

Abbeyfield Newcastle Upon Tyne Society
Limited(The)

Abbeyfield Residential Care Home - Castle Farm

Inspection report

Castle Farm Road
Newcastle Upon Tyne
Tyne and Wear
NE3 1RF

Tel: 01912841344

Date of inspection visit:
24 September 2019

Date of publication:
23 October 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

Abbeyfield Residential Care Home - Castle Farm is registered to provide accommodation for up to 24 people with residential care needs. 22 people were using the service at the time of the inspection. Some of the people were living with a dementia type illness.

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

People and family members told us the service was safe. Risks were well managed and lessons were learned to reduce future risks. The registered manager and staff understood their responsibilities about safeguarding. Arrangements were in place for the safe administration of medicines.

There were enough staff on duty to meet the needs of people. The provider had an effective recruitment and selection procedure, and carried out relevant vetting checks when they employed staff. Staff were suitably trained and received regular supervisions and appraisals.

People's needs were assessed before they started using the service, and were continually assessed to ensure care plans remained relevant and any emerging needs were met. Staff treated people with dignity and respect. They helped to maintain people's independence by encouraging them to care for themselves where possible.

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.

Staff knew people well and understood what was important to them. People lived full and active lives and were protected from social isolation.

The provider had a complaints procedure and people were aware of how to make a complaint. An effective quality assurance process was in place. People, family members and staff were regularly consulted about the quality of the service.

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

Rating at last inspection

The last rating for this service was good (published 25 March 2017).

Why we inspected

This was a planned inspection based on the previous rating.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-

inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

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 caring.

Details are in our caring 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 ●

Abbeyfield Residential Care Home - Castle Farm

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 Care Act 2014.

Inspection team

One inspector and an Expert by Experience formed the inspection team. 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

Abbeyfield Residential Care Home - Castle Farm 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 and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. We also contacted Healthwatch. Healthwatch is an independent consumer champion that gathers and represents the views of the public about health and social care services in England.

We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return. This is information providers are required to send us with key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. This information helps support our inspections. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We spoke with eight people who used the service and one family member about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with four members of staff including the registered manager. 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.

We reviewed a range of records. This included three people's care and medicines records. We looked at two staff files in relation to recruitment and staff supervision. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including policies and procedures were reviewed.

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

- People and family members told us the service was safe. Comments included, "I feel safe because I've got a bell in my room in three different places" and "The staff are very good at keeping me safe here."
- The registered manager understood safeguarding procedures and had followed them. Staff demonstrated a good knowledge of safeguarding and had been trained in how to protect people from abuse.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management; Learning lessons when things go wrong; Preventing and controlling infection

- Accidents and incidents were appropriately recorded and analysed to identify any trends or lessons learned.
- The registered manager demonstrated how lessons had been learned from a recent fire service inspection.
- Risks were well managed. Staff understood potential risks and how to mitigate them.
- Checks were carried out to ensure people lived in a safe and clean environment.
- The home was exceptionally clean and staff had been appropriately trained in infection prevention and control.

Staffing and recruitment

- The provider had an effective recruitment and selection procedure. They carried out relevant security and identification checks when they employed new staff.
- There were enough staff on duty to meet the needs of people.

Using medicines safely

- Appropriate arrangements were in place for the safe administration and storage of medicines.
- Medicine administration records were accurate, up to date and audited regularly.

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.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant 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 were assessed before they started using the service to ensure their individual needs could be met.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People and family members told us staff were appropriately trained and skilled. One person told us, "I think the staff are very capable." A family member told us, "Staff are very informative."
- Staff were supported in their role and received regular supervisions and an annual appraisal.
- New staff completed an induction to the service and staff training was up to date.

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

- People were supported with their dietary needs as necessary.
- Mealtimes were pleasant, sociable events. The dining room was nicely decorated and staff supported people in a calm and engaging manner. People told us the food was good and there was plenty of choice.

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

- People were supported with their healthcare needs and to attend appointments when necessary. One person told us, "I've been taken into hospital while I've been here because I collapsed and staff have been really supportive throughout all my treatment."
- People had hospital checklists. These contained useful information in case the person was admitted to hospital. One person's hospital checklist contained inaccurate information. The registered manager agreed to correct it.
- The service worked with health and social care professionals such as GPs, the community nursing team and physiotherapists.

