

# Shaw Healthcare Limited

# Croft Meadow

## Inspection report

Tanyard Lane  
Steyning  
West Sussex  
BN44 3RJ

Tel: 01903814956  
Website: [www.shaw.co.uk](http://www.shaw.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
04 March 2021

Date of publication:  
23 March 2021

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inspected but not rated

Is the service safe?

**Inspected but not rated**

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

Croft Meadow is situated in West Sussex and is one of a group of homes owned by Shaw Healthcare Limited. It is a residential care home providing nursing care and support for up to 60 people with a variety of health needs, including frailty of old age and dementia. At the time of the inspection there were 48 people living at the home.

We found the following examples of good practice.

The majority of people living at the home had received a coronavirus vaccine and their consent had been obtained. People and staff had access to regular testing for coronavirus. All staff completed Lateral Flow Device Tests (LFD) and the provider was arranging for staff to undertake LFD tests at their home before coming on shift. LFD tests provide results quickly and an assurance that staff are well when their tests return a negative result.

In line with Public Health England guidance, the home was closed to visitors during the outbreak, except for relatives visiting a person who was receiving end of life care. The provider had a visiting policy for when the home re-opened. Visitors would need to undertake an LFD test and obtain a negative result before being allowed into the home. Personal protective equipment (PPE) such as disposable masks, would need to be worn, as a minimum. The hairdressing room had been allocated for visits as there was a separate external entrance for visitors. The room would be sanitised between visits, and social distancing guidelines will be followed. Moveable plastic screens will be used in the testing area to protect visitors and staff.

There were sufficient supplies of PPE for staff to use, and staff checked on each other to make sure masks were worn appropriately when working in the home. Staff changed into their PPE before or as they arrived on site; this minimised the risk of cross-contamination. Staff were issued with pocket-sized hand sanitisers for ease of use. Staff worked on the same unit during a shift and people no longer had access to all parts of the home. Care staff did not have access to the kitchen. Potentially contaminated laundry was kept separately from other laundry and was double-bagged and washed on a sluice setting. These practices reduced the risk of the spread of infection. Infection prevention and control (IPC) systems were robust and effective. 'High touch' areas of the home were cleaned frequently; the home was very clean and hygienic standards were maintained.

Daily handover meetings updated staff on what was happening at the home and current guidance; these meetings provided an opportunity for staff to discuss any issues. Meetings were held in an area of the home large enough to enable staff to socially distance from each other.

We had been informed that a member of agency staff who had tested positive for coronavirus continued to work at the home. We discussed this concern with the manager who assured us this was not the case. The agency staff member had tested negative using an LFD test when they came on shift, but subsequently received their result from a polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test which was positive. As soon as it was

known the agency staff member had tested positive, they started their period of isolation and did not work at the home. The home contacted other staff and people who lived at the home who had received care from the agency staff member, and all undertook a PCR test.

The provider had a range of policies to support their working practices. These included a standard operating procedure during the pandemic, admissions policy, risk assessments, IPC systems and guidance, and weekly IPC audits.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### **Is the service safe?**

Inspected but not rated.

**Inspected but not rated**

# Croft Meadow

## **Detailed findings**

### Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

As part of CQC's response to care homes with outbreaks of coronavirus, we are conducting reviews to ensure that the Infection Prevention and Control practice was safe and the service was compliant with IPC measures. We also received information of concern about infection control and prevention measures at this service. This was a targeted inspection looking at the IPC practices the provider has in place.

This inspection took place on 4 March 2021 and was unannounced.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

S5□ How well are people protected by the prevention and control of 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.