

# Blackpool Borough Council

# The Arc

## Inspection report

Clifton Avenue  
Blackpool  
Lancashire  
FY4 4RF

Tel: 01253477855

Website: [www.blackpool.gov.uk](http://www.blackpool.gov.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
30 August 2017

Date of publication:  
27 September 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 Assessment and Rehabilitation Centre (The ARC), had recently changed to an integrated provider with the national health service and social services working together to provide care and support for 33 people. The staff team consists of rehabilitation support workers, occupational therapists, physiotherapists and nurses. The team all work together to assess and rehabilitate people over a period of approximately four weeks to enable them to live independently in their own home. Accommodation is located on two floors with a lift available to facilitate access to the second floor.

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

People staying at the ARC told us they were happy with their care and liked the staff who looked after them. We observed care practices throughout our inspection visit and saw staff were kind and patient with the people in their care. One person staying at the ARC said, "The staff are very kind and very caring."

The service had systems in place to record safeguarding concerns, accidents and incidents and take necessary action as required. Staff had received safeguarding training and understood their responsibilities to report unsafe care or abusive practices.

Risk assessments had been developed to minimise the potential risk of harm to people during the delivery of their care. These had been kept under review and were relevant to the care provided.

We saw staff assisting people with mobility problems. They were kind and patient and assisted people safely.

The service had sufficient staffing levels in place to provide support people required. We saw staff members could undertake tasks supporting people without feeling rushed. People staying at the ARC told us staff were responsive to their needs.

Medication procedures at the ARC were safe. Staff responsible for the administration of medicines had received training to ensure they had the competency and skills required. Medicines were safely kept with appropriate arrangements for storing in place.

We looked around the building and found it had been maintained, was clean and hygienic and a safe place for people to live. We found equipment had been serviced and maintained as required.

The service had safe infection control procedures in place and staff had received infection control training. Staff wore protective clothing such as gloves and aprons when needed. This reduced the risk of cross infection.

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff support them in the

least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service support this practice.

People had been consulted about their care and had agreed with the support to be provided.

People told us they were happy with the variety and choice of meals available to them. We saw regular snacks and drinks were provided between meals to ensure people received adequate nutrition and hydration.

People staying at the ARC were supported by occupational therapists and physiotherapists with their rehabilitation. They had access to nursing staff to attend to their nursing needs and General Practitioners (GPs) visited the service daily between Monday and Friday to monitor people's health needs.

The design of the building and facilities provided were appropriate for the care and support provided.

People told us staff were caring towards them. Staff we spoke with understood the importance of high standards of care to give people meaningful lives.

People's care and support was planned with them. People told us they had been consulted and listened to about how their support would be delivered.

The service had information with regards to support from an external advocate should this be required by them.

The service had a complaints procedure in place. People we spoke with told us they were happy and had no complaints.

People told us their privacy was respected and staff treated them with respect and dignity at all times.

The registered manager used a variety of methods to assess and monitor the quality of the service. These included surveys to seek the views of people about the service provided on their discharge from the ARC.

## 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.

# The Arc

## Detailed findings

### Background to this inspection

We carried out this comprehensive 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 visit took place on 30 August 2017 and was unannounced.

The inspection team consisted of an adult social care inspector and an 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. The expert-by-experience had a background dealing with older people and people.

We spoke with a range of people about the service. They included six people staying at the ARC, two relatives, a representative of the provider, the registered manager, and six staff members. Prior to our inspection visit we contacted the commissioning department at Blackpool Council and Healthwatch Blackpool. Healthwatch Blackpool is an independent consumer champions for health and social care. This helped us to gain a balanced overview of what people experienced accessing the service.

We reviewed the Provider Information Record (PIR) we received prior to our inspection. 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 provided us with information and numerical data about the operation of the service. We used this information as part of the evidence for the inspection. This guided us to what areas we would focus on as part of our inspection.

During our inspection we used a method called Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). This involved observing staff interactions with the people in their care. SOFI is a specific way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us.

