

Mrs Tersaim Khaira

Orchard Cottage

Inspection report

78 Old Road East
Gravesend
Kent
DA12 1PE

Tel: 01474321127
Website: www.orchardcarehome.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
17 April 2019
26 April 2019

Date of publication:
20 May 2019

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

About the service:

Orchard Cottage provides accommodation with personal care to older people, some of whom may be living with dementia. The accommodation is provided over two floors and care is provided for up to 10 people. There were 8 people using the service when we inspected.

People's experience of using this service:

People told us they felt safe with staff. Comments included, "Yes, I am safe here" and "We are well looked after, it is our home."

People had good relationships with staff, who were knowledgeable of their physical and emotional needs, as well as likes, dislikes and interests. Staff were responsive to changes in people's health needs. If needed, they sought advice from relevant professionals.

People felt included in planning their care. Care plans were person centred, achieved good outcomes and showed people were offered choice and involved wherever possible.

People's rights, their dignity and privacy were respected. One relative said, "The staff are very good, we see the same regular staff and are always welcome."

Staff supported people to maintain a balanced diet and monitor their nutritional health.

Medicines were stored and managed safely by staff and the registered manager. There were policies and procedures in place for the safe administration of medicines. Staff followed these policies and had been trained to administer medicines safely.

People received care from staff who were well supported with induction, training and ongoing supervision.

People knew how to complain and that any concerns would be listened and responded to by the provider. Actions were taken as a response to complaints as appropriate.

Feedback from people and relatives was sought and used to make improvements.

The provider had made changes to improve the service for people. On-going redecoration was planned over the next twelve months.

Quality monitoring systems included audits, checks on staff practice and checks on people's satisfaction with the service they received.

The provider has systems in place to ensure they kept up to date with developments in the sector and changes in the law.

Lessons were learnt and used to make improvements.

The service was led by an experienced, competent manager who understood their role and responsibilities, as did staff. The service had a clear management structure and people had confidence in the manager and provider.

Rating at last inspection: The service was rated as Requires Improvement at the last comprehensive inspection on 24 August 2016. Subsequently a focussed inspection was carried out on 02 March 2017, showing improvements had been made and the Safe domain was rated as Good.

At this inspection, the service met the characteristics of Good in all domains.

Why we inspected: This was a comprehensive inspection scheduled based on the previous rating.

Follow up: We will continue to monitor the service through the information we receive.

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

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 effective?

The service was Effective

Details are in our Effective findings below.

Good ●

Is the service caring?

The service was Effective

Details are in our Effective findings below.

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

The service was Responsive

Details are in our Responsive findings below.

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

The service was Well-led

Details are in our Well-led findings below.

Good ●

Orchard Cottage

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. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

Inspection team:

One inspector carried out this inspection on the 17 and 26 April 2019.

Service and service type:

Orchard Cottage is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

Notice of inspection: This was a comprehensive inspection and was unannounced.

What we did:

Following the comprehensive inspection in August 2016, the Safe domain was rated as Requires Improvement. A subsequent focussed inspection was carried out in March 2017, showing improvements had been made and the Safe domain was rated as Good.

Before the inspection the provider completed a Provider Information Return. Providers are required to send us key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. This information helps support our inspections. We took this into account when we inspected the service and made the judgements in this report. We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last comprehensive inspection, on 24 August 2016. This included details about incidents the provider must notify us about, such as abuse or serious injury.

During the inspection, we spoke with three people; two staff and the registered manager. We reviewed a range of records. This included three people's care records and medicine records. We also looked at three staff recruitment records, assessment, supervision and support records and reviewed records relating to the management of the service, staff training and policies and procedures.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm. People told us they felt perfectly safe when being supported by staff.

Good: People were safe and protected from avoidable harm. Legal requirements were met.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse.

