

Mr Munundev Gunputh

Friern Residential Care Home

Inspection report

26-30 Stanford Road
Friern Barnet
London
N11 3HX

Tel: 02083686033

Date of inspection visit:
30 May 2023

Date of publication:
12 June 2023

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Friern Residential Care Home is a care home registered to accommodate up to 18 people. Its services focus mainly on caring for older adults who have mental health conditions. On the day of our inspection there were 18 people residing at the home.

People's experience of using this service and what we found

People had access to healthcare services and were involved in decisions about their care. Partnerships with other agencies and health professionals enabled effective outcomes for people.

People's care was planned and risks to their safety and wellbeing were assessed. The service reviewed these plans regularly, involving people in these reviews and asking for their opinions.

Staff had completed safeguarding training and understood their role in identifying and reporting any concerns of potential abuse or poor practice.

Staff were recruited to the service safely and people's medicines were administered safely. The service was clean and with no unpleasant smell. Staff knew how to use and dispose of personal protective equipment (PPE) safely.

People had been living at the service for many years but had been assessed before care had begun. People were involved in planning their care and care was personalised to meet their needs detailing their likes and dislikes.

People and staff praised the managers of the service and agreed that they were approachable, knowledgeable, fair and did their job well. The staff team worked well together and supported the registered manager.

The staff team was committed to providing a high-quality service. They had undertaken training so that they were skilled and knowledgeable to effectively meet people's needs. Staff understood their responsibilities to report any concerns.

People were given choices about the way in which they were cared for. Staff listened to them and knew their needs well.

Care plans contained information about each person's individual support needs and preferences in relation to their care and we found evidence of good outcomes for people.

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

this practice.

Recruitment practices were safe and relevant checks had been completed before staff worked at the service.

The managers of the service actively sought the views of people and their relatives about the running of the service, and they dealt promptly with any concerns that people raised.

The provider had systems in place to monitor and improve the quality and safety of the service provided. There was a positive culture throughout the service. Staff told us they enjoyed working at the service and felt valued.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection

At the last inspection we rated this service Good. The report was published on 24 May 2018

Why we inspected

This inspection was prompted by a review of the information we held about this service. This report only covers our findings in relation to the Key Questions Safe and Well Led. For those key questions not inspected, we used the ratings awarded at the last inspection to calculate the overall rating.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service, which will help inform when we next inspect.

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 was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below,

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led

Details are in our well-led findings below.

Good ●

Friern Residential Care Home

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Health and Social Care Act 2008,

As part of this inspection we looked at the infection control and prevention measures in place. This was conducted so we can understand the preparedness of the service in preventing or managing an infection outbreak, and to identify good practice we can share with other services.

Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by 2 adult social care inspectors, and 1 Expert by Experience. An Expert by Experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

Service and service type

Friern Residential Care Home 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.

Registered Manager

This service is required to have a registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

At the time of our inspection there was a registered manager in post.

Notice of inspection

The inspection was unannounced. We visited the location's service on 30 May 2023.

What we did before the inspection

Before our inspection, we reviewed the information we held about the service which included statutory notifications and safeguarding and the Provider Information Return (PIR). The PIR 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 helps support our inspections. We used all this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We spoke with the registered manager, 2 care workers, 7 people who used the service and 2 relatives. We looked at 4 people's care records and 2 staff records including safe recruitment; we also looked at various documents relating to the management of the service.

Following our visit, we received further information from the registered manager, which included audits and fire safety evidence.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse; Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management.

- People were safe and protected from avoidable harm. Legal requirements were met.
- There was a system in place to document and report safeguarding incidents. This included reporting to the local authority safeguarding team and the CQC.
- Comments from people and relatives included, "yes, I am sure they are safe there, I am more than happy with the service". And "I am safe from harm here."
- Staff had completed safeguarding training and staff were able to demonstrate how they recognised signs of abuse and poor practice. Staff told us they were able to raise any concerns to the management team and were confident actions would be taken.
- A staff member told us, "We can tell if something is wrong from their [people] behaviour or they want to be alone and not mix with other residents."
- People told us they felt safe and looked after by the staff.
- Staff assessed all potential risks to people and put guidance in place so that the risks were minimised. Risk assessments were developed that maximised people's independence and ability to remain in control of their life.
- Risk assessments covered sleeping, self-harm, self neglect, falls and going out in the community.
- Indicators of deterioration in people's mental health were also set out in people's care records.
- Maintenance information and record keeping of contractor visits were accessible. During our visit we observed a number of improvements that taken place since our last inspection. This included redecoration and new flooring and windows throughout the home.
- Regular checks of the building and equipment took place, including fire safety equipment.
- Fire drills were regularly held, and people had individual personal evacuation plans to guide staff in the event of a fire.

Staffing and recruitment

- There were enough staff to keep people safe and meet their individual needs. We observed people were attended to in a timely unrushed manner.
- Staff told us there were always enough staff which allowed them to take people out who needed assistance with this.
- A person using the service told us, "The staff are very good here; I think they do a good job".
- Staff had been recruited in a safe way. Appropriate checks were made of an applicant's work references, full employment history, relevant qualifications and of the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). DBS checks provide information including details about convictions and cautions held on the Police National Computer. The information helps employers make safer recruitment decisions.