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

- The premises were appropriately designed for the people who lived there. Bedrooms were individually decorated. Most of the people were independently mobile and corridors were clear from obstructions.

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

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular 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 particular 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 registered manager and staff had a good understanding of the MCA. They were aware of the need for decisions to be made in a person's best interests if they were unable to make those decisions for themselves.
- Where people were unable to make their own decisions, the proper legal process was followed. DoLS had been applied for where necessary.

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.

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 supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; respecting equality and diversity

- People and family members told us staff were kind and considerate. One person told us, "The staff help with dressing me and undressing me. The carers approach is fantastic. For example, they have always been kind and helpful and treat you like they would treat their own family."
- None of the people using the service at the time of the inspection had specific religious or spiritual needs. However, religious services and events were held at the home for anyone who wanted to attend.
- People were treated as individuals and staff supported them to live their lives how they wanted.

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

- People and their family members were involved in the care planning process.
- People were able to make choices and discuss their preferences. These were clearly documented in their care records.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People told us staff respected their privacy and dignity. Comments included, "I think staff are very respectful of me and treat me with dignity. For example, they always knock and shout my name before entering my bedroom" and "Dignity and confidentiality are respected, absolutely."
- People told us staff supported them to be independent. One person told us, "I feel my independence is still very much promoted by staff."
- Care records described what people could do for themselves and what they required support with.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

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

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to ensure people have choice and control and to meet their needs and preferences

- Care records were regularly reviewed, included important information about the person and were person-centred.
- A person was identified as being at risk of pressure damage. Although a risk assessment was in place, they did not have a specific pressure care plan. The registered manager agreed to put this in place.
- People's individual aims and goals were recorded. These described what the person wanted from their care and support.

Meeting people's communication needs

Since 2016 onwards all organisations that provide publicly funded adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). The standard was introduced to make sure people are given information in a way they can understand. The standard applies to all people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss and in some circumstances to their carers.

- People were given information in a way they could understand and support plans described the level of support they required with their communication needs.

Supporting people to develop and maintain relationships to avoid social isolation; support to follow interests and to take part in activities that are socially and culturally relevant to them

- Staff knew people well and understood what was important to them. Social assessments were used to identify people's individual interests and preferences.
- People lived full and active lives and were protected from social isolation. One person told us, "The home is alive with activities." Another told us, "The activities are unbelievable. We have a committee to discuss ideas and residents' meetings to share ideas."
- Staff escorted people in the local community for appointments, shopping and socialising. Some people were able to access the community independently.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- The provider had a complaints policy and procedure in place. People and family members told us they did not have any complaints but were aware of how to make a complaint.
- Systems were in place to ensure complaints were acknowledged, investigated and responded to.

End of life care and support

- The service was not supporting anyone with end of life care needs. However, staff had received training and some people had discussed and recorded their wishes for end of life care.

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

- People and family members told us the service was well-led and the registered manager was approachable. Comments included, "I love being here. I would give it an excellent, 10 out of 10" and "I would recommend this place without any hesitation at all."
- Staff were happy in their work and told us the registered manager was approachable. One staff member told us, "It is the best place I have ever worked."

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

- The registered manager acted in an open and transparent way. They submitted notifications in a timely manner for significant events that had occurred, such as accidents and incidents.
- The registered manager and staff understood their roles and responsibilities.
- The provider monitored the quality of the service to ensure a high standard of care.

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

- People were able to feed back on the quality of the service. Residents' meetings took place regularly and annual questionnaires were sent to people, family members and visitors. These were analysed and responses were posted on the notice board.
- Staff meetings took place regularly. Additional staff meetings were held with the provider.

Continuous learning and improving care; Working in partnership with others

- Staff were assigned 'lead role' responsibilities for different aspects of the service. The registered manager had created a contact list for people and visitors to let them know which staff member to contact.
- The service had introduced a new oral health assessment tool following the publication of CQC's report into oral health in care homes.
- The service had developed good links with the local community. A baby and toddler group visited the service and there were good links with a church group and two local schools. A local supermarket donated items to the service and was due to hold a 'cheese and wine' event for people, visitors and volunteers. One

of the people who used the service ran a book club before they moved into the home and was able to continue to host it from the home.