- Staff knew how to identify different types of abuse and were confident that any concerns they had would be managed appropriately by the provider and registered manager.
- Training was regularly updated so staff could keep up-to-date with changes to legislation and best practice. The registered manager liaised with the local authority safeguarding team when required.
- Staff were supported to understand how they could 'whistle blow' to external organisations such as social services if they had concerns. Staff told us that they had not had any concerns about people's safety.
- People told us they felt safe. One person said, "I have lived here for some time and I always feel safe, all the staff are good." One relative review stated, 'Chiefly my relative is safe and well treated by caring staff.'

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- The risks involved in delivering people's care had been assessed to keep people safe. Risks to people and the environment were assessed before people moved in. The assessments included assessing and recording actions to reduce risks. Staff assessed people's mobility, nutrition and health needs. For example, if people needed support when using mobility aids. The care records included instructions on what action to take if any changes in mobility was noted.
- Individual moving and handling assessments were carried out for those who required it. These included, how people were supported to walk or get out of bed.
- The maintenance of the premises was planned to reduce risks. Parts of the premises were being refurbished/updated. For example, a twelve month plan of refurbishment works had been sent to us following the inspection by the registered manager. This included refurbishment of bedrooms and communal areas. Small repair works had already been completed to the premises to maintain safety,

Using medicines safely:

- Processes were in place to make sure people received their medicines safely. People's ability to manage their own medicines was assessed before they were admitted to the service. One person told us, "The staff are very good, I always get my medicines regularly and they (staff) do not forget to give them."
- Medicines were stored safely. Storage temperatures were recorded within recommended ranges to maintain the effectiveness of medicines. Staff described how they kept people safe when administering medicines. 'As and when' required medicines (PRN) were administered in line with the provider's PRN policies.
- Processes were in place to safeguard people and staff when medicines were being administered. Staff supporting people with medicines had undertaken medication training.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- A system was in place to record accidents and incidents. Incidents, accidents were reported by staff in line with the provider's policy. The registered manager took steps to ensure that lessons were learned when things went wrong. Actions were taken to reduce the risk of recurrence. For example, involving health care professionals to discuss ways of reducing risks.
- Policies about dealing with incidents and accidents were in place to minimise harm and continued to be effective.

Preventing and controlling infection

- There were gloves and aprons available to staff when these were needed. People told us the staff use gloves appropriately when providing personal care.
- Staff told us they had access to as much equipment as they needed.
- Infection control training was provided to staff on their induction into the service and regularly updated.
- Relative reviews stated, 'Always fresh and clean' and 'The place is always clean and does not have a smell that some have.'

Staffing and recruitment

- There continued to be enough staff to keep people safe. Staffing was matched to people's assessed needs. Two staff were deployed on shift during the day and one member of staff was deployed to work during the night. The registered manager was able to deploy more staff as and when people's needs changed. People said, "Yes, there is enough staff, they know us very well, there is always someone around to help when you need it."
- Staff continued to be recruited safely. For example, Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks had been completed which helped prevent unsuitable staff from working with people who could be vulnerable. We reviewed three staff files and evidenced that a robust recruitment procedure was in place. Most staff had worked at the service for several years.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence.

Good: People's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law.

- People's needs and choices had been assessed before they received any care, so that care achieved effective outcomes in line with guidance. One relative review stated, 'From the start of the assessment process until the placement, the contact I had with the manager was ongoing.'
- Assessments considered any needs the person might have to ensure that their rights under the Equality Act 2010 were fully respected, including needs relating to people's disability or religion.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People were supported by staff who had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care. We evidenced from the staff training records and staff confirmed that training was regularly updated.
- The registered manager told us that there had been no new staff since the last comprehensive inspection in August 2016.
- Staff received a mix of online and face-to-face training, including subjects such as first aid, moving and handling theory and practice and health and safety. When people had specific health conditions, staff were provided with specialist training in order to effectively care for them. Specialist training, such as dementia awareness was available or sought out by the registered manager if it was required. One person told us, "Staff are well trained, they know what they are doing."
- Staff received supervision and an annual appraisal and told us they felt well supported. Staff had the support they needed to enable them to develop into their role with the skills and confidence required to support people well.
- Staff we spoke with had good knowledge and understanding of their role and how to support people effectively.

Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support; Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care.

- Staff continued to support people very well with their health needs.
- People confirmed their health needs were well met. One person told us, "They (staff) get the GP to visit if I am unwell."
- Staff had a good understanding of people's health needs. They supported people to attend regular health appointments and check-ups and liaised with the GP for referrals to other health professionals.
- Information about people's health needs and their preferences for support was shared with healthcare staff when people were admitted to hospital to enable people to be supported in accordance with their needs and wishes.
- Staff supported people by arranging assessments for specialist equipment that might enhance their lives, such as specialist beds or mattresses.

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet

- People were supported to eat and drink to maintain a balanced diet and good health. People said the food was good and different choices were available.
- Staff understood people's food likes and dislikes. They had gathered information from people, their relatives to inform their understanding of how to meet people's nutritional needs.
- We observed the lunch service. People were encouraged to eat and drink as much as they wanted. One person had opted for a lasagne dish as they did not like fish. Relatives reviews stated, 'Always plenty of good food available and personal tastes are catered or' and 'The food is always freshly prepared in the kitchen and of a good 'home cooked' standard.'

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 with appropriate legal authority. 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 found that they were. Staff gave examples of how they supported people to make their own decisions. For example, offering a choice of two items to wear. We observed people choosing where they wanted to go, what they wanted to eat and what they wanted support with. Staff were respectful of people's choices and decisions.
- Where people did not have the capacity to make decisions, meetings were held with relevant people to discuss what would be in people's best interests.

Adapting service, design, decoration to meet people's needs

- The design and layout of the service met people's needs. People knew where their rooms were and where to find communal areas such as the kitchen, lounge and toilets.
- People's bedrooms were decorated to their own tastes.
- The garden was well maintained. We observed people moving around the service freely. One person told us they spent time in the garden when the weather was good.
- One relative review stated, 'This is a small care home, with a homely personal feel. It is perfect for my relative. The staff and management were extremely helpful making this possible.'

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

Good: People were supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; equality and diversity

- One person said, "Staff are all good, I get along with all of them". One relative review stated, 'My mother is cared for by staff who understand her and are patient.' Another stated, 'All staff and management very accommodating and always helpful.' One relative told us "The staff are excellent."
- People were treated with kindness and compassion in their day-to-day care. Staff told us they knew people well, it was a small service and staff said people received consistent support.
- Staff sought accessible ways to communicate with the people they supported. For example, using gestures and facial expressions that the person understood. Staff told us that they would communicate with people about what they were going to do before they did it. This was detailed in care plans which explained when people needed reassurance.
- People were asked about how they wanted to be supported to meet their equality and diversity needs such as support relating to their religion or sexuality. No one wanted any support with these needs at the time of the inspection.

Supporting people to express their views and be involved in making decisions about their care

- People were supported to express their views and they and their relatives were involved in making decisions about their care and support. One relative review stated, 'My relative was invited to spend a day at the service and then did not leave.'
- Staff invited people and their relatives to the person's initial assessment and subsequent reviews of their care.
- People were involved in the review of their care plans and risk assessments and able to voice their opinion if things were not working for them. People told us about their review meetings and said they felt able to speak up. They had signed their assessments and care plans to say they agreed with the content.
- If people did not have relatives to support them, the management team would refer to external advocates for support. Advocates are people who are independent of the service and who can support people to make decisions and communicate their wishes.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People were supported by staff to be as independent as possible. Care plans considered people's strengths and abilities, such as how they take part in making decisions about their care, or what aspects of the care they can complete themselves.
- People had their dignity and privacy respected. Staff said this might include shutting doors when providing intimate support and covering the person with a towel during personal care. One relative review stated, 'At all times the staff and management cared for her needs and ensured she maintained her dignity.'

- The registered manager made arrangements which ensured that private information was kept confidential. Care and staff records containing private information were stored securely at the office when not in use. Computer records were password protected so that they could only be accessed by authorised members of staff. Staff told us they would not share information about a person without their consent.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the service met people's needs.

