

CareSmart Limited

Kent Farm Care Home

Inspection report

Caresmart Limited
Kent Farm Care Home
Uffculme
Devon
EX15 3AR

Tel: 01884840144
Website: www.kent-farm.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
08 December 2016

Date of publication:
16 January 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service effective?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We completed an unannounced inspection on 8 December 2016. This was in response to receiving information of concern from a member of the public about the care of a person who used to live in at the home but had recently left and to concerns from another person about misleading advertising. This report only covers our findings in relation to these concerns. We previously carried out a comprehensive inspection at the service on 29 and 30 March 2016. At that inspection, we found five breaches of regulations in relation to person centred care, consent, safe care and treatment, safeguarding and quality monitoring and rated the service, 'Requires improvement.' You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Kent Farm care Home on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Kent Farm residential home is registered to provide accommodation with personal care for up to 21 people, many of whom are living with dementia. At the time of our inspection there were 16 people living at Kent Farm Care Home, which included three people living in The Old Dairy. The Old Dairy is a four bedroom annexe in the grounds of the main house a short distance away, which provides accommodation specifically for people living with dementia.

The service had a registered manager. 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.

Concerns were raised about the care and supervision arrangements for a person who lived at The Old Dairy. This was because people being cared for there go across to Kent farm during the day, and the person was regularly refusing to do so, which meant they were on their own in the Old Dairy with staff checking on them regularly. Whilst not ideal, this was a temporary solution agreed with the person's relative. The registered manager recognised the home could no longer meet the person's needs. So, they worked with the person's relative and their GP in their 'best interest' to arrange to find the person a home that could better meet their specialist mental health needs, and the person moved to another home at end of November 2016.

Separate concerns were raised with us about a local advert showing the home had an 'Excellent 3 star rating with Care Quality Commission' (CQC), which misrepresented the current 'Requires improvement' CQC rating. When we visited we found signage outside the home also referred to an 'Excellent' CQC rating. However, in the main entrance of the home and on the home's website, the home's current CQC rating was accurately displayed. We followed this up with the registered manager and provider. In response, the provider contacted us the next day to confirm the advertising wording had been amended for the next publication and outlined plans to temporarily amend the signage outside the home with adhesive plastic, until a permanent solution was arranged in January 2017.

We will carry out a further inspection at this home within the next four months to check the requirements of the previous inspection have been met.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement ●

Some aspects of the service were not safe.

Some risk assessments were overdue for updating.

The temporary staffing and supervision arrangements for a person who previously lived at the home weren't ideal. However, staff knew about their responsibilities to safeguard people and reduce risks as much as possible.

Is the service effective?

Requires Improvement ●

Some aspects of the service were not effective.

People's consent was sought for their day to day care. Where people appeared to lack capacity, mental capacity assessments were completed but lacked detail about how staff could assist each person to make as many decisions for themselves as possible.

People were supported to maintain good nutrition and hydration.

People were supported to maintain their health, staff recognised when a person's health deteriorated and sought healthcare advice and carried out that advice.

Kent Farm 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.

The inspection took place on 8 December 2016 and was unannounced. The inspection team included an inspection manager and an inspector.

Prior to the inspection we corresponded further with the member of the public to find out more details, and spoke with a health professional who regularly visits the home to get their feedback. We looked at all information we held about the home, including the previous inspection report and any notifications. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law. This enabled us to ensure we were addressing any potential areas of concern.

We sought feedback from two people who lived at the home and a relative and looked at two people's care records. We met with five staff, which included three care staff, a housekeeper and the registered manager.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

We followed up a concern about a person being left alone in The Old Dairy during the day, if they refused to go across to the main part of Kent Farm care home. Staff explained that normally, people who lived in The Old Dairy went over to the main house after breakfast each morning about eight forty five and returned in the evening after supper about six thirty for the night. Staff confirmed there was no care staff on duty in The Old Dairy during the day, as it was empty. In the evening and at night, once people had returned, a care worker was on duty, which was confirmed by the staff rotas we looked at.

We asked staff about the care of person who previously lived in The Old Dairy. They explained the person's mental health had significantly deteriorated over the few months before they left. The person's behaviour was unpredictable, some days they were happy to accompany staff across to the Kent Farm main building and other days became aggressive and refused to leave. Staff said they would leave the person for a while, and then tried again to persuade them, and that some staff were more successful than others at persuading the person to leave. However, they said gradually the problem had got worse, with the person refusing to leave three or four times a week in the last two months.

The person lived upstairs in The Old Dairy and their care records showed they were living with dementia and weren't aware of the time and place. They used a stick or wheeled walker to mobilise, as they were unsteady on their feet and were at increased risk of falling. The person had a stairgate fitted outside their room, which staff said the person could open and close themselves. The registered manager explained the stairgate wasn't used to confine the person but to remind them that there were steps outside their door. Staff said the person remained in their room and either laid on their bed or sat in their chair, whenever they refused to leave The Old Dairy. Staff closed the person's stairgate and locked the stairgates at top and bottom of the stairs, which meant the person couldn't access the stairs, although there were a couple of steps outside their door which led to a lounge/kitchen area. Staff explained that when the person left their room, a staff member always accompanied them to use the lift or the stairs.

