

Parkside (St.Helens) Limited

Parkside (St Helens) Limited

Inspection report

Parkside Care Home
280 Prescott Road
St Helens
Merseyside
WA10 3AB

Tel: 01744452160

Date of inspection visit:
03 December 2020
07 December 2020

Date of publication:
19 January 2021

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Parkside (St Helens) Limited is a residential care home providing personal care and accommodation for up to 30 people aged 65 and over in one adapted building. There were 22 people living at the home at the time of this inspection.

People's experience of using this service and what we found

There were enough staff available to meet people's needs. People told us there were enough staff to help them when needed. One person said, "Staff come quickly if I need them." There was a high proportion of agency staff on duty on the first day of our inspection as many regular staff were absent due to unplanned sickness. Records showed people still received the care and support they needed. Regular staff with good knowledge of the home and the people living there had returned to work by the second day of our inspection.

Some parts of the home were not clean on the first day of our inspection. However, the situation had changed on the second day of the inspection as regular staff, including a cleaner, returned to work and the home was clean throughout. We observed staff following good infection prevention and control practice, such as safe donning, doffing and disposal of personal protective equipment (PPE). People had been supported to self-isolate in their rooms as and when required. The home had a regular testing programme in place for both staff and people living at the home.

People told us they felt safe living at the home. One person commented, "Oh I'm very safe here. I've got to know the staff quite well. They're very kind and caring." Staff had received safeguarding training and were knowledgeable about their role in recognising and reporting safeguarding concerns.

Although the registered provider had sufficient oversight of the home, we found communication with key stakeholders was sometimes inconsistent. We have made a recommendation to help review and improve contingency planning at the home.

Staff had a positive, committed and caring attitude. Regular staff were knowledgeable about the people they were supporting and spoke fondly about them. People told us staff listened to them and they were approachable. One person said, "Yes I can say if I'm unhappy, staff listen to me. I've been here a long time and I'm very happy here." There were systems in place to gather feedback from people living at the home and their relatives.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection

The last rating for this service was good (published 16 January 2019).

Why we inspected

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. This inspection began as a targeted inspection looking at the IPC practices the provider had in place. In light of our findings the inspection was extended to a focused inspection to review the key questions of safe and well-led.

We reviewed the information we held about the service. No areas of concern were identified in the other key questions. We therefore did not inspect them. Ratings from previous comprehensive inspections for those key questions were used in calculating the overall rating at this inspection.

The overall rating for the service has remained good. This is based on the findings at this inspection.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Parkside (St Helens) Limited on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Good ●

The service was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

Details are in our well-Led findings below.

Parkside (St Helens) Limited

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The 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. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

Inspection team

This inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Service and service type

Parkside (St Helens) Limited 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 manager registered with CQC. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before the inspection

We checked the information that we held about the service. This included statutory notifications sent to us by the provider about incidents and events that had occurred at the service. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law. We also gathered feedback about the service from the local authority. The provider was not asked to complete a provider information return prior to this inspection. This is information we require providers to send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We took this into account when we inspected the service and made the judgements in this report. We used all this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We spoke with four people who lived at the service about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with 10 members of staff including the provider, deputy manager, carers, agency carers and other staff.

We reviewed a range of records. This included five people's care records and multiple medication records. We looked at three staff files in relation to recruitment and staff supervision. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including quality assurance records were reviewed.

After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found. We looked at various documentation including health and safety records and policies and procedures.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

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

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Preventing and controlling infection

- Infection control practices were implemented within the home. The home had a regular testing programme in place for both staff and people living at the home. On the first day of the inspection the home did not have a cleaner on duty due to unplanned absence. Some parts of the home were not clean. For example, donning and doffing areas were unclean and untidy. However, the situation had changed on the second day of the inspection as regular staff, including a cleaner, returned to work and the home was clean throughout.
- The home had designated areas for donning and doffing personal protective equipment (PPE) and staff had access to all the required PPE. We observed staff donning, doffing and disposing of PPE in line with best practice.
- People had been supported to self-isolate in their rooms as and when required.
- Staff had received training on infection prevention and control practice and the use of PPE.

