

St. Georges Court Healthcare Limited

St Georges Court Care Centre

Inspection report

Russell Street
Cambridge
Cambridgeshire
CB2 1HT

Tel: 01223712135

Date of inspection visit:
09 December 2016

Date of publication:
07 February 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Inspected but not rated

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 14 September 2015 and rated the service as good in all areas. After that inspection we received concerns in relation to people's safety. As a result we undertook a focused inspection to look into those concerns. This report only covers our findings in relation to this topic. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for St George's Court Care Centre on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

This unannounced inspection took place on 9 December 2016.

Although appropriate action had been taken when any safeguarding concerns had been raised these had not always been reported to the Commission as required.

There was a staffing tool in place to calculate how many staff were needed to meet people's needs. The staffing levels were sufficient to meet people's basic needs. Extra staffing was sometimes required to support people when they displayed behaviour that challenged others. The registered manager had arranged for the extra staffing to be in place. The staff were not always aware of where people were and this could place them at risk.

Staff had access to personal protective equipment. This helped to decrease the risk of the spread of infection. People's air mattress were regularly checked to ensure they were set at the appropriate levels to prevent them developing pressure sores.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Staffing levels were sufficient to meet people's needs. When needed staffing levels were increased to offer people extra support. Staff were not always aware where people were and this could have placed them at risk of harm.

Action had been taken to prevent the spread of infections.

Inspected but not rated

St Georges Court Care Centre

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this unannounced focussed inspection in response to concerns that were raised with the Commission. The concerns mainly related to people's safety.

This inspection took place on 09 December 2016 and was unannounced. The inspection was carried out by one inspector and one inspection manager.

Before we carried out this inspection we reviewed the information we held about this service. We looked at notifications. A notification is information about events that the registered persons are required, by law, to tell us about.□

During our inspection we spoke with the registered manager, two nurses and three people who used the service. We looked at the care records for three people. We also looked at records that related to health and safety such as accidents and incidents.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

We found from looking at people's records that not all allegations of harm had been reported to the Care Quality Commission (CQC). The registered manager had reported concerns to the local safeguarding team and when needed the appropriate action had been taken. However, CQC had not always been notified of each safeguarding concern.

We received a concern before the inspection about people's needs not being met at night due to the number of staff available. The registered manager stated that the staffing levels were calculated according to people's assessed needs. There was a dependency assessment in place for each person and these had been regularly reviewed to ensure that they were an accurate reflection of their needs. Staff told us that they were offered extra shifts to cover any staffing shortages but did not feel pressured into working them if they did not want to. The registered manager told us that when necessary they used agency staff to ensure they were enough staff working in the home to meet people's needs. Staff allocation sheets were completed at the beginning of each shift for each floor so that staff knew where they were working and whom they were responsible for.

People living at St Georges Court Care Centre told us that there was normally enough staff available when they needed them. One person told us, "About two weeks ago I had to wait about 20 minutes to go to the toilet, it was a relief when I got taken. But that's once in a blue moon that I have to wait that long. If I need help at night I ring the bell and they come." Another person stated (when we asked them if staff were available when they needed them), "I've got no complaints at all." We saw that records had been completed to ensure that people's care and support needs were checked during the night as required.

The staff opinions varied about the staffing levels. The majority of the staff told us that the levels were normally sufficient apart from when people needed extra support. For example, one person had displayed behaviour that challenged the staff and other people living in the home. We discussed this with the manager at the time of the inspection and they stated that when this had occurred extra staff had been allocated so that they could work on a one to one basis with the person. We looked at the person's records and saw that although the number of instances had decreased they had recently displayed behaviour that challenged others and the one to one staffing was no longer in place. The registered manager had made referrals to the appropriate health care professionals to request additional support for the person and staff.

During the inspection the person who had displayed behaviour that challenged others was seen to be in a communal area and no staff were present. We raised our concern with the registered manager that this could place other people and the person at risk of harm if they displayed behaviour that challenged others. After the inspection we received notifications that there had been more instances of the person displaying behaviour that challenged others. The registered manager stated that the staffing levels had been increased to ensure that the person's support needs were met and other people were not being put at risk. During the inspection we found that when staff were busy they were not always aware of where people were. On the middle floor we saw one person had accessed a staff office and was looking through the shelves. We saw that there were items that could have been dangerous to their health in the office and a nearby unlocked

medication trolley which contained creams and lotions. There must be sufficient staff at all times so that people are not placed at risk of harm.

Staff confirmed that they had access to personal protective equipment (PPE) such as gloves and aprons when they needed it. The registered manager also provided invoices showing that PPE was ordered regularly and made available to all of the staff.

Where people used air mattresses to prevent pressure sore occurring we saw that they had been regularly checked to ensure that they were at the correct setting for their weight. This information was also recorded in people's records so that staff could refer to it if needed.

We noticed during the inspection that the medication trolley on the top floor created a very loud and unpleasant noise on the floor below when it was moved. The registered manager stated that she was aware of the problem and had recently ordered a new trolley so that it would no longer be a problem. Prior to the inspection a concern was raised regarding medication administration errors. The records showed that when there had been any errors they had been dealt with appropriately.