

Czajka Properties Limited

Fairmount Nursing Home

Inspection report

10 Nab Wood Drive
ShIPLEY
West Yorkshire
BD18 4EJ

Tel: 01274592922

Website: www.czajka.co.uk/fairmount.html

Date of inspection visit:

24 April 2019

25 April 2019

Date of publication:

21 June 2019

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement 

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement 

Is the service effective?

Good 

Is the service caring?

Good 

Is the service responsive?

Good 

Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement 

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service:

Fairmount Nursing Home provides accommodation, care and support for up to 37 people over 65 years old including people living with dementia, people receiving end of life care and people on respite care. There were 31 people living at the service on our first inspection day and 30 people on the second.

People's experience of using this service:

People and relatives told us they had a positive experience with the care provided. One person said, "I would highly recommend this place to anyone, they are always pleasant and when I ask for something I get it."

We found the service had deteriorated in the safe domain and continued requiring improvement in the well led domain since our last inspection. The service met the characteristics of requires improvement in two out of the five key questions. This was the first time this service is rated as 'requires improvement.'

We found one breach of the regulations in relation to safe care and treatment because of risks to people due to inconsistencies in the management of medicines and management of some risks to people's care.

At this inspection, we found improvements were still required in how the service was managing people's medicines. Medication was administered in a kind and person-centred way however, we found inconsistencies in the administration of thickeners prescribed to manage people's swallowing difficulties and records did not always confirm time specific medication had been administered as required.

The management of risks was not always consistent. We found concerns with the support people were receiving with their moving and handling requirements. We could not be certain people who required specialist seating equipment to meet their postural and pressure relief needs were using the appropriate equipment.

There was a regular and varied programme of activities at the home and people spoke positively about the activities coordinator. However we found people, in particular those living with dementia, spent periods of time without being offered social stimulation.

The provider had several systems in place to monitor the quality of the service, but these had not always been effective in identifying or addressing the issues found at this inspection.

People and relatives spoke positively about the relationships established with staff. People's care plans were personalised, however this information was not always kept secure. We made a recommendation about respecting people's rights to dignity and privacy.

People were supported by staff who were motivated, enjoyed their job and felt well supported through regular supervisions and training.

The provider had developed several links with the community and partnerships to support care provision and service development.

Feedback from people, relatives and staff was positive and they felt the service was well-led. They told us the management team were always available to speak with and were approachable. The registered manager was responsive in addressing the issues found at this inspection and told us about plans they had to improve 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:

At our last inspection the service was rated Good (report was published on 28 October April 2016).

Why we inspected:

This inspection was part of our scheduled plan of visiting services to check the safety and quality of care people received.

Follow up:

We will continue to monitor the service to ensure that people received safe, high quality care.

Further inspections will be planned for future dates.

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 not always safe.

Details are in our Safe findings below.

Requires Improvement ●

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 not always well-led.

Details are in our Well-Led findings below.

Requires Improvement ●

Fairmount Nursing Home

Detailed findings

Background to this 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:

This inspection was conducted by one adult social care inspector and an expert by experience on the first day and one adult social care inspector on the second day. An expert by experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service. For the purpose of this inspection, that experience was in caring for people with dementia.

Service and service type:

Fairmount Nursing home is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as single package under one contractual agreement. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The service had a registered manager who had been managing the service for the last 7 months. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) 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.

Notice of inspection:

This inspection was unannounced. Inspection activity started on 24 April 2019 and ended on 25 April 2019.

What we did:

Before the inspection, we reviewed all the information we held about the service including previous inspection reports and notifications received by the CQC. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to tell us about by law. We used information the provider sent us in the Provider Information Return. This is information we require providers to send us at least once annually to

give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We used all this information to decide which areas to focus on during our inspection. We requested and received feedback from other stakeholders. These included Healthwatch Bradford, the local authority safeguarding team and commissioners of care.

During the inspection, we spoke with six people using the service and five relatives. We spent time observing care in the communal lounges and dining rooms. 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 spoke with a healthcare professional visiting the service. We spoke with thirteen staff members; this included the registered manager, human resources manager, clinical lead, procurement manager, moving and handling senior manager, nurses, chef, activities coordinator and care workers. We looked at care records for three people using the service and we reviewed four medicine administration records. We looked at training, recruitment and supervision records for three staff. We also looked at various policies and procedures and reviewed the quality assurance and monitoring systems of the service.