When the person refused to leave The Old Dairy during the day, this meant the person was on their own in their room for periods of time, in between staff checks. Staff said often, by lunchtime, the person agreed to go across. We asked staff how they monitored the person's wellbeing if they refused to leave The Old Dairy. Care staff said they popped across every 30-40 mins to check on the person, although these checks were not documented. They said the housekeeper was there doing housework for about an hour each morning between 10 and 11, so kept an eye on the person. The housekeeper made the person a cup of tea and kept trying to persuade them to go across every so often. This was consistent with the person's care records which instructed staff to check on person every 30 minutes and to keep offering to take them across to Kent farm. We checked whether any additional charges were made for these checks and were told none were.

As the person couldn't use a call bell to call staff, we asked the registered manager whether they had considered using a pressure mat to alert staff if the person moved or left their room. They said they didn't think it was necessary because the person never left their room and at night there was always a staff member on duty. However, the records showed on one occasion the person had become confused in the

middle of the night and tried to climb over their stairgate outside their bedroom door but the staff member on duty intervened.

A risk assessment and care plan, last updated in October 2016 was in place to guide staff about how they should manage the occasions when the person refused to leave The Old Dairy. For example, 'If [person] wants to go to the door, do not restrict him. Go and have a chat. If he is verbally aggressive don't confront him...stay relaxed and jovial and maintain eye contact.' Some risk assessments we looked at had recently been updated, but others were overdue for review as they had last been reviewed in September 2015.

The person we spoke with said they liked living there and felt safe, which relatives confirmed. We checked all around the home and had no safety concerns. A professional recalled meeting the person once and visiting them in The Old Dairy during the day, but said they weren't concerned about the person's safety and felt the home was providing safe care for people.

When we looked at the information on the home's website and in leaflets at the home, they suggested The Old Dairy had 24 hour staffing. We checked with the registered manager, who said this was not the case, they said they made the staffing arrangements clear to all prospective clients and their families. The provider has since contacted CQC to confirm they have updated the website to make clear the staffing arrangements in The Old Dairy and removed the leaflets with erroneous information.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 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.

In June 2016, a mental capacity assessment was carried out and showed the person lacked capacity, although it lacked detail about how staff could assist the person to make as many decisions for themselves as possible. It said, 'Communicate in an appropriate way, support the person by making them feel at ease.'

However, staff demonstrated an understanding of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) (MCA) and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) and how these applied to their practice. Staff described how they sought the consent of the person for all care and treatment given and acted in accordance with whether the person's wishes. They said sometimes the person was quite happy to receive personal care but refused at other times, and staff respected their wishes and offered them assistance again at regular intervals and usually they accepted help eventually. Sometimes, the person agreed to walk across to Kent Farm and on other occasions they made it clear they wanted to be left alone in their room. Staff confirmed the person was never forced to leave the Old Dairy against their will.

Staff said often, by lunchtime the person would agree to go across to Kent farm. We asked what happened about the person's food, if they refused to go across. They said sometimes, the person would have a late lunch in the dining room after the others had finished and other times staff took the person's lunch across to them. Staff confirmed the person was offered regular food and drink, wherever they were being cared for.

We asked the registered manager whether the person was subject to a Deprivation of Liberty supervision order. The registered manager confirmed they had made an application to the local authority Deprivation of Liberty team for the person in 2016, as the person was subject to restrictions on their liberty. This was because they weren't safe to leave the home unaccompanied by staff or a relative and because keypad locks were fitted to The Old Dairy. A letter showed the local authority acknowledged receipt the application but as there was a long waiting list, they were still awaiting an assessment visit. We asked whether the home had contacted the local authority DoLS team again for advice or submitted an urgent DoLS application when the person started refusing to leave the Old Dairy during the day, but the registered manager said they hadn't.

The person's records showed the registered manager contacted their GP regularly about the person's deteriorating mental health and was in regular contact with the person's relative. They said their relative was 100% supportive of the steps they were taking to manage the person. This was confirmed by written feedback from the person's relative which said, 'Thank you for the care you gave [person] during his stay at

The Old Dairy/Kent farm.'

We asked the registered manager whether they sought any advice from the specialist mental health services about managing this person, and they said they planned to do so but the person moved out before this happened. They said they realised, due to the person's deteriorating mental health and increasingly unpredictable behaviours, the home could no longer meet their needs. The registered manager and the provider met with the person's relative to discuss this. Notes of the meeting confirmed they agreed the person lacked capacity to make a decision about their future care and treatment, and a 'best interest' decision was agreed with the relative for the person to move to another home. Information about other services was provided to the relative and their needs were assessed by the new provider before they moved.

A nursing health professional confirmed they visited the home three or four times a week and worked closely with the registered manager and other staff to meet people's health care needs.