

Caring Homes Healthcare Group Limited

Moorlands Nursing Home

Inspection report

Macdonald Road
Lightwater
Surrey
GU18 5US
Tel: 01276473140
Website: www.caringhomes.org

Date of inspection visit: 30 January 2015
Date of publication: 19/06/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires improvement



Is the service safe?

Requires improvement



Is the service effective?

Requires improvement



Is the service responsive?

Requires improvement



Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 17 December 2014. Breaches of legal requirements were found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to staffing and the care and welfare of people.

We undertook this focused inspection on the 30 January 2015 to check that the provider had followed their plan and to confirm that they have now met legal requirements. This report covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Moorlands Nursing Home on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

At the time of inspection there was no registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission 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 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

Risk assessments for people had been reviewed and a plan for staff on how to reduce the risk was included in each person's care plan.

Summary of findings

People were being weighed regularly and where had a concern had been identified advice was being sought from health care professionals. Staff were recording the advice from the health care professionals and providing the most appropriate care to people.

Care plans had been completely re-written and reviews of care had been undertaken for the remaining eight that still needed to be done. Care plans detailed information people's social and medical history, the person's preferences and any identified risks. Staff understood people's individual needs.

Staff had been re-deployed around the service and people were now getting their care in a timely way. People were being turned in bed by staff at regular intervals to reduce the risk of pressure sores and people received their medicines on time every day. People were able to get up and go to bed when they wanted.

A health care professional said that staff were happier and that the atmosphere in the service was a lot calmer. We found this to be the case on this inspection.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

We found that action had been taken to improve the safety of people living at the service.

There were sufficient numbers of qualified and skilled staff at the service to meet people's needs.

People received their medicines in a timely way. People's risk assessments were up to date

Requires improvement



Is the service effective?

We found that action had been taken to improve the effectiveness of care for people living at the service.

People's weight and nutrition was being monitored and where people had lost weight, advice had been sought from healthcare services to support them to maintain good health.

Requires improvement



Is the service responsive?

We found that action had been taken to improve the responsiveness of care for people living at the service.

People's care was being regularly assessed and reviewed to ensure their needs could be met.

Requires improvement



Moorlands Nursing Home

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of Moorlands Nursing Home on 30 January 2015. This inspection was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 17 December 2014 inspection had been made. The team inspected the service against three of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe, effective and responsive to people's needs. This is because the service was not meeting some legal requirements. Moorlands

Nursing Home provides residential and nursing care for up to 41 older people some of whom were living with dementia. At the time of our inspection there were 33 people at the service.

The inspection was undertaken by two inspectors. During our inspection we spoke with two people who used the service, three relatives of people who used the service, four members of staff and one health care professional. We looked at four care plans and risk assessments, weight charts for everyone at the service, minutes of the last staff meeting in December 2014 and the latest quality assurance report provided by Surrey County Council.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At the previous inspection on 17 December 2014 the service was in breach of regulation 9 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010. Risk assessments that should have been updated monthly were not being reviewed consistently.

When we returned on this inspection, records showed where a risk had been identified, these had been reviewed. Where people were at risk of falling there were up to date moving and handling assessments to guide staff on how to provide the most appropriate care. This included the type

of equipment that was needed to assist people to move including slide sheets and hoists. It was identified that one person should always have two members of staff to assist them to transfer. We saw that this happened on the day of the inspection. Other risk assessments included people's nutrition, bed rails and personal hygiene. One person was at risk of losing weight and it was identified that a member of staff should support them during all meal times. Staff supported this person during lunchtime to eat their meal. One relative said "I feel confident that she (mother) is safe here, I see staff support people during meal times." The service is no longer breaching this regulation.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At the previous inspection on the 17 December 2014 the service was in breach of regulation 9 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010. People were not always getting the correct care that met their needs. People were not being weighed consistently. One person who was at a high risk of malnutrition needed to be weighed weekly but had not been weighed for four weeks. This person had lost weight but there were no records to show that a referral had been made to the appropriate health professionals, such as a dietician, to gain advice.

