

Mrs V Rattan

Brook Care Home

Inspection report

17 Brook Close
Rochford
Essex
SS4 1HN

Tel: 01702549499

Date of inspection visit:
06 March 2017

Date of publication:
28 March 2017

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 the 6th March 2017.

Brook Care Home provides accommodation and personal care for up to 20 people some of whom may be living with dementia. At the time of our inspection 14 people were living at the service.

At our last inspection the service was rated as Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

The service was safe. Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that was intended to ensure people's safety and welfare. People were cared for safely by staff who had been recruited and employed after appropriate checks had been completed. People's needs were met by sufficient numbers of staff. Medication was dispensed by staff who had received training to do so.

The service was effective. People were cared for and supported by staff who had received training to support people to meet their needs. The registered manager had a good understanding of their responsibilities in relation to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. People were supported to eat and drink enough as to ensure they maintained a balanced diet and referrals to other health professionals were made when required.

The service was caring. Staff cared for people in an empathetic and kind manner. Staff had a good understanding of people's preferences of care. Staff always worked hard to promote people's independence through encouraging and supporting people to make informed decisions.

The service was responsive. People and their relatives were involved in the planning and review of their care. Care plans were reviewed on a regular basis and also when there was a change in care needs. People were supported to follow their interests and participate in social activities. The registered manager responded to complaints received in a timely manner.

The service was well-led. Staff, people and their relatives spoke very highly of the manager. The service had systems in place to monitor and provide good care and these were reviewed on a regular basis.

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.

Brook 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 the 6th March 2017 and was unannounced. The inspection was carried out by one inspector and an inspection manager.

Before the inspection, we reviewed previous reports and notifications that are held on the CQC database. Notifications are important events that the service has to let the CQC know about by law. We also reviewed safeguarding alerts and information received from a local authority.

During the inspection we used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). SOFI is a way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us.

During our inspection we spoke with seven people, a relative, the manager and two care staff. We reviewed four care files, four staff recruitment files and their support records, audits and policies held at the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At this inspection we found the same level of protection from abuse, harm and risks as at the previous inspection and the rating continues to be good.

People told us that they felt safe living at the service. One person said, "I really like it here, the staff are really kind and caring." A relative said, "[person name] has been happy since they moved in here."

Staff knew how to keep people safe and protect them from safeguarding concerns. Staff were trained and able to identify how people may be at risk of harm or abuse and what they could do to protect them. In addition staff were aware that the service had a safeguarding policy to follow and a 'whistle-blowing' policy. One member of staff said, "I would first raise any safeguarding concerns to my supervisor or directly to the manager. If they did not act I would call the 'whistle blowing' number or email the relevant authorities." They went on to say, "I have every faith the manager would take action though." The manager was fully aware how to raise safeguarding concerns and was in the process of updating and reviewing the services policies and procedures.

Staff had the information they needed to support people. Staff undertook risk assessments to keep people safe. These assessments identified how people could be supported to maintain their independence. The assessment covered preventing falls, how to keep people safe, and how to support people's mental health for example when they become anxious. Staff were trained in first aid at work, should there be a medical emergency and they knew to call a doctor or paramedic if required.

People were cared for in a safe environment. The manager ensured there were regular risk assessments completed of the premises and equipment used and there was an emergency contingency plan in place should there be an event that effected the running of the service. Staff received training in first aid and health and safety to ensure they knew what action to take in an emergency. People living at the service also had a personal evacuation plan in place should they need to be evacuated. The manager told us that the service had been undergoing a period of refurbishment and we saw some rooms were in the process of being redecorated.

The manager kept under review the numbers of staff required to support people and adjusted these numbers where necessary. The manager told us that the service was fully recruited and that they did not need to use agency staff. From our observations we saw there were always staff available to support people. A relative told us, "There always seems to be plenty of staff around whenever I visit." One person we spoke with told us "There is always staff around to talk to."

The manager made sure they recruited staff of good character and ensured all staff completed enhanced disclosure and barring checks (DBS). The manager talked to new members of staff informally at first before getting them to complete an application form and carrying out a more formal interview. Then if successful pending references they were employed at the service.

Medicines were managed and administered safely. People told us that they got their medicine on time and when they needed it. One person said, "The staff give me all my tablets I have five a day." Only trained and competent staff administered medication. Medication was stored safely in accordance with the manufactures guidance. In the previous three months the manager had ensured all staff had completed refresher medication training and had completed competency assessments to ensure they had the skills to dispense medication safely.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At this inspection, we found staff had the same level of skill, experience and support to enable them to meet people's needs effectively, as we found at our previous inspection. People continued to have freedom of choice and were supported with their dietary and health needs. The rating continues to be good.

The manager was very keen for staff to develop and attend training courses. Staff told us that they were supported to achieve nationally recognised qualification, one member of staff said, "I get lots of support from other staff with training and I see my NVQ assessor every month." In addition staff said that they had regular opportunities to reflect on their practice and to discuss the running of the service during daily staff meetings and supervision sessions. One member of staff told us, "We discuss everything in supervision about people's care; I recently went through all the new care plan documentation during supervision with my manager. We also discuss how we are doing and if we need to make any changes."

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 Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Staff knew how to support people in making decisions and how people's ability to make informed decisions can change and fluctuate from time to time. The service took the required action to protect people's rights and ensure people received the care and support they needed. Staff had received training in MCA and DoLS, and had a good understanding of the Act. Appropriate applications had been made to the local authority for DoLS assessments and to protect people's rights under the court of protection by the manager. We also saw assessments of people's capacity in care records had been made. This told us people's rights were being safeguarded.

