

Mrs Audrey Zeane Redmore

Redstacks

Inspection report

36 Heads Lane
Hessle
Humberside
HU13 0JH

Tel: 01482640068

Date of inspection visit:
28 June 2018
03 July 2018

Date of publication:
10 August 2018

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

This inspection took place on 28 June 2018 and 3 July 2018 and was unannounced.

Redstacks is a privately-owned care home in a residential area of Hessle. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection. The home is registered to provide personal care and accommodation for up to 14 older people, including those with dementia related conditions. At the time of our inspection 13 people were receiving a service.

At our last inspection in February 2016, we rated the service overall good. At this inspection, we found the evidence continued to support the overall rating of good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and on-going 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.

The service had a manager in place who was registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC). A registered manager is a person who has registered with the 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.

Medicines were managed safely and staff had a good knowledge of the medicine systems and procedures in place to support this. We found staff had been recruited safely and training was provided to meet the needs of people. Staff received regular supervision and appraisal and told us they felt supported in their roles.

Staff received training on safeguarding adults from abuse and understood their responsibilities in respect of protecting people from the risk of harm. Accidents and incidents were responded to appropriately and monitored by the management team. The service was clean and infection control measures were in place. People and relatives spoke positively about the clean and well-maintained environment.

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.

People's nutrition and hydration needs were catered for. A choice of meals were offered and drinks and snacks were made readily available throughout the day.

There was a positive caring culture within the service and we observed people were treated with dignity and respect. People's wider support needs were catered for through the provision of activities provided by care staff and visiting entertainers.

There was a complaints policy and procedure made available to people who received a service and their relatives. All complaints were acknowledged and responded to quickly and efficiently. The service sought feedback from people who received a service; feedback was positive.

There was a range of quality audits in place completed by the management team. These were up-to-date and completed on a regular basis. All of the people we spoke with told us they felt the service was well-led; they felt listened to and could approach management with concerns. Staff told us they enjoyed working at the service and enjoyed their jobs. People spoke highly of the provider who was heavily involved with the day to day running of the service

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?

The service remains good.

Good ●

Is the service effective?

The service has improved to 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 ●

Redstacks

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 checked 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 28 June 2018 and 3 July 2018 and was unannounced.

Before the inspection we reviewed all the information we held about the service. This included information we received from safeguarding and statutory notifications since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the commissioners of the service prior to our visit. The registered provider also completed a provider information return (PIR). 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 used this information to help us plan the inspection.

The inspection was carried out by one adult social care inspector. We spoke with the provider, registered manager, deputy manager, one senior care assistant, one care assistant, the training coordinator, the chef and the maintenance worker. We spoke with three people who used the service, seven of their relatives and one visiting healthcare professional. We looked at two people's care records, two staff recruitment files, staff training and supervision records. We also looked at records in relation to the management of the service, including quality audits, surveys and development plans.

We used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection 2 (SOFI 2). SOFI 2 is a way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us.

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.

Relatives told us they felt people were safe, one relative told us, "We have just been away on holiday and my mind was at ease, knowing that my relative is safe here."

The provider had systems in place that ensured people's medicines were managed consistently and safely by staff. Medicine information had been included in people's plan of care and each person had a medication administration record (MAR) that staff signed each time they administered a medicine.

We looked at the recruitment records for two new members of staff. These records evidenced an application form had been completed, references obtained and checks made with the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS).

We observed sufficient staffing was available to meet the needs of people. A relative we spoke with confirmed this and said, "There certainly seems to be enough staff, it is always easy to find someone and speak to them if I need to."

People's care plans included detailed risk assessments to identify and reduce risks to people. Documents were individualised and provided staff with a clear guidance.

Safeguarding and whistleblowing policies were in place at the service and staff we spoke with demonstrated knowledge of what to do if they had concerns. The local authority safeguarding team were informed when required and all events had been notified to CQC.

The implementation of infection control procedures ensured people and staff were protected from the risk of infection. Staff had access to Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). Regular audits and checks were in place. One relative told us, "Their room is so nice, it's always very clean and there are never any bad smells."

Accidents and incidents were monitored to ensure staff followed the provider's policies and procedures and to identify any patterns that might be emerging or improvements that needed to be made.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At the last comprehensive inspection, we found the service was not always effective and awarded a rating of requires improvement. At this inspection, we found the service had improved to be effective.

The premises were well-appointed and pleasant throughout and people's bedrooms were personalised. The service introduced the use of dementia friendly signage to help orientate people and had replaced a patterned carpet with a plain one.

Care plans showed people's needs were assessed and evaluated. Care plans gave information about people's diverse needs including their health needs and how they were to be addressed. Records detailed community health professional's involvement. A professional told us that the service was proactive when working with other agencies, "They contact us promptly for advice, they have also been proactive with the local GP and pharmacy."