Staffing and recruitment

- There were enough staff available to meet people's needs. People told us there were enough staff to help them when needed. Comments included, "Staff come quickly if I need them" and "I press the buzzer if I need help, they normally come very quickly."
- There was a high proportion of agency staff on duty on the first day of our inspection as many regular staff were absent. Records showed that people still received the care and support they needed. The situation had changed significantly on the second day of the inspection as regular staff with good knowledge of the home and people living there returned to work.
- Staff responded to people's call bells promptly throughout our inspection and carried out regular wellbeing checks on people who were self-isolating in their rooms.
- Staffing levels were monitored, reviewed and amended when needed by the provider.
- Staff were safely recruited. Appropriate checks were carried out to ensure new staff were suitable to work with vulnerable adults.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People were safeguarded from the risk of abuse. People told us they felt safe living at the home. Comments included, "Oh yes, I do feel safe, I know the staff" and "Oh I'm very safe here. I've got to know the staff quite well. They're very kind and caring."
- Staff had received safeguarding training and were knowledgeable about their role in recognising and reporting safeguarding concerns.
- The provider had systems to manage safeguarding concerns and information and guidance about how to raise safeguarding concerns was accessible throughout the home.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risks to people, were assessed, monitored and managed.
- The environment was well-maintained and regular safety checks had been carried out on utilities and equipment.
- Fire safety was effectively managed at the home. We found some fire exits partially obstructed by moving and handling equipment but this was relocated immediately by staff.
- People had personalised risk assessments which were reviewed regularly and gave staff the information needed to manage the risks associated with people's care.

Using medicines safely

- Medicines were safely administered, stored and recorded by staff who had the required knowledge and skills.
- The provider had systems and checks to ensure the safety and quality of medicines administration was maintained.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Accidents and incidents were appropriately monitored and managed by staff at the home.
- There were systems in place to review this information to ensure appropriate action was taken in response to any accidents and incidents.
- Relevant policies and procedures were in place to help guide staff.

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.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements; Working in partnership with others

- CQC had been notified of significant events which had occurred, in line with the provider's legal obligations. However, we identified one incident which had significantly impacted upon service delivery and the provider had not notified CQC of this.
- There could have been more effective communication between the provider and other organisations, such as the local authority and CQC, regarding the challenges the home was experiencing at the time of the inspection visit.

We recommend the provider reviews and improves systems and processes to ensure effective and consistent contingency planning at the home.

- Ratings from the last CQC inspection were clearly displayed within the home, as required.
- There was a range of regularly reviewed policies and procedures in place to help guide staff.
- Records showed that staff worked well with other health and social care professionals to ensure people's health and wellbeing was maintained.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people; and how the provider understands and acts on their duty of candour responsibility

- There was a high proportion of agency staff on duty on the first day of our inspection as many regular staff were absent due to unplanned absence. Agency staff lacked in-depth knowledge of the home and the people living there. However, several regular staff had returned to work by the second day of our inspection and we saw they had a positive, committed and caring attitude.
- Regular staff were knowledgeable about the people they were supporting and spoke fondly about them.
- During the second day of the inspection the deputy manager demonstrated good leadership in what were challenging circumstances for both staff and people living at the home.
- The registered provider understood their responsibilities regarding the duty of candour and staff were supported to maintain openness and transparency within the home.

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

- People told us staff listened to them and they were approachable. One person said, "Yes I can say if I'm unhappy, staff listen to me. I've been here a long time and I'm very happy here."

- There were systems in place to gather feedback from people living at the home and their relatives. For example, staff completed a 'resident of the day' review on a monthly basis which involved asking people for their feedback on various aspects of their experience at the home.
- Records showed staff had supported people to keep in touch with their loved ones throughout the pandemic and staff had kept relatives updated on people's health and wellbeing.

Continuous learning and improving care

- The provider had systems in place to monitor, assess and improve the quality and safety of service being provided.
- Records relating to quality monitoring were clear and well-maintained.
- The provider had an improvement plan in place to help continuously improve the quality of care being provided at the home.