After the inspection, we exchanged emails with the registered manager for additional evidence and updates on the actions being taken by the provider following this inspection.

The report includes evidence and information gathered by the inspector and expert by experience. Details are in the key questions below.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm

Some aspects of the service were not always safe. There was an increased risk that people could be harmed. Regulations may or may not have been met.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- The provider was not always managing risks to people's care in a consistent way.
- There were systems in place to identify and manage risks to people's care. People had a range of risk assessments to look at different areas of their care such as their moving and handling requirements, continence, falls and nutrition. However, we could not be certain risks to people's posture and skin integrity for people using specialist seating equipment were being managed appropriately because they had not had a seating assessment. During our first inspection day, we observed that a person who had difficulties with keeping their posture and had high risk of developing pressure ulcers was not well positioned in their chair and their feet were not supported. We raised this issue with the registered manager and they immediately placed a cushion under the person's feet to offer additional support. We discussed our concerns further with the registered manager and they told us they would request advice and complete specialist seating assessments for people requiring them and had plans to organise additional training for staff.
- People were not always safely supported with their moving and handling requirements. We observed one person sat on their wheelchair without the lap belt correctly fastened. Staff quickly supported this person after we raised concerns. There had been a recent accident at the home, that was being investigated by the local safeguarding team, where a person sustained an injury following a fall from a wheelchair; they were not using their lap belt. When we reviewed the accidents and incidents log, there had been instances of accidents or near misses involving the inappropriate use of equipment. We discussed our concerns with the registered manager, they told us, and we saw evidence, that specific members of staff had completed an assessment of their competency to perform moving and handling manoeuvres and issues with manual handling had also been discussed during staff meetings.
- On our first inspection day, we observed staff using the same sling when supporting different people to move with an electrical hoist. This is not safe as people might require different size of slings and it is not in line with good infection control practices. We discussed this issue with the registered manager and on our second day, we saw this was no longer happening. During the inspection, we received confirmation from the procurement manager that all the equipment used to move people had passed the requirements for lifting equipment however this information was not readily available and the registered manager did not have list of the equipment used at the home to move people. They told us they would complete an inventory in the weeks following the inspection.
- These findings constitute a breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (regulated activities) Regulations 2014.
- The provider was managing safely the risks to people in an event of a fire. People had a personal evacuation plan and during our inspection visit, we observed staff completing a fire drill.

Using medicines safely

- At this inspection, we found inconsistency in how medicines were being managed. We observed staff administering people's medicines in a person-centred way and people told us they were satisfied with this area of their care. One person said, "I get my medicine and they stay with me while I have taken it."
- We found there was a lack of instructions for some people requiring the use of thickeners. There were no clear instructions to show how many scoops of this product staff should use when supporting two people requiring it. There was also no information in their care plans and staff gave us conflicting information. There had not been any known detrimental effects to these people's health. We discussed this issue with the registered manager and they told us they would take immediate action to contact the GP and get clarity on the prescriber's instructions and update people's care plans accordingly.
- Some people living at the home required their medication to be given at specific times. We observed the nurse were following this however, when we reviewed medication administration records (MARs) we could not be sure records were always accurate of when people add taken their medication. One person had been having difficulties and declining to take their medicines. Staff were exploring different ways to support this person to take this medicine, for example, by trying again at a later time. However, the actual time medication had been administrated was not being recorded. The nurse told us they would start recording this on people's MARs.
- Regular medicine audits were being completed and an action plan developed to address the issues found. However, these audits had not been effective in identifying some of the issues found at this inspection.
- These findings constitute a breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (regulated activities) Regulations 2014.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- At this inspection, we found the provider was open and transparent when accidents happened. The registered manager told us they had learnt from when concerns had been identified and taken action to prevent them happening again, however, we could not be certain their actions had always been effective. For example, the registered manager had provided staff with additional guidance on how to use equipment to safely move people following a serious injury of a person who did not have their lap belt fastened, but we saw the same issue during our first inspection day. When we reviewed the last accident and incident report, we saw there had been a considerable increase in incidents where people had fallen or slipped onto the floor. We discussed this with the registered manager and we were reassured that actions had been taken to manage the risks to specific people. The registered manager had completed an analysis of trends and patterns, but this did not include information that would allow them to make considerations about, for instance, reviewing staffing levels. We asked them to review and send us an updated analysis. They sent us this information and we were reassured improvements were being made in how the provider was using the information about people's accidents and incidents to prevent reoccurrence.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People told us they felt safe with the care they were receiving. One person said, "Oh yes, I feel safe here." Relatives agreed their love ones received safe care.
- Staff knew how they would identify signs of abuse and what action they would take if they had concerns about people's wellbeing. Records showed safeguarding training was delivered on a regular basis.
- We reviewed the information about recent safeguarding concerns and we were reassured the registered manager had taken appropriate action to manage these.