- There was very little staff turnover. Most staff had worked at the service for many years which provided consistency and continuity for people living in the service.
- At the time of our inspection the service was not using any agency staff.

Using medicines safely

- Accurate records for the receipt, administration and disposal of medicines were kept. There were written protocols to guide staff on the administration of medicines prescribed 'as and when' required'.
- People received their medicines safely and at the right time. A staff member said, "Our competencies are checked every six months."
- Medicines were clearly recorded within people's medicines administration records.
- Regular audits of medicines administration took place to ensure continuous safety.

Preventing and controlling infection

- We were assured that the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.
- We were assured that the provider was meeting shielding and social distancing rules.
- We were assured that the provider was admitting people safely to the service.
- We were assured that the provider was using PPE effectively and safely.
- We were assured that the provider was accessing testing for people using the service and staff
- We were assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises.
- We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.
- We were assured that the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.

Visiting in care homes

- The provider's approach to visiting followed the latest government guidance in relation to visiting in care homes.

Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental 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. When they lack mental capacity to take decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible. People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty had the appropriate legal authority and were being met.

- The service was working within the principles of the MCA.
- Mental capacity assessments (MCA) were completed for people. These had followed best practice and current guidelines. MCA's were decision specific, such as, can someone consent to bed rails being used, or do they consent to remaining at the care home. It was clear if a person was able to understand, retain, weigh up and communicate their decision. When someone was not able to do this, a best interest checklist was completed with all relevant relatives and healthcare professionals.
- Staff empowered people to make their own decisions about their care wherever possible.
- We heard staff asking people for their consent before assisting them and offering people choices about how and where to spend their day
- Staff knew about people's capacity to make decisions and were able to communicate with people well in a

variety of ways to support this.

- Staff demonstrated best practice around assessing mental capacity, supporting decision making and best interest decision making.
- Staff confirmed that they had undertaken training in relation to the MCA.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture. At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same.

This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people.

The service promoted people's care needs and comfort while living at the service.

- People told us they enjoyed the environment and staff support.
- Feedback from relatives was also positive. A relative said, "I am so pleased knowing [family member] is living there, it's a really good caring home for them".
- There was a friendly, open, positive, and supportive culture at the home. We observed staff interacted with people in a kind and considerate manner, treating them with dignity and respect.
- The registered manager and staff were motivated to provide the best possible person-centred care and support for people.
- People and staff were complimentary about the registered manager and said they were very approachable and that they would have no hesitation in raising concerns or making suggestions.
- Staff said they felt comfortable to put forward any ideas they may have to improve the care, support or wellbeing for people and were confident these would be acted upon.
- People and staff told us that they felt involved in changes and were provided with opportunities to give feedback and offer suggestions for improvements.
- Care plans included information about people's diverse needs and how these could be met, for example, supporting people with religious and cultural needs.
- Staff and people spoken with described a caring, relaxed environment to live and work.

How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong; Continuous learning and improving care

- Relatives told us the service was well managed. Comments included, "literally, they are in touch with me all the time and would contact me immediately if there are any issues, the communication is really good" and "the boss is very good".
- We had no concerns regarding duty of candour. We found the registered manager was open and transparent throughout the inspection.
- There were systems in place to monitor the safety of the service and the maintenance of the building and equipment. This included audits of people's nutrition, medicines, staff records, care plans, health and safety, accidents, and incidents. We were shown examples of quality audits that had taken place at the home recently. This gave an overview of all the checks and audits that were completed on either a daily, weekly, monthly, or quarterly basis.

- Staff were being supported to develop their skills through appropriate training.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- The registered manager understood the importance of their role and responsibilities. They demonstrated a strong commitment to providing good care for people using the service, providing support to staff employed within the service and ensuring compliance with regulatory requirements was achieved.
- The registered manager had a very good understanding of people's needs and maintained a good oversight of the service .
- Staff were positive about working at the service and felt valued they told us they were well supported. Comments included, "I just like them, they are very supportive and very understanding" and "They do walking around and always available to help us."
- Staff were aware of the whistleblowing procedure and said they would use this if the need arose.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- Effective arrangements were in place for gathering people's views of the service they received and those of people acting on their behalf.
- A survey was carried out with professionals staff ,relatives and people who used the service in May 2023 which showed good levels of satisfaction.
- Staff meetings were held to give the management team and staff the opportunity to express their views and opinions on the day-to-day running of the service.
- Monthly relatives/residents meetings were also in place.
- The stable staff team ensured staff were familiar with people's needs and provided person-centred care.

Working in partnership with others;

- Staff worked well with people, their relatives and professionals to ensure people were supported safely and in the way they wanted.
- Records showed people were supported to access services in the community including GPs, and specialist professionals to promote people's health and wellbeing when required.
- Information showed the service worked closely with others. For example, the Local Authority psychiatrists, GP's, social workers and other healthcare professionals and services to support the delivery of quality care provision.