

Healthmade Limited

Royal Court Care Home

Inspection report

22 Royal Court
Hoyland
Barnsley
South Yorkshire
S74 9RP

Tel: 01226741986

Date of inspection visit:
25 January 2021

Date of publication:
02 March 2021

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Inspected but not rated
---------------------------------	-------------------------

Is the service safe?	Inspected but not rated
----------------------	-------------------------

Is the service well-led?	Inspected but not rated
--------------------------	-------------------------

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Royal Court is a care home providing accommodation and personal care to older people, some of whom are living with dementia. The service can support up to 40 people in one building. At the time of this inspection there were nine people living at Royal Court.

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

Since we last inspected the service the manager had left. Temporary management arrangements had been put in place by the provider to help maintain the running of the service, as well as address areas of concern. The service was temporarily being run by a regional manager and an interim manager, who were experienced and skilled at supporting services to improve.

Following the last inspection, improvements had been made to the governance and quality assurance systems. Internal audits had been completed and action plans had been developed to support the home to make necessary improvements. The provider had also acted on feedback from external healthcare professionals. However, the provider's governance and quality assurance systems need to be embedded to evidence their effectiveness as well as demonstrate clear oversight and scrutiny of the service, so continuous improvements are made and sustained.

The design and layout of the premises did not meet the needs of people living with dementia. The provider had started a programme of refurbishment to improve the premises, but aspects of the environment still did not support safe infection control measures at the time of this inspection. Further work was required to make the premises fit for purpose in line with statutory requirements and to reflect national best practice guidance for people who are living with dementia.

The infection prevention and control (IPC) systems had improved since our last inspection. Prominent and clear IPC signs reminded everyone at the point of entry and throughout the home about procedures for infection control. The home was accessing regular COVID-19 testing, which had assisted them to identify an outbreak of COVID-19. Risks in relation to visitors had been assessed and action taken to minimise risks. Staff were seen wearing PPE correctly and management carried out checks to ensure this was maintained. However, we found the systems used by the provider to monitor IPC practices needed to be further embedded and sustained over time, to ensure the IPC system remained safe.

We received positive feedback about the service from relatives who said care met individual needs and they said they felt involved in decision making regarding their relative's care. Staff demonstrated a strong sense of personal responsibility regarding the future of 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 and update

The last rating for this service was inadequate (published 5 December 2020) and there were three breaches of regulation.

Why we inspected

We undertook this inspection for two reasons. Firstly, this inspection was part of CQC's response to care homes with outbreaks of coronavirus. When a care home experiences a widespread outbreak of coronavirus, CQC conducts a review to ensure the Infection Prevention and Control practice was safe and the service was compliant with IPC measures. Secondly, on 8 December 2020 there was a change in ownership of Healthmade Limited who are the registered provider of Royal Court Care Home. The new directors of Healthmade Limited had completed an action plan to show what they would do and by when to improve the service. A decision was made to inspect the service to check whether improvements were being made to the service.

This inspection was a targeted inspection. CQC have introduced targeted inspections to follow up on breaches of regulation or to check specific concerns. They do not look at an entire key question, only the part of the key question we are specifically concerned about.

Targeted inspections do not change the rating from the previous inspection. This is because they do not assess all areas of a key question. Therefore, the overall rating for the service has not changed following this targeted inspection. The service remains rated inadequate overall.

At this inspection we found some improvements had been made to the service's IPC system and the provider's governance systems, however further improvements were still needed.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection and our last focussed inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Royal Court Care Home on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Follow up

We will work alongside the provider and local authority to monitor progress. We will return to visit as per our re-inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

Special Measures

The overall rating for this service is 'Inadequate' and the service is therefore in 'special measures.' This means we will keep the service under review, and we will re-inspect within 6 months to check for significant improvements.

If the provider has not made enough improvement within this timeframe. And there is still a rating of inadequate for any key question or overall rating, we will take action in line with our enforcement procedures. This will usually lead to cancellation of their registration or to varying the conditions of their registration.

For adult social care services, the maximum time for being in special measures will usually be no more than 12 months. If the service has demonstrated improvements when we next inspect it and it is no longer rated as inadequate in any of the five key questions, it will no longer be in special measures.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

At our last inspection we rated this key question inadequate. We have not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we only looked at the parts of this key question, we had specific concerns about at the last inspection.□

Inspected but not rated

Is the service well-led?

At our last inspection we rated this key question Inadequate. We have not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we only looked at the parts of this key question, we had specific concerns about at the last inspection.□

Inspected but not rated

Royal Court Care Home

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The 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 the Infection Prevention and Control practice was safe and the service was compliant with IPC measures. This was a targeted inspection looking at the IPC practices the provider has in place. We also looked at specific concerns we had about the provider's governance and quality assurance systems.

Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by two inspectors.

Service and service type

Royal Court is a 'care home.' People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The service did not have a manager registered with CQC. An interim manager was in place whilst the provider recruited a permanent manager.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. 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.

During the inspection

We spoke with three people who lived at the home and ten members of staff including the regional manager, the interim manager, two senior carer assistants, four care assistants and two kitchen assistants. We spoke with three relatives over the telephone. We observed people being supported in communal rooms and we looked around the home.

After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found.

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 inadequate. This meant people were not safe and were at risk of avoidable harm. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we have only looked at the part of the key question, we had specific concerns about. We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

Preventing and controlling 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 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.
- We were somewhat assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises. Some areas of the building were not well maintained and therefore were unable to be effectively cleaned. The provider confirmed they planned to refurbish these areas.

Although we found the provider had made improvements to the IPC system since the last inspection, further refurbishment of the premises is needed, to ensure IPC practices are safe. We need to see the improvements made to the IPC system embedded and sustained over a longer period of time.

We have also signposted the provider to resources to develop their approach.

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 inadequate. This meant there were widespread and significant shortfalls in service leadership. Leaders and the culture they created did not assure the delivery of high-quality care. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we have only looked at the part of the key question, we had concerns about. We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- Since we last inspected the service the manager had left, and temporary management arrangements were put in place by the provider to help maintain the running of the service, as well as address areas of concern. The service was run by a regional manager and an interim manager who were experienced and skilled at supporting services to improve.
- Governance systems to assess, monitor and improve the service had been implemented. However, these had not yet been embedded to evidence their effectiveness as well as demonstrate clear oversight and scrutiny of the service so that continuous improvement is made and sustained.
- An action plan, showing the areas of improvement that were required, had been drawn up by the interim manager. Whilst some recent improvements had started to be made, further progress was required over a longer period of time, to ensure all necessary actions were completed.
- Staff spoke positively about the way the service was managed. For example, one person said, "They [provider] are making big changes to improve the service. For example, we're getting new furniture and carpets. Everything is going to be redecorated and they are involving the residents in this process it's a big change for everyone."