People had choice in what they wanted to eat and these choices were accommodated. People told us they were very happy with the food. One person said, "Its good food here, it's nourishing and it keeps us going. We are left with plenty of drinks and fluids."

Care plans clearly identified people's capacity to make decisions under the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). The MCA provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack capacity to do so for themselves. The Act requires that, as far as possible, people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. 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).

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA. Records we examined showed that any restrictions were deemed to be in the person's best interests and the least restrictive option.

New staff were supported to understand their role through a structured induction. Following induction, all staff entered into an on-going programme of training which provided them with skills to meet the needs of people. The staff we spoke with were positive about the training provided and they felt supported by management. Records showed staff received regular supervision.

Relatives and professionals felt staff had the right skills and experiences to do the job. Comments from the professional included, "The staff seem very well trained, they are on the ball and know what to respond to."

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 and their relatives consistently confirmed that staff were kind and caring; we heard comments from people such as, "Staff are wonderful, very good at their job and also very nice."

The service has built open and trusting relationships with people and their families. Comments from relatives included, "They are just amazing, they think of the little things, like they know my relatives likes football and rugby, they always make sure this is on the TV or radio for him" and "The care levels are amazing, I have years of experience as a nurse and I wouldn't want my family member to be cared for anywhere else." Other comments include, "The staff here show people more than dignity and respect, they show people love and affection."

The staff expressed positive values and commitment to caring for people. One staff member told us, "Because we are small we can give quite a lot of time to our residents. We want to give 100% care at all times." Some staff had worked at the service for a very long time. This meant that there was consistency for people within the home and that staff knew people well.

People's independence was promoted through the care they received. Detailed care plans recognised people's abilities and skills and ensured staff encouraged and supported people to maintain their independence. Relatives confirmed that staff promoted people's independence where they could.

People's cultural and religious needs were considered when support plans were developed. Care plans included personal history information and cultural and religious needs. The management informed of connections they had with local religious groups

People were supported to communicate in accessible ways which met their needs; this included the use of verbal and non-verbal communication, including facial expressions and body language.

Staff positively welcomed the use of advocates. Advocates represent the interests of people who may find it difficult to be heard or speak out for themselves.

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.

People told us, "If we use the call bell staff are through to us within a minute." Relatives told us, "[Name of person] was very poorly before moving in here. Since then thy [person] has improved a lot here, the staff respond to their needs promptly."

People were supported to maintain important relationships and relatives were welcomed to be part of events at the service. Relatives told us, "The parties in the summer are lovely and staff come along with their children. It's a lovely family atmosphere."

People and their relatives were involved in the development of their care plans. Plans contained individualised information and they complied with the accessible information standard through asking, recording and sharing communication needs people had. People's communication needs were recorded in care plans and care plans included evidence of regular care plan reviews.

The service continued to listen to people to improve the service on offer, through holding regular meetings for people and their relatives.

The provider was responsive to concerns or complaints raised since the last inspection. All four complaints in the last year had been dealt with quickly and effectively.

People's end of life preferences were individualised and included the person's religion and funeral preferences. Feedback from relatives regarding end of life care was extremely positive. A relative told us, "My relative would not be with us now if it wasn't for these staff. The staff can recognise straight away signs and symptoms (and not always the obvious ones) and act on this immediately. When the doctors said he was at end of life, I said there is no one else who can look after him but the staff at Redstacks."

A professional told us, "I continue to be very impressed with the care they are providing [name of person]. This person's health has drastically improved with their care and they continue to be responsive to this person's needs."

People were enabled to engage in activities, both within their home and in the local community. Care staff delivered in house activities and the service invited groups and entertainers into the home.

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 were extremely positive about the provider and the registered manager. Comments included, "The provider always says she wants it to be like a big family and she makes sure that it is", "The provider has such high standards and that filters down to the care staff. She really sets high expectations for this home."

All of the staff we spoke with felt able to approach the registered manager and said there was an open-door culture in the service. Staff told us, "It is good management here, I have a lot of respect for the provider. The manager looks after the staff, that way she keeps a happy staff team." Staff told us that they were proud to work for the home, "I am proud of this service and all the staff, we work really hard."

Feedback from people, their relatives and staff was sought through meetings and annual surveys. Surveys completed in February 2018 returned positive feedback for the service and the staff team. The overall satisfaction score was 96% and comments included were, "The staff are helpful and considerate." These surveys had been reviewed by the registered manager and a summary had been circulated.

There was a quality monitoring system in place to help monitor and drive improvements to the care people received. The registered manager and deputy completed a large number of weekly and monthly internal audits to ensure they understood what was happening directly with people and to establish how they could learn from any mistakes made.

Feedback we received confirmed staff had built positive relationships with visiting professionals. Comments from them included, "The staff have time to sit and care for people. I always receive a nice welcoming atmosphere from all of the staff."

The registered manager understood their relevant legal requirements and had notified the Care Quality Commission of all significant events which have occurred in line with their legal responsibilities.