

Sea Esta

ID Number: RES0120

24-Hour Residence – 2018 Inspection Report

Sea Esta
Rush
Co. Dublin

Community Healthcare Organisation:
CHO 9

Team Responsible:
Intellectual Disability

Total Number of Beds:
5

Total Number of Residents:
4

Inspection Team:
Siobhán Dinan, Lead Inspector

Inspection Date:
31 January 2018

Inspection Type:
Unannounced Inspection

The Inspector of Mental Health Services:
Dr Susan Finnerty MCRN009711

Date of Publication:
24 July 2019

Contents

Introduction to the Inspection Process.....	5
Service description.....	5
Residence facilities and maintenance.....	5
Resident profile.....	5
Care and treatment.....	6
Physical care.....	6
Therapeutic services and programmes.....	6
Recreational activities.....	6
Medication.....	7
Community engagement.....	7
Autonomy.....	7
Staffing.....	8
Complaints.....	8
Risk management and incidents.....	8
Financial arrangements.....	9
Service user experience.....	9
Areas of good practice.....	9
Areas for improvement.....	10

Introduction to the Inspection Process

This inspection and report were guided by the themes contained in the Mental Health Commission Quality Framework.

Services will be aware of the Audit Toolkit deriving from the Quality Framework and may wish to consider using this Toolkit in pursuing service improvement within the residence involved.

Service description

Sea Esta was a five-bed, 24-hour, nurse-staffed residence in Rush, Co. Dublin. The two-storey house was owned and operated by the HSE. It opened as a 24-hour residence 2014. At the time of inspection, Sea Esta was providing a high-support rehabilitation service for four permanent residents and one respite resident at weekends. All of the residents had a primary diagnosis of mild-to-moderate intellectual disability.

Residence facilities and maintenance

Sea Esta accommodated residents in five large single bedrooms with shared bathroom facilities. The ground floor comprised a large bright kitchen/dining room, a sunroom, a utility/laundry room, three bedrooms, a sitting room, and a large bathroom. The first floor contained two bedrooms, a store room, an office, a bathroom, and a bright, spacious activity room.

The exterior of the house was well maintained. There was a large garden with a trampoline, exercise room, swings, and a polytunnel, which was planted with vegetables and flowers. At the time of inspection, all of the bedrooms had been painted recently and the sunroom had been redecorated and fitted with new blinds.

Resident profile

At the time of the inspection, Sea Esta was providing accommodation for four permanent male residents and one male respite resident at weekends. They were aged between 23 and 36, and their duration of stay ranged from two months to four years. All of the residents had a primary diagnosis of an intellectual disability, and all were mobile.

Care and treatment

Sea Esta had a policy in relation to individual care planning, which was dated January 2014. All of the residents had a multi-disciplinary individual care plan (ICP). Residents could attend ICP reviews, which occurred every six months. Family members were also invited to ICP review meetings. A key worker system was in operation in the residence, and residents were assigned a consistent named individual. Residents received a psychiatric evaluation at least six-monthly.

Multi-disciplinary team meetings were held weekly in the Central Services Office, and the clinical nurse manager 2 attended. Residents could also attend.

Physical care

The residence had a policy in relation to physical care and general health, which was dated January 2014. All residents had access to a GP, who completed their general physical examinations. Residents had access to a range of other health services by referral from the GP or consultant, including physiotherapy, dietetics, speech and language therapy, general hospital services, and chiropody.

Therapeutic services and programmes

The residence did not have a policy in relation to therapeutic programmes. There was a large activities room in the house as well as a therapeutic room with a sensory area. Staff delivered therapeutic programmes on-site, including mindfulness.

Residents also attended the Knockamann Day Service in Portrane, where they accessed a wide range of therapeutic services. They also had access to programmes in the Prosper day service and the Gheel autism service in Fairview.

Recreational activities

Residents in Sea Esta had access to a wide range of recreational activities. These included TV, radio, exercise equipment, arts and crafts, and board games. They also went walking on the beach, visited local cafés and a pub, went to the cinema, went shopping, and attended the local Arch Club weekly.