Good: People's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to meet people's needs, preferences, interests and give them choice and control

- People received support which was based around their needs, choices and preferences. Each person had their own individualised care plan which detailed the support they needed, and how staff were to provide that support. The plans were written in a personalised way.
- Family and friends who were important to people were recorded in the care plan. For example, different family members such as sons and daughters and grandchildren as well as close friends who played an important role in people's lives. Support networks were clearly set out so that staff knew the relationships and who to contact when.
- Care plans were regularly reviewed and any change in information updated immediately by staff.
- Care plans were drawn up with people, taking into consideration information and advice from health professionals such as district nurses and occupational therapists.
- The provider met the principles of the accessible information standards 2016 (AIS). AIS applies to people who use a service and have information or communication needs because of a disability, impairment or sensory loss. When people were assessed, their communication needs were taken into account. The care plans enabled people or their relatives to check they were receiving the agreed care. One relative told us, "Two staff operate the mobility equipment and this is written in the care plan, they (staff) are careful with my relative."

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- The complaints procedure was detailed, giving the information needed if people wanted to make a complaint. Guidance was given about where to take their complaint if people were not satisfied with the response, such as the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO).
- People and their relatives told us they knew how to make a complaint and felt any concerns they had would be treated seriously by the registered manager.
- The registered manager said there had been no formal complaints made since the last comprehensive inspection in 2016.
- Information on how to make a complaint was displayed clearly to inform people of the process to follow. This information included details on what to do if the person or relative was not happy with how the complaint was responded to, such as contacting external organisations.

End of life care and support

- People were supported as appropriate at the end of their life to have a pain free and dignified death.
- Staff worked closely and sensitively with involved health professionals to make sure people received the right support.

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

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

Planning and promoting person-centred, high-quality care and support; and how the provider understands and acts on duty of candour responsibility

- The provider had a statement of purpose which set out their vision and values for the service. This was available to people and staff if they wanted a copy. Staff had a good understanding of the values that were expected of them and agreed that a good quality service was what they all strived for.
- The registered manager checked if staff followed the values held by the provider by discussing them in supervisions. Staff told us, "The registered manager is here regularly, and we can always contact them by telephone if and when needed. The manager is very supportive."
- Staff told us they thought the culture at the service was transparent and open, and the registered manager was available if they had queries or concerns. People said the service was well led. One relative review stated, 'The home, room, food and care of staff is excellent.'

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

- There was a registered manager in post. 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.
- It is a legal requirement that a registered provider's latest Care Quality Commission inspection report rating is displayed at the service where a rating has been given. This is so that people, visitors and those seeking information about the service can be informed of our judgements. The registered persons had conspicuously displayed their rating on their website and within the service, which were accessible to the public.
- Services that provide health and social care to people are required to inform the Care Quality Commission of important events that happen in the service. This is so that we can check that appropriate action has been taken. The registered manager had submitted notifications to Care Quality Commission in an appropriate and timely manner in line with our guidelines.

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

- Arrangements had been made for the service to learn, innovate and ensure its sustainability.
- The registered manager carried out a number of audits and checks to make sure a safe and effective service was provided. Additionally, the views of people, their relatives and staff were gathered in order to help improve the service.

Continuous learning and improving care

- Regular staff meetings were held and staff told us they were able to speak out if they wanted to. A staff member said, "We are a good staff team, most of us have worked here for year."
- There was a system in place for undertaking spot checks for medicine administration, moving and handling and competency observations. This included ensuring that any future staff were delivering care as detailed in the care plan and seeking feedback from people on the quality of the care provided.

Working in partnership with others

- The service works in partnership with people, their relatives and health and social care professionals to ensure people have the best outcomes.
- The registered manager and staff helped people to be part of their community, using local resources and keeping close contact with health and social care professionals to make sure people had access to joined up care when necessary. For example, working closely with the community nursing team.