People were very complimentary of the food and chef and said that they had enough food and choice about what they liked to eat. One person told us, "I like the food it is all home cooked and you can smell it cooking." Another person told us, "All the food is lovely, I like the Spanish omelettes, shepherd's pie and fish pie." People told us that they always had a choice of what to eat and if they did not want what was offered the chef would make them something else. We observed the dining experience which was a very pleasant experience for people with most choosing to attend the dining room and socialise at meal times.

Staff carried out nutritional assessments on people to ensure they were receiving adequate diet and hydration. Staff also monitored people's weight for signs of loss or gains and made referrals where appropriate to dietitians. We saw from records that staff were very good at ensuring where people were at risk of poor nutrition they were supported to have fortified diets and additional fluids.

People were supported to access healthcare as required. The service had good links with other healthcare professionals, such as, chiropodist, opticians, community nurses and GPs. People told us that staff supported them to visit their GP and attend hospital appointments or family members went with them. We

saw from records that staff were very observant of people's changing health conditions and sought prompt medical advice for them. One person told us, "The chiropodist was here yesterday sorting out my feet." We saw another person who had reported they had earache, staff immediately arranged for them to attend the GP surgery for review.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection people remained happy living at the service, they continued to be very complimentary of the staff and felt cared for. The rating continues to be good.

Staff had positive relationships with people. They showed kindness and compassion when speaking with them. Staff took their time to talk with people and showed them that they were important. People we spoke with were very complimentary of the staff and the support they received. One person said, "The staff are very good, they are caring." Another person told us, "I like it here, all the staff are good, they talk to you and treat you well. I feel quite contented." We saw that people were relaxed in the company of staff and shared many conversations throughout the day.

Staff knew people well including their preferences for care and their personal histories. Staff told us that they try to support people to maintain their independence as much as possible and assessed the level of support people needed all the time. We saw care plans were very detailed and contained biographies of people's life so far as well as containing all the details of how they preferred to be supported. Each person had an allocated member of staff as a key worker, one member of staff said, "As a key worker I make sure that they have everything they need, the way they like it. I also support them with any shopping they need or spend time talking with them one to one and do activities."

People told us that staff respected their privacy and promoted their dignity. Some people shared rooms at the service, this was done with their agreement and should they require privacy curtains were in place to separate the rooms. The manager told us that people had access to religious support should they chose to have this. In addition some people had advocates who helped to look after their welfare and ensure that their needs were being met. People were encouraged to maintain contact with friends and relatives and they could visit people at any time.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At this inspection we found staff were as responsive to people's needs and concerns as they were during the previous inspection. The rating remains Good.

The service was remained responsive to people's needs. Since our last inspection the provider had been undertaking refurbishment and redecoration of the service. We saw new flooring had been laid and new furniture had been purchased along with redecoration of main areas and individual rooms. The manager told us that people were included in the process and could choose what colour they would like their room painted. The manager was also responsive to people's changing health needs and had arranged for one person to have a more suitable chair purchased to support them to be able to spend time out of their room with other residents.

Staff encouraged people to maintain their interests and links with the community. People were supported to go out with staff and relatives, one person told us how they liked to go out for walks and for a coffee. Another person was supported to visit their relatives once a week to stay with them. Some people continued to be very independent at the service, one person told us how they went each day to the shop to collect the newspapers, and we heard people giving them additional lists of things to bring back such as chocolate bars. We saw some people liked to spend their time knitting or doing art work. Staff told us that they sometimes supported people with activities or games and in the good weather people enjoyed going out on the minibus to local parks, pubs or just down to the seafront for ice-cream. In addition sometimes the men living at the service liked to get together to watch sport and football on the television.

The registered manager had a robust complaints process in place that was accessible and all complaints were dealt with effectively. People said if they had any concerns or complaints they would raise these with the manager. However people told us they generally did not have any complaints. The service also received compliments one read said, 'Thank you so much for helping me, I am really grateful, you are all superstars.'

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At this inspection we found staff were as well led as at the previous inspection. The rating remains Good.

The service had a manager who had previously worked at the service and they were in the process of registering with the CQC. 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.

Everyone we spoke with knew the manager and were very complimentary of them and the staff. People and their relatives told us that they regularly spoke with the manager. One person said, "(managers name) is firm but fair, you can talk to them about anything."

Staff shared the manager's vision for the service. One member of staff said, "We want people to feel happy, relaxed and at home here. Another member of staff said, "We try and make this a stable environment for people so that they are comfortable and happy here." People told us that they were happy living at the service and we saw there was a sense of community with people getting along together and supporting each other.

The manager gathered people's views on the service through regular meetings with people. One person told us, "We have a meeting every month with (staff name) to discuss everything." During the meetings the staff gained people's views on the service and any suggestions they had. This showed that the management listened to people's views and responded accordingly, to improve their experience at the service.

Staff felt supported and valued by the management team. Staff told us that the manager was always available to give them support and that they were 'very hands on' with care. One member of staff said, "Since the manager started everything is working much better now, everyone knows what they are doing and it is more organised." Staff also felt supported by each other, one member of staff said, "We have a good team here, we all help each other and work well together like a family."

The manager had a number of quality monitoring systems in place to continually review and improve the quality of the service provided to people. They carried out regular audits, for example, on people's care plans, accident and incidents, health and safety, and environment. Since their return to the service the manager was in the process of reviewing all the governance at the service. This information was used as appropriate to continually improve the care people received.