Medication

The residence had a policy in relation to medication management, which was dated June 2015. Medication was prescribed by the consultant psychiatrist or GP. A Medication and Prescription Administration Record (MPAR) system was in use, and residents' MPARs contained valid prescriptions and administration details. At the time of inspection, none of the residents were self-medicating. Medication was supplied by a local pharmacy and was stored appropriately and legally in a locked cabinet.

Community engagement

The location of Sea Esta, close to Rush beach, facilitated community engagement. Residents were within easy reach of all local amenities, including shops, the library, the church, the post office, a local park, the barbers, and restaurants and cafés. There was a bus stop close to the house, and the residence had its own car, which could be used to bring residents to activities and appointments.

Autonomy

Residents had full access to the kitchen to make meals or snacks. Residents were free to determine their bedtimes, but none of them had a key to their own bedrooms. Residents helped out with household chores with the assistance of staff, and a weekly rota of activities was posted up. Residents could receive visitors at any time. They could leave the house to go into the garden, exercise room and polytunnel, but they needed staff support if they were leaving the residence.

Staffing

Staff Discipline	Day whole-time equivalent (WTE)	Night WTE
Clinical Nurse Manager 2	1	0
Registered Psychiatric Nurse	2	1
Health Care Assistant	1	1
Multi-Task Attendant	0	0

Team input (Sessional)

Discipline	Number of sessions
Occupational Therapist	As required
Social Worker	As required
Clinical Psychologist	As required

Medical Staff	Frequency of attendance at residence
Consultant Psychiatrist	Six-monthly
Non-Consultant Hospital Doctor	0

Staff had up-to-date training in Basic Life Support, the Therapeutic Management of Violence and Aggression, recovery, and fire safety.

Complaints

Sea Esta had a complaints policy, which was dated January 2014. Details of the complaints process were displayed publicly, and residents were aware of how to make complaints. In the first instance, complaints were brought to a member of staff and were dealt with locally, where possible. Where a complaint needed escalation, the clinical nurse manager 2 progressed them to the complaints manager. A minor complaints book was being maintained in the residence. Community meetings were held monthly in the residence, and minutes of these were recorded. There was no suggestion box on the premises.

Risk management and incidents

The residence had a risk management policy, which was dated January 2014. It also had a safety statement dated January 2018 and an up-to-date risk register. Residents were assessed for risk at admission and on an ongoing basis, when changes to risk were identified. Incidents were reported and documented using the National Incident Management System.

The residence was physically safe, fire escapes were easily accessible, and fire extinguishers were serviced and in date. There were three first aid kits on the premises.

Financial arrangements

Sea Esta had a policy on the management of residents' finances, which was dated October 2012. All residents paid the same weekly charge, which covered food and utilities. Some of the residents had bank or post office accounts, and family members managed other residents' money. Appropriate procedures were in place in relation to staff handling residents' money, and secure facilities were in place for the safe-keeping of residents' money. Cash logs were maintained, and transactions were receipted and signed by staff and residents.

Residents did not contribute to a kitty or social fund. Residents' finances were audited weekly.

Service user experience

The inspector greeted residents and explained the purpose of the inspection. Two residents spoke individually with the inspector. Each were satisfied with their care and treatment. The residents told the inspection team that they enjoyed going to their day service and the activities they were involved in.

Areas of good practice

1. Sea Esta provided a comfortable home environment for residents. Staff were well engaged with residents and the environment was warm and relaxed.
2. Family members were invited to attend ICP review meetings with the consent of residents.
3. There was strong emphasis on the provision of social and recreational activities for the residents.
4. The residence had recently been repainted inside resulting in the premises having a bright and fresh feel to it.
5. A polytunnel was available to residents in the garden.
6. Residents had access to a large therapies room with a sensory area.

Areas for improvement

1. A copy of all ICPs should be offered to residents or a reason should be stated as to why this did not happen.
2. Any complaints, comments, or suggestions received by residents or family members should be documented separately from the clinical files.
3. The service should consider the introduction of a suggestion box.