We looked at care records of three people, staff training and supervision records of four staff and arrangements for meal provision. We also looked at records relating to the management of the ARC and the medication records of four people. We reviewed the services recruitment procedures and checked staffing

levels. We also checked the building to ensure it was clean, hygienic and a safe place for people to live.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People staying at the ARC told us they had confidence in staff who supported them and felt safe when they received their care. We observed staff supporting people with mobility problems. They were kind and patient and supported people safely. Comments received included, "I always feel safe when being supported by staff. They are very patient." And, "I have every confidence in the staff. They know what they are doing."

Discussion with the registered manager confirmed they had an understanding of safeguarding procedures. This included when to make a referral to the local authority for a safeguarding investigation. The registered manager was also aware of their responsibility to inform the Care Quality Commission (CQC) about any incidents in a timely manner. This meant we received information about the service when we should do. Records seen and staff spoken with confirmed they had received safeguarding vulnerable adults training. Staff told us they understood their responsibility to report abusive practice or unsafe care.

Care plans seen had risk assessments completed to identify potential risk of accidents and harm to staff and people in their care. Risk assessments we saw provided instructions for staff members when delivering their support. These included moving and handling assessments. Care plans we looked at showed risks had been assessed and care planned appropriately.

We found staff had been recruited safely, appropriately trained and supported. They had skills, knowledge and experience required to support people with their care. The registered manager monitored and regularly assessed staffing levels to ensure sufficient staff were available to provide support people needed. During our inspection visit staffing levels were observed to be sufficient to meet the needs of people staying at the ARC.

We looked at how medicines were prepared and administered. Medicines had been ordered appropriately, checked on receipt into the ARC, given as prescribed and stored and disposed of correctly. We observed two senior staff members administering medication during the lunch time round. We saw the medication trolley was locked securely whilst attending each person. People were sensitively assisted as required and medicines were signed for after they had been administered.

We looked around the building and found it was clean, tidy and maintained. The service employed designated staff for cleaning of the premises who worked to cleaning schedules. We observed staff making appropriate use of personal protective clothing such as disposable gloves and aprons. Hand sanitising gel and hand washing facilities were available around the building. These were observed being used by staff undertaking their duties. This meant staff were protected from potential infection when delivering personal care and undertaking cleaning duties.

## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

People received effective care because they were supported by an established and trained staff team who had a good understanding of their needs. We saw people visiting the ARC were made welcome by staff and where appropriate updated about their relative's welfare. Comments received from people staying at the ARC included, "I was in a wheel chair when I came here and I now have a tripod walking stick. I have come on leaps and bounds with their help." And, "The staff are very professional, skilled, competent and patient. I have every confidence in them."

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 (MCA). The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The staff working in this service make sure that people have choice and control of their lives and support them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service support this practice.

People told us they enjoyed the meals provided for them and were happy with the choices made available to them. Comments received included, "We get beautiful meals and plenty to eat. I am never hungry." And, "There is plenty of choice and alternatives if you want them. The meals are not too bad at all."

We observed lunch in the dining room. We saw different portion sizes and choice of meals were provided as requested. Food served looked nutritious and well presented. Drinks were provided and offers of additional drinks and meals were made where appropriate. The support we saw provided was organised and well managed. The atmosphere throughout lunch was relaxed and unhurried with people being given sufficient time to enjoy their meal.

The service had been awarded a five-star rating following their last inspection by the 'Food Standards Agency'. This graded the service as 'very good' in relation to meeting food safety standards about cleanliness, food preparation and associated recordkeeping.

People's healthcare needs were carefully monitored and discussed with the person or family members as part of the care planning process. They were supported by occupational therapists and physiotherapists with their rehabilitation. They had access to nursing staff to attend to their nursing needs. In addition GPs visited ten people with nursing needs daily between Monday and Friday to monitor their health needs.

