviewed to identify patterns of trends.

## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

When we last inspected Upalong Residential Home we found the service was effective and rated it good. Following this inspection, we found the service was still effective and our rating remains good.

People were supported with their nutritional needs to maintain good health. People told us they were happy with the food provided. One person told us, "It is all home cooked you know." Another person said, "We are always provided with an alternative meal if we did not like the one on offer." We observed this happen on the day of the inspection when one person asked for a different dessert which was provided by staff. The service employed two chefs and staff told us the food was always cooked "From scratch" and that alternative meals were always provided if needed. The lunch time meal looked and smelled very appetising and we saw the food provided was enjoyed by people. One relative told us, the food was "Home cooked" and their family member had gained weight.

People's needs were assessed before they moved into the service to identify the care they required. This information was used to develop people's care plans which staff were familiar with. People were supported to access health care services in line with their individual requirements. People had input and support from appropriate healthcare professionals such as the district nurses and community psychiatric teams. One person told us, "The doctor comes to visit whenever I need to see them." Another said, "I see the dentist and optician, they come here to see me." One person had upcoming healthcare appointments at the local hospital. One relative told us staff ensured the person attended these and this was, "As good as it can be."

People were supported by staff who had been trained to undertake their role. People told us they thought staff were well trained. One person told us, "We would soon make a fuss if staff did not do things in the right way." Another person told us, "We are in charge and we would tell them if they did things wrong." Staff received mandatory training every year and we saw from training records available to us they were up to date. Staff told us their induction was thorough and it included training, policies and procedures and peoples' care plans. Staff explained what they had learned from their training. For example staff told us how they put into practice the training they had received in infection control. We saw that when staff supported people to move this was done so effectively and in line with best practice.

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. We saw the service continued to work within these principles. There was evidence in people's care plans that consent was obtained appropriately. People told us staff would never do anything without asking for their permission first. One person told us, "They always ask if I am ready for help." Staff understood the principles of the MCA and told us they never did anything without people's consent. This was observed this during the inspection when we saw staff asking people if they needed help and respecting the persons answer.

The environment was maintained to meet people's needs and was currently appropriate for people living at the service. As peoples needs change this is something that needs to be considered in the future. The



environment was clear from any obstacles and maintained in a way that helped people to feel comfortable in their surroundings. One person told us, "It is very homely here, I have everything I want, all my family photographs and furnishings are in my bedroom." A relative told us "This is very homely, they have everything they need here."

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

When we last inspected Upalong Residential Home we found the service was caring and rated it good. Following this inspection, we found the service was still caring and our rating remains good.

Without exception people told us staff were kind and caring towards them. One person told us, "Staff treat us all with kindness, they listen to us and look after us well." Another told us, "Staff are wonderful," whilst a third person told us staff were, "Very good, very kind and look after us very well." Relatives confirmed this view and told us staff, "Couldn't be more caring."

Staff told us the importance of respecting people and treating them with kindness. We observed positive and caring interactions between staff and people living at the service throughout our inspection. Staff clearly knew people well and had developed positive relationships with them. We saw staff sang and danced with people and engaged in conversations taking time to listen to what people said.

Staff also maintained people's dignity and treated them with respect. People told us staff were very respectful and undertook all personal care in the privacy of their bedrooms with the doors closed. One person told me, "Staff will always ask if I want help with dressing and they make sure that my door is closed. They talk to me all the time when they help me."

Staff told us it was important to respect people's individuality and to maintain their privacy. They provided support respectfully and sensitively. Staff also encouraged people to be independent as this was important to them. People were encouraged to help with daily chores such as cleaning, laundry and other house hold tasks. People told us they enjoyed helping staff as it was "Their home and they do what you would normally do in your own home." We observed two staff supported one person to get up out of their chair and to use their walking aid. Both staff reassured the person throughout and gave them lots of encouragement.

People were involved in their care and supported to express their views on it. There were regular resident's meetings where discussions could be had about all aspects of the service they received. One person told us, "We tell staff about what we want to do and they respect our wishes." One relative told us they were involved in the care provided to their loved one and said, "We went through the care plan together."

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

When we last inspected Upalong Residential Home we found the service was responsive and rated it good. Following this inspection, we found the service was still responsive and our rating remains good.

People received personalised care that met their needs. Care plans provided sufficient information about the care each person required and contained background history on their likes/dislikes in terms of food and their hobbies and interests. There were individual plans for communication, mobility, sleep, nutrition and skin integrity. There was detailed guidance in place where a need had been identified for example in relation to people's behaviours or risks.

Staff told us regular discussions took place with people about their care plans and they would make changes when they needed to. One relative told us, "They are always updating the care plans." Staff were responsive to people and this was a view confirmed by relatives who told us, "Staff notice when [person] is unwell and always act proactively and tell me."

People had opportunities to participate in activities if they chose to. One relative told us that this was an area that had improved recently. One person told us, "We went to the seaside which was fun." We saw that staff took time to sit and talk with people which they clearly enjoyed. In the afternoon staff painted people's nails in a 'pamper' session.

Discussions had also taken place with people in respect of their wishes at the end of their life. We discussed with the registered provider how this is an area that could be further developed. They told us this would be addressed by contacting a local hospice to obtain advice on this, however at the time of our inspection there was not anyone who was receiving end of life care.

People told us they had never had to make a complaint about the service or staff but they would talk to staff and the registered provider if they needed to. They were confident their concerns would be addressed and resolved. There had not been any formal complaints since the last inspection. There was a complaints procedure displayed in the service which referenced the previous regulatory body. We spoke to the registered provider who advised this would be updated.

There was also a compliments book where people and visitors could give feedback. Written comments included, "Just want to say how good the care home is, 10/10 for patient care when a resident fell. As an ambulance crew it is rare to see such caring staff," "I was very impressed with the standard of food, care and accommodation. I can see (my relative) is very happy here" and "Very impressed with the level of care and compassion from carers. Highly recommend for anyone's family member to be a resident here."

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

When we last inspected Upalong Residential Home we found the service was well-led and rated it good. Following this inspection, we found the service was still well-led and our rating remains good.

People and relatives were complimentary about the leadership of the service and said how well managed it was. One person told us, "[The manager] is very good." Another said, "[The manager] is lovely." One relative told us the service was, "Incredibly efficient and well run." Another relative told us that the deputy manager had, "Improved things tremendously."

The registered provider told us recent surveys had been undertaken and that all comments received were positive about the care people received. Monthly resident meetings took place when people could raise concerns or make any suggestions about how the service was run, this was confirmed during discussions with people and staff. Staff told that the registered provider was, "Very good" and made changes when they had been suggested. People, relatives and staff were very complimentary about the registered provider and how approachable they were.

We saw that people approached the registered provider and deputy manager throughout the inspection to speak with them. Where people had made requests to change aspects of the service these were accommodated where possible by the registered provider. For example, one person had requested a different type of food which was bought every week specifically for this person.

Staff told us they felt valued and supported by the registered provider. There was an established and loyal staff team who had been working at the service for many years who worked well and supported each other.

Quality assurance processes remained effective and meant that the safety and quality of the service was maintained. Regular checks of medicines management and health and safety were made and identified and addressed issues in the service. The service also continued to work closely with other agencies outside of the organisation including Local Authorities and other external healthcare professionals.

Services that provide health and social care to people are required to inform the Care Quality Commission (CQC) of important events that happen in the service. The registered provider had not needed to inform CQC of significant events as none had occurred since the last inspection. They understood their responsibilities should significant incidents or safeguarding concerns occur.