Staffing and recruitment

- People and relatives told us there were enough staff to provide support and our observations confirmed this. One person said, "If I need anything I just press my buzzer and they come and help." One relative commented, "I think there are enough staff, they answer the buzzer as soon as they can."

- Staff were safely recruited. The home frequently used agency staff and the manager told us the action they took to make sure they had the necessary skills and training and were aware of the needs of people living at the home. The human resources manager told of their ongoing programme of recruitment.

Preventing and controlling infection

- The provider was managing the risks of cross infection appropriately. One relative told us: "The home and the room is always clean and tidy." The provider told us they had been awarded 98.6% in an audit relating to infection control conducted by the local authority and a five star rating by the Food Standards Agency on food hygiene.

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

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

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

- People were able to walk freely between different areas of the home throughout the day. People's bedrooms were decorated in a personalised way. We noted there was no signage throughout the home to help people and visitors to access the different areas of the home, in particular to make it more accessible for people living with dementia. We discussed this with the registered manager and after the inspection they told us this was going to be discussed at a corporate level.

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

- People gave positive feedback about the quality of the food and drinks available to them. Comments included, "The food is nice here and there is enough", "Food is lovely" and "I get drinks when I want them, and the homemade cakes are so nice, I would recommend it here to anyone." Relatives told us staff were supporting their loved ones appropriately with their meals. One relative said, "The staff will cut up meats for [person] that may prove difficult for [person]. There is a choice of two main courses, but if [person] doesn't like either then they will make something else, maybe an omelette or something easy." Our conversations with the chef and observations confirmed this was happening. The kitchen area was well organised and clean and there was information available summarising people's specific needs and preferences.
- We observed people being supported to have their meals in an appropriate way. The mealtime experience was relaxed. We discussed with the registered manager the number of people who were having their meals in their bedrooms and the size of the dining area not allowing for all residents to have a meal at the same time. They told us people had a choice on where to have their meals and alternative arrangements could be made if more people chose to go to the dining area. The home catered for people who required specific meals due to their health conditions such as diabetic diets.
- People who were nutritionally at risk had been referred to appropriate professionals and support was in place.

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. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, whether any restrictions on people's liberty had been authorised and whether any conditions on such authorisations were being met.

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. The application procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are

called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). At this inspection, we saw the provider was compliant with DoLS procedures however, when these had been authorised, the provider had not submitted the necessary statutory notifications. We discussed this with the registered manager and advised them to review the guidance; they told us they would submit these notifications.

- At this inspection, we saw the provider was working within the principles of the MCA and staff were aware of how to apply this as part of the day to day delivery of care.
- We asked people if they were able to make decisions and if staff respected them and people responded positively. One person said, "I would highly recommend this place to anyone, they are always pleasant and when I ask for something I get it."

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

- The provider was assessing people's physical, mental health and social needs, and their care and support was planned through the development of a care plan. Staff demonstrated they knew people's preferences.
- People's needs in relation to the protected characteristics under the Equalities Act 2010, were considered in the planning of their care. We saw care and support was delivered in a non-discriminatory way and respected people's individual, diverse needs. People's communication requirements were included in their care plans. The registered manager told us how some people whose first language was not English, had the option to speak with staff who also spoke their native language.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People and relatives told us staff had the appropriate skills and knowledge to provide appropriate care.
- Records we reviewed and our conversations with staff confirmed new members of staff had been through an induction period where they had completed relevant training and shadowed experienced care workers.
- There was a regular programme of training for staff; we reviewed the training matrix and staff files and we saw training was up to date.
- People were assisted by staff who had been supported through regular supervision. Staff told us their supervision meetings were supportive and they were able to discuss issues that were relevant to their roles.

