Four Seasons (Bamford) Limited

Half Acre Care Home

Inspection report

Higher Ainsworth Road
Radcliffe
Manchester
Greater Manchester
M26 4JH

Tel: 01617259876

Date of inspection visit:
30 October 2018

Date of publication:
09 January 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

The inspection took place on 30 October 2018 and was unannounced. This meant the provider did not know we would be visiting.

At our last inspection in May 2016 we rated the service good. 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. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good.

Half Acre House is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection. Half Acre House can accommodate up to 29 older people. At the time of our inspection there were 27 people using the service.

A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) 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. At the time of our visit, the manager had been in post only three weeks although they had worked at the home several years previously. The manager told us they would be applying to register with CQC.

People we spoke with told us they felt safe at Half Acre House. Staff had been trained in safeguarding issues and knew how to recognise and report any abuse.

People's medicines were managed and stored safely. We saw the environment was clean and well maintained.

There were enough staff to meet people's needs. Any new staff were appropriately vetted to make sure they were suitable and had the skills to work at the service. The staff were given support by means of regular training, supervision and appraisal.

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

Peoples dietary needs were well recorded and supported.

There were friendly relationships between people and staff. People told us that staff treated them with dignity and respect and their wishes were listened to.

People's health and mental well-being was well monitored. Staff responded promptly to any changes in the

person's health or general demeanour.

A new activity co-ordinator was in post and they were being mentored by an experienced co-ordinator from another service who was sharing their ideas and knowledge about activity planning.

Care records were all maintained although some work needed to take place to ensure people's end of life wishes were captured. The manager had begun to address this on the day of our visit.

People told us they knew how to raise a concern if they were unhappy with anything and we saw people were asked about their views of the service through meetings.

Systems were in place for auditing the quality of the service and for making improvements. We saw the manager was keen to share learning from incidents and to take forward improvements they had identified through their quality assurance process.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe? The service remains good.	Good
Is the service effective? The service remains good.	Good
Is the service caring? The service remains good.	Good
Is the service responsive? The service remains good.	Good
Is the service well-led? The service remains good.	Good

Half Acre Care 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 took place on 30 October and was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of one adult social care inspector.

We reviewed other information we held about the service, including any statutory notifications we had received from the provider. Notifications are changes, events or incidents that the provider is legally obliged to send us within the required timescale. Before the inspection, we also contacted the local authority commissioners for the service and the local authority safeguarding team to gain their views of the service provided. We spoke with a visiting district nurse on the day.

Before the inspection, the provider completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). This 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. This information helped us plan our inspection.

We looked at care records for three people who used the service. We examined documents relating to recruitment, supervision and training records and various records about how the service was managed. We also had a tour of the home and viewed people's bedroom's with their permission.

We spoke to eight people who used the service, two visitors, the manager, regional support manager, two housekeeping staff, the chef, activity co-ordinator and three care staff members.

Good

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At the last comprehensive inspection, we found the service was safe and awarded a rating of good. At this inspection, we found the service continued to be safe.

People we spoke with told us they felt safe at Half Acre House. One person told us, "Yes I do feel safe here," and another person said, "Yes, I was falling a lot before." Relatives we spoke with also told us they felt their family members were safe.

Staff told us that they regularly received safeguarding training. Staff told us they knew how to raise concerns and were confident that the manager would take the appropriate action.

Risk assessments were tailored to people's needs and covered issues such as dealing with emotional distress, falls and mobility. These assessments had been regularly reviewed. Staff had a good understanding of the strategies to be used to support people with their anxieties.

Regular checks of the premises and equipment were carried out to ensure they were safe to use and required maintenance certificates were in place. We saw remedial actions had been taken quickly, for example following a service of the emergency lighting where several issues were found, works had been taken the following week and a full review of the system carried out. Accidents and incidents were monitored and the manager and provider reviewed these to check for trends. We saw learning from safeguarding incidents was reflected upon, analysed and shared with the staff team.

Staff had received a range of training designed to equip them with the skills to deal with all types of incidents including medical emergencies. The provider had ensured plans were in place to deal with any situation.

The provider's recruitment processes minimised the risk of unsuitable staff being employed. These included seeking references from previous employers and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. The DBS carry out a criminal record and barring check on individuals who intend to work with children and vulnerable adults. This helps employers make safer recruiting decisions.

People told us they felt there were usually enough staff on duty. We witnessed nurse call bells were answered promptly. The home had recently recruited additional staff such as a maintenance worker and an activity co-ordinator. One staff member told us, "Yes there are enough staff here."

Staff received training to handle medicines safely, and medicine administration records (MARs) were correctly completed. Medicines were safely and securely stored, and stocks were monitored to ensure these were available when they needed.

Good

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At the last comprehensive inspection, we found the service was effective and awarded a rating of good. At this inspection, we found the service continued to be effective.

People's individual needs were robustly assessed before they started using the service. We discussed with the manager and senior carer how re-assessments for people in hospital were carried out. The home was proactive in ensuring if they could not continue to meet people's needs. This was communicated to professionals and family quickly.

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) authorisations.

Staff understood when the requirements of MCA applied and when DoLS authorisations would need to be sought. In the care files we reviewed we saw most people had consented to the care planned. We asked the manager to ensure this was updated for everyone. People confirmed that staff asked for their consent when performing individual aspects of care, such as administering medicines or helping someone with aspects of personal care.

Staff received mandatory training in a number of areas to support people effectively. Mandatory training is courses and updates the provider thinks are necessary to support people safely. This included training in areas such as health and safety, fire safety, first aid, infection control, moving and handling and food hygiene. We saw there was a training matrix in place and the manager was monitoring completion levels of training with staff.