We looked at the building and found it was appropriate for the care and support provided. Bedrooms were single occupancy and two rooms provided en-suite facilities. There were bathroom/shower rooms and toilets on each floor. There was a lift that serviced the second floor to ensure it could be accessed by people with mobility problems. Each room had a nurse call system to enable people to request support if needed. Aids and hoists were in place which were capable of meeting the assessed needs of people with mobility problems. Doorways into communal areas, corridors, bedrooms, bathing and toilet facilities offered sufficient width to allow wheelchair users access. The service had a gymnasium where people were

supported by occupational therapists and physiotherapists with their rehabilitation including stair practice. The service also had a rehabilitation kitchen where people were assessed to confirm they can use cooking facilities safely.

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

People staying at the ARC told us they were happy with their support and felt well cared for. Comments received included, "I do think they are very kind. In fact they are exceptional in my opinion." And, "They are all very kind and caring."

Staff had a good understanding of protecting and respecting people's human rights. They were able to describe the importance of promoting each individual's uniqueness and there was an extremely sensitive and caring approach observed throughout our inspection visit.

We saw staff had an appreciation of people's individual needs around privacy and dignity. We observed they spoke with people in a respectful way, giving people time to understand and reply. We observed they demonstrated compassion towards people in their care and treated them with respect. One person we spoke with said, "My privacy and dignity are respected at all times."

We spoke with the registered manager about access to advocacy services should people require their guidance and support. The registered manager had information with regards to support from an external advocate should this be required.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

People staying at the ARC told us they received a personalised support service which was responsive to their care needs. They told us the care they received was focussed on them and they were encouraged to make their views known about how they wanted their care and support provided. Three care plans we looked at were reflective of people's needs and had been regularly reviewed to monitor the person's progress with their rehabilitation. Staff spoken with were knowledgeable about support people in their care required.

The service had a complaints procedure which was available to people staying at the ARC. The procedure was clear in explaining how a complaint should be made and reassured people these would be responded to appropriately. We looked at the services complaints log and saw where complaints had been received these had been responded to in a professional and timely manner. People staying at the ARC when we undertook our inspection visit told us they were happy and had nothing to complain about.

The registered manager told us she had considered good practice guidelines when managing people's health needs. For example, the service was in the process of introducing written documentation to accompany people should they need to attend hospital during their stay at the ARC. The documentation will contain information providing clear direction as to how to support a person and include information about the person's communication and care needs, medical history and medication.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

There was a registered manager in place. 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.

We found the service had clear lines of responsibility and accountability. The registered manager was supported by a deputy manager, team leaders and senior carers who undertook some management tasks including administering medication. The registered manager and her staff team were experienced, knowledgeable and familiar with the needs of the people they supported. Discussion with the registered manager and staff on duty confirmed they were clear about their role and between them provided a well run and consistent service. Comments received from people staying at the ARC and their visitors included, "The staff are very respectful and there is a very relaxed atmosphere." And, "The staff are excellent. Really friendly and helpful."

The service had procedures in place to monitor the quality of the service provided. Regular audits had been completed. These included reviewing care plan records, monitoring the environment, health and safety issues, falls and infection control.

Staff meetings had been held to discuss the service provided. We looked at minutes of the most recent team meeting and saw topics relevant to the running of the service had been discussed. These included discussing feedback received from people who had used the service. One person wanted staff to know how welcome they had been made to feel during their stay at the ARC and all staff had treated them really well.

Discharge questionnaires had been completed commenting on the service by people returning home. We saw people said they were happy with the meals provided, comfort and the care they received from helpful and respectful staff. Comments received included, 'Good job done by all. The staff made me feel very important.' And, 'This has helped me to get my dignity back. I have learned to stand on my own two feet again.'

The service was run in partnership with health and social care professionals. Throughout their stay at the ARC people had access to healthcare care support including occupational therapists, physiotherapists, nursing staff and GPs. When ready to return home social work staff based at the ARC were able to coordinate their discharge home and arrange any support from community services. This ensured people continued to receive support once they had returned home.

The service had on display in the reception area of the home their last CQC rating, where people visiting the home could see it. This has been a legal requirement since 01 April 2015.