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

- The records reviewed confirmed referrals had been made when necessary and the provider maintained regular contact with relevant services such as the GPs, social workers and the physiotherapists. Our conversation with a visiting healthcare professional confirmed staff were making referrals in a timely way and followed professional advice.

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

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

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People told us they felt respected and staff treated them well. One person said, "The staff are very nice, they are pleasant and smiling and helpful, I'm happy here."
- During this inspection, we observed staff interacting with people in a respectful manner and encouraging them to be as independent as possible. One person was doing morning exercises in the communal area and the registered manager and staff praised them for their workout. We observed a person informing a staff member that they wanted to get support with their morning routine; the staff member was caring for another person but gave verbal reassurance that they would call another member of staff to support and we saw them doing it.
- However, during this inspection, we also noted some instances where people's rights to privacy and dignity were not always respected. We observed staff did not protect a person's privacy while performing manual handling and their underwear was showing. Staff acted quickly when this issue was raised. We discussed this with the registered manager; they told us they would speak with staff about the standards of care they expected. When we reviewed the provider's recent quality survey to residents, families, friends and advocates we saw this issue had been previously raised. One comment read: "the hoisting of female residents in dresses is not at all discreet, perhaps a modestly blanket could be used or more suggestions to relatives to provide clothing that takes this into consideration."
- During this inspection, we observed on three separate occasions, people's records not being kept secure. We raised this issue with the registered manager after every time that we saw this was happening and immediate action was not taken. After our inspection, the registered manager told us they had fitted a padlock in the cabinet where people's records were kept. We recommend that the service seek advice and guidance from a reputable source about always respecting people's rights to dignity and privacy.

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

- People and relatives shared positive feedback about the relationships they had established with staff. One person told us, "The carers are very caring and they will come and have a chat with me when they have time" and "They [staff] are marvellous and have helped me so much." One relative said, "There is always a pleasant relaxed atmosphere, people are friendly. I would recommend this home to anyone."
- We saw plans of care had information about people's personal history, their likes and dislikes, interests and hobbies and this was used in the delivery of care. For example, the home had made arrangements to support a person to continue to care for their pet, with the support from staff, while living at the home. The registered manager told us how they balanced this person's wishes with their responsibilities to maintain good hygiene and infection control.

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

- People and relatives told us they were involved in decisions about the care delivered by the provider. When we checked people's records, we confirmed regular reviews were taking place. However, records did not always show how people and relatives had been involved.
- The provider organised regular resident meetings where people were able to discuss the running of the home and the registered manager informed them of news and changes, such as introducing new staff members and activities planned.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

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

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

- There was a regular and varied programme of activities at the home and people spoke positively about the activities coordinator. However, we found people's records did not always evidence they were being offered regular activities. We found people, in particular those living with dementia, spent frequent periods of time without being offered social stimulation. For example, during the morning of our second inspection day, we observed some people in the communal lounge not being offered activities; most people were living with dementia. We asked the activities coordinator why they were not providing activities at this time and they told us they were completing paperwork. We discussed this with the registered manager who said they would have expected activities to be happening at that time. During the inspection, the registered manager showed us a set of sensory objects that were available at the home to promote interaction and stimulation, in particular of people living with dementia. This was placed in the communal areas and we saw staff using it with people. After the inspection, the registered manager told us they had spoken with staff to ensure accurate recording of activities offered is completed.
- Activities developed at the home included, pet therapy, quizzes and one to one support. People shared positive feedback about the one to one support provided. The activities coordinator told us about their plans to further develop their activity programme; for example, they were planning to build a wheelchair accessible garden. They said, "Once a month the residents [people] will be planting and growing herbs and will choose a meal to use them." During our inspection, we saw the home had organised a birthday party for one person while their family were present. The management of the home also told us people could access other facilities available situated within the complex; for example, sport and fitness activities and social events.
- People's care plans were detailed, individualised and reviewed regularly. This provided staff with the required up to date guidance to care and support for people who used the service.
- The home was meeting the requirements of the Accessible Information Standard (AIS); this is a framework put in place from August 2016 making it a legal requirement for all providers to ensure people with a disability or sensory loss can access and understand information they are given. The registered manager told us how they made available minutes of resident's meetings in regular and large print. The registered manager described how they supported a person with communication difficulties by using a book with pictures and liaising with the speech and language therapist.

