

The Cedars (Weston) Limited

Cedars (The)

Inspection report

8 Clevedon Road
Weston Super Mare
Somerset
BS23 1DG

Tel: 01934629773

Date of inspection visit:
17 August 2017

Date of publication:
26 September 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

The Cedars provides accommodation and personal care for up to 28 older people including people living with dementia.

The inspection took place on 17 August 2017 and was unannounced. This was a focussed inspection to look at issues arising from information of concern received by CQC.

The last comprehensive inspection of the service took place in October 2016. At that inspection we rated the service overall as 'Requires Improvement'. As a result of this focussed inspection we have not altered the overall rating.

This inspection was focussed on the question; Is the service safe? We looked at; People's experiences and how safe they felt, recruitment, staff knowledge of safeguarding and whistleblowing, incident and accident reporting and, specific issues relating to medicine administration.

The manager registered with CQC was no longer working at the home at the time of our inspection. A new manager was in post and intended to start the registration process with us as soon as possible. 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 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

People reported feeling safe and that staff were kind to them, providing support when they required it. Staff were knowledgeable and confident about reporting any issues of concern. Staff completed incident and accident forms when necessary.

People had no concerns about how their medicines were administered.

We found that overall systems for recruitment were mostly robust. Suitable checks were undertaken to help the manager make safe recruitment decisions. However, applicants full employment history had not always been assessed.

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 rating at our last comprehensive inspection was requires improvement. The rating has not changed as a result of this inspection.

People reported feeling safe.

Staff had good knowledge of safeguarding vulnerable adults from abuse.

Incidents and accidents were reported and recorded.

Robust recruitment procedures were in place for new staff.

Requires Improvement ●

Cedars (The)

Detailed findings

Background to this 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, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

This inspection took place on 17 August 2017 and was unannounced.

This inspection was prompted by information of concern. We inspected the service to review whether there were any current risks to people's safety.

The inspection was carried out by two Inspectors of Adult Social Care. Prior to the inspection we looked at all information available to us relating to the information of concern.

We spoke with five members of staff and the manager and five people who used the service. We looked at recruitment records relating to six members of staff, reviewed incident and accident records and relevant policies.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People spoke positively about living in the home and none reported any concerns about their safety. Comments included; "Staff are all very nice and helpful", "Staff are lovely and always speak politely", and, "Staff are always kind". People told us they had call bells if they needed them and staff would come and help if they were needed. Nobody reported seeing anything that concerned them about the conduct of staff.

We checked the recruitment records for six members of staff. In each case, we saw that relevant interview questions were asked to enable the provider to assess candidate's knowledge and experience. This included questions about safeguarding and whistleblowing, equality and diversity and previous life and work experience with older people. Prior to beginning work, references were sought from previous employers and character references.

For each member of staff we checked, a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check had been carried out. The DBS check identified whether a person has been barred from working with vulnerable adults and whether they have any convictions that would affect their suitability for the role. No concerns or convictions had been noted on the disclosures of staff we checked. In one case, we found a person's employment history hadn't been fully discussed with them to check gaps, which is required by law. However this person did have a satisfactory reference in place from a previous employer.

We spoke with staff and found they were confident and knowledgeable about safeguarding vulnerable adults and the whistleblowing process. Whistleblowing is the term used to describe the action taken by staff to report concerning practice in the workplace. Staff were able to give examples of things that might make them concerned, such as seeing someone being hit, or evidence of neglect such as a person not being supported to wash. Staff felt confident about approaching the manager with concerns if they ever needed to. Staff told us they would approach agencies such as the Care Quality Commission or the local authority if they felt their concerns weren't being taken seriously by the provider. Staff who worked nights, told us they had a team leader who they would report to but there was also a senior member of staff on call if required.

We checked some specific issues around medicine administration with staff as medicine administration had formed part of the concerns that prompted this inspection. The concerns related to how staff managed situations where a person was due their medicine but were found to be asleep. At this inspection, staff administering medicine gave appropriate answers about what they would do in this situation, such as waking the person if the medicine was time critical, or returning later if the medicine could be given later. People we spoke with reported no concerns about how staff supported them with medicines.

We checked incident and accident records for the last month. Prior to this, the manager told us forms were kept in individual files and there had been no system of audit in place. Since arriving in post, the manager was holding incident and accident forms in a central file and auditing monthly. This gave the opportunity to identify any possible trends in the kind of incidents taking place. From the records we viewed, it was clear that staff were reporting and recording significant events and appropriate follow up action was taken.

We checked whether incidents relating to people's safety were being notified to CQC, as required by legislation. A safeguarding log was in place, detailing incidents that had been report to the CQC and to the local safeguarding adults team. It was clear from this that concerns were being reported to the right agencies as they occurred. We also checked a sample of daily records and found no evidence of any concerns or incidents that hadn't been formally reported through an incident and accident form.

At our last comprehensive inspection, the Safe domain was rated as requires improvement. The rating has not changed as a result of this inspection.