

Four Seasons (Evedale) Limited

The Oaks and Little Oaks

Inspection report

172 London Road
Balderton
Newark
Nottinghamshire
NG24 3JF

Tel: 01636605365
Website: www.fshc.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
21 July 2016

Date of publication:
24 August 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Requires Improvement ●
Is the service safe?	Inadequate ●
Is the service well-led?	Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

This unannounced inspection was carried out on 21 July 2016. The Oaks and Little Oaks is a care home with nursing and provides accommodation and personal care for up to 73 older people. On the day of our inspection there were 30 people who were using the service.

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 16 March 2016. Breaches of legal requirements were found. We undertook this focused inspection to check that they now met legal requirements. This report only 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 (location's name) on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

The service did not have a registered manager in place at the time of our inspection and has not had one since December 2014. The operations manager told us a new manager has been appointed, who will apply to become the registered manager when they take up their post. 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 were supported by staff who understood the risks people could face and were provided with appropriate care that promoted their safety.

People who used the service and care workers were able to express their views about the service which were acted upon. The management team provided leadership that gained the respect of care workers and motivated them as a team. There were systems in place to monitor the quality of the service and make improvements when needed.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Inadequate ●

The service was not always safe.

People were provided with the care they needed safely.

We did not look at all areas of this question and we will consider whether there has been an improvement in the rating when we undertake our next comprehensive inspection

Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement ●

The service was not always well led.

People views and experiences in using the service were used to identify and make improvements to the quality of the service they received.

People used a service where staff were motivated through encouragement and support to carry out their duties to the best of their ability.

We have not reviewed the rating for this question as we need to see that the improvements made are sustained. We would also require there to be a registered manager in post to improve the rating for well led.

The Oaks and Little Oaks

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of The Oaks and Little Oaks on 21 July 2016. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection 16 March 2016 inspection had been made. The team inspected the service against two of the five questions we ask about services: Is the service safe and is the service well led? This is because the service was not meeting some legal requirements. The inspection was undertaken by two inspectors.

Prior to our inspection we reviewed information we held about the service. This included previous inspection reports, information received and statutory notifications. A notification is information about important events which the provider is required to send us by law.

During the inspection we spoke with six people who used the service and three relatives. We also spoke with 4 care staff, one senior care worker, a registered nurse, three housekeeping staff, the operations manager