Staff we spoke with during the inspection told us the management completed supervision sessions and conducted an annual appraisal with them. Supervision is a process, usually a meeting, by which managers provide guidance and support to staff. We saw records which showed that staff had received an appraisal and supervision on a regular basis.

We saw evidence in care plans that staff contacted external healthcare professionals such as GPs, nurses and specialist doctors, when needed. The service worked with other health and social care professionals involved in people's support. We met with a visiting district nurse who told us, "If I have any concerns about anything, I raise it and it's dealt with straight away." They told us a person they were visiting had much improved since they had moved to Half Acre House as the nurse knew them when they lived at home.

Everyone we spoke with told us the food provided by the service was good. We saw people's nutritional needs were monitored using the MUST (a national screening tool). The home had recently changed its mealtimes so the main meal was at tea-time. This has been undertaken after consultation with people. The chef and senior carer told us how this had improved people's appetites much more. We heard staff gently

encouraging people, "Come on have some of that drink its still warm, you haven't had much to drink today." We saw people with specific dietary needs such as a softened diet had this information recorded clearly in their care records and within the kitchen.

Good

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At the last comprehensive inspection, we found the service was caring and awarded a rating of good. At this inspection, we found the service continued to be caring.

People we spoke with told us, "The staff are all lovely." We heard one person say to have a staff member saying, "You have a good heart." We heard staff talking with people about their families and sharing memories.

We saw staff treated people with dignity and respect. We witnessed a staff member supporting a person who had a visual impairment. Throughout their assistance helping them to the bathroom, they reassured them with physical guidance but verbally kept reassuring them about where they were and what was happening next.

We heard a staff member carrying out an assessment with someone. They did this in a way the person could understand by repeating their responses to the question. For example, the person said they liked to wear a shirt and cardigan and the staff member checked by saying, "So you feel comfortable wearing a cardi and shirt so we will make sure that happens for you." We heard people being given choices at mealtimes, one person saying, "I'd like some soup in a mug." People we spoke with confirmed they were given choices in relation to daily living such times they got up and went to bed and how and where they spent their time.

The service encouraged people to be as independent as possible. We heard one staff member gently waking someone up and asking them if they wanted their heating back on as it was chilly. The person replied they didn't and the staff stated, "Just ring for me at anytime and I'll come and put it on."

We saw people were supported to maintain relationships with those close to them. The service and the manager had an open door policy welcoming friends and relatives to the home. There were private spaces within the home such as nicely decorated smaller lounges where people could meet with their family in private if they wished. Relatives we spoke with told us they felt welcomed and able to raise any issue or concern.

The service supported people to access advocacy services in the local area and information was provided in accessible formats for people.

Good

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At the last comprehensive inspection, we found the service was responsive and awarded a rating of good. At this inspection, we found the service continued to be responsive.

Assessments and care plans showed how people's lifestyles and beliefs were respected, like their culture, religion or faith. Records described in detail what support was needed from staff and specific requirements with regard to mobility, personal care, medication, nutrition, mental health, physical wellbeing and any other additional information. We spoke with the manager as we found in the three care plans we viewed that people's end of life wishes weren't recorded. The manager stated they would prioritise this discussion with people and would update the plans accordingly.

The manager told us of plans to improve end of life care by turning a vacant room into an area for family members who wanted to be with their loved ones at this time. Another staff member who was providing mentorship support to the new activity co-ordinator told us about how they focussed on making sure people's rooms were adapted at this time with sensitive lighting, flowers and calming music if this was wished for.

Handover sessions were detailed and one of the senior carers explained how staff were deployed around the service at handover so that people's care needs were met at key times.

All the people we spoke with said they felt able to say if they were unhappy with the service. For instance, one person commented, "Oh yes, I know who the boss is and she is about all the time, I know I can talk to her." There had not been any formal complaints at the service since our last visit. The provider had clear complaints information which was available in an easy read format and there were regularly meetings for people to share their views about the service.

We saw people enjoying nail care and crafts and saw people were supported to access the local community such as going to the shops. The new activity co-ordinator was being supported to develop a new plan of activities for the home which people said they were looking forward to.

Good

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At the last comprehensive inspection, we found the service was well-led and awarded a rating of good. At this inspection, we found the service continued to be well-led.

People said the service was well-run and they had confidence in the management team. All the people we spoke with described how they had the chance to chat to the manager or senior staff whenever they wanted.

There had been changes to the management team over the past year. The registered manager had moved to another of the provider's services and would be de-registering with CQC. An experienced manager who used to manager the service several years ago had been in post for three weeks and was in the process of applying to be registered with the Care Quality Commission.

Staff members told us, "[Name] is really approachable, she is out with us all the time." We saw regular staff meetings took place and ideas and feedback was welcomed. We saw the manager worked flexibly so they met with night staff weekly as well as being available out of hours to meet with families.

The provider was meeting the conditions of their registration and submitted statutory notifications in a timely manner. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send to the Commission by law. We saw all records were kept secure, up to date and in good order, and maintained and used in accordance with data protection laws.

Half Acre House undertook surveys about the quality of life people experienced receiving care and support from the service and people also had access to forms which they used to raise an issue, concern or give thanks about the service.

The service worked with community partners such as local schools and facilities for older people within the local community.

The provider had a clear management structure and quality assurance system to make sure good governance arrangements were in place. Senior staff carried out regular checks of medicine management and care records. The manager carried out monthly audits of the service which were sent to the provider's quality assurance department. An action plan was developed for any areas they could improve upon.