End of life care and support

- The provider was caring for people who required end of life care and the registered manager told us they had been given a nationally recognised award in caring for people requiring this specialised care. People who required care at the end of their lives had a dedicated care plan which highlighted some of their preferences and some people also had a specific care plan for any anticipatory drugs prescribed. When we reviewed the plan for one person, we noted this did not show evidence of conversations between staff, the

person and their relatives to discuss specific wishes. We discussed this with the registered manager who assured us these conversations had taken place, but had not been recorded; after the inspection they told us this had been completed.

- Staff had received end of life care training and told us how they would appropriately support people at the end of their lives, and their relatives. We saw the registered manager had established close working relationships with relevant healthcare professionals providing this specialised care. The home had received a nationally recognised awarded on providing palliative care.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- People and relatives told us if they had any concerns they would not hesitate to discuss them with care staff or management and were confident their concerns would be addressed. One relative told us, "I have only complained once, it was just a misunderstanding and was dealt with, [registered manager] is very approachable."

- We reviewed complaints received by the service and these had been managed appropriately.

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

Service management was inconsistent. Leaders and the culture they created did not always support the delivery of high-quality, person-centred care. Some regulations may or may not have been met.

Continuous learning and improving care

- At our last inspection, on 28 October 2016 we saw the quality assurance system had not been fully effective in identifying issues with medicines' administration and recording and we recommended for medicine audits be reintroduced. At this inspection, we saw the provider was completing regular audits on medication and the findings were transferred into an action plan. However, we continued to find some issues in relation to medicines management. We also identified improvements were required in the management of risks to people, recording of activities and consistency in respecting people's dignity and keeping their information secure.
- A variety of regular audits and quality monitoring were taking place. However, these had not always been effective in identifying some of the issues we raised during this inspection, such as issues with moving and handling. Some of the audits conducted by the provider had also not always been effective in driving the necessary improvements because some of the issues already identified in their internal audits, were again found at this inspection. For example, the provider's internal audit on February 2019 identified issues with the lack of recording of activities; we found the same at this inspection. The provider's medication audit in March 2019 had identified an issue with "as directed" labels on creams; at this inspection, we found the same was happening with thickeners.
- The registered manager was responsive in addressing the issues found at this inspection and after our inspection, sent us an action plan to address the implement the necessary improvements. We will follow this up at our next inspection.

Planning and promoting person-centred, high-quality care and support with openness; and how the provider understands and acts on their duty of candour responsibility; Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- People, relatives and staff were positive about the management team and registered manager. "One relative said, "[Name of registered manager] is very approachable". One staff member said, "I really like [registered manager]."
- People and relatives told us they recommended the service to others in need of care.
- Staff told us they enjoyed their jobs and told us the team worked well. Comments included, "I really enjoy my job, I would not change it for anything, I feel it is rewarding and makes me feel good."
- The provider had not ensured notifications had been submitted when DoLS had been authorised. Registered providers of health and social care services are required by law to notify CQC of significant events that happen in their services. We discussed this issue with the registered manager and they told us they would submit these immediately and review the guidance on statutory notifications.
- Under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) (Amendment) Regulations 2015,

registered providers have a legal duty to display the ratings of CQC inspections prominently in both the office and on their websites. On our arrival at the home we saw the ratings from last inspection were clearly displayed.

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

- We saw evidence of people's views being sought through resident meetings. These were also attended by the nominated individual and minutes evidenced relevant conversations about the running of the home and improvements being implemented or planned.
- Staff told us team meetings were regular and meaningful, so they could be kept updated of any changes at the service.

Working in partnership with others

- The management team and staff worked with other professionals to ensure the care and support they provided was proactive. Records that we reviewed confirmed this. One visiting healthcare professional told us how they felt very welcome when visiting the home and staff were always available to discuss people's needs. They added the management team showed genuine interest in people's needs.
- The provider told us how they worked with other organisations to improve the quality of the care delivered and opportunities to people, such as the local university and an organisation developing adapted sport.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows where regulations were not being met and we have asked the provider to send us a report that says what action they are going to take. We will check that this action is taken by the provider.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care	Regulation 12 HSCA RA Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment During this inspection, we found inconsistencies in the management of medicines and management of some risks to people's care.