On this inspection the interim manager told us that this person had been referred to the GP and that guidance had

been provided to staff to support this person's food and drink intake. This person had been weighed weekly since our last inspection. The interim manager explained that each person at the service had been categorised as needing either weekly, twice monthly or monthly weighing. Individual staff were allocated people that they needed to weigh. Weights were recorded on charts and these were up to date. The interim manager reminded staff during meetings of their responsibilities in relation to completing the weight charts and recording any advice that they had sought from health care professionals. Staff understood the need to do this and that they needed to seek advice if they had any concerns about a person's weight. The service is no longer breaching this regulation.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At the previous inspection on 17 December 2014 the service was in breach of regulation 9 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010. Care plans were inconsistently completed. Where people had expressed a specific time to get up in the morning this was not always done.

On this inspection most of the care plans had been completely re-written and reviews of care had been undertaken for the eight that still needed to be done. The care plans included detailed information about the person's social and medical history, the person's preferences and any identified risks. The care plans detailed what staff needed to do for the person. Staff had knowledge of people's individual needs. One relative told us that their mother had settled in to the service well and had commented that she was content. They told us that nothing was too much trouble for the staff and that they really understood their mother's needs. They said "They (staff) do anything that mum needs."

A member of staff said that the person who needed a special cushion for their wheelchair had now been provided it. We saw that the cushion was being used. They said they had spoken to the Tissue Viability Nurse to gain advice about the most appropriate cushion to get. As a result of this the person had been able to get out of bed more regularly and their pressure sore had improved. The service is no longer breaching this regulation.

At the previous inspection on 17 December 2014 the service was in breach of regulation 22 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010. There were not enough suitably skilled staff to meet people's needs and this impacted on the care people received. Some people did not receive personal care until approximately 13.00 due to the shortage of staff. Those that needed support to eat in their rooms were not getting this in a timely way. One person needed support from staff to take a ten minute walk each day which had been. One relative told us that her family member had to stay in bed as there was not an appropriate cushion for this person's wheelchair to reduce the risk of developing pressure sores. The advice of a Tissue Viability Nurse had not been obtained in relation

to the correct type of cushion to buy. Turning charts for people cared for in bed were not completed consistently. recommended by the physiotherapist which the member of staff said was not happening.

On this inspection we were told by the interim manager that although the staffing ratio had not increased, due to the re-deployment of staff, people were now getting their care in a timely way. They told us that the staff had been split into three groups, including nurses, with an equal split of people who required a hoist to move them. They said that for those people who liked to get up early the night staff would do this which meant there were less people for the morning staff to get out of bed. They said "Staff are allocated better, it is not perfect but it is improving." When we arrived at the inspection at 9.25 there were already five people up in the living rooms. Some people were sitting having breakfast in their rooms and some were being provided personal care by staff. By late morning all of the people in the service that wanted to had been supported to get out of bed. The interim manager told us that those people who needed support to eat in their rooms would receive this first before the meal was served in the dining room. We saw that this was the case on the day of the inspection. People were being turned in bed by staff at regular intervals to reduce the risk of pressure sores and people received their medicines on time every day.

One member of staff told us "Things have started to be better, the manager gave me some confidence, she (the interim manager) changed the routines of staff and I've now got some free time to spend with people." They explained that the person who required a daily walk (when they wanted) was now having this as one member of staff had been allocated to do this. They said that the call bells were hardly going off now. They said "I want to see changes; it's all about team work." People were now being transferred into armchairs instead of staying in their wheelchairs unless they preferred not to and we observed this on the day. One relative told us that they felt there were enough staff to meet people's needs. They said "We are impressed with the home."

The interim manager said that where there were shortages in staff due to sickness, care staff were borrowed from a local sister home. The health care professional that we contacted told us that they observed the staff from another service being given a full handover, shown around the building and introduced to people with complex care

Is the service responsive?

needs. They told us that they had visited frequently over recent weeks and had noted that people had been provided personal care in the mornings in a timely way.

They said that staff were happier and that the atmosphere in the service was a lot calmer. We found this to be the case on this inspection. The service is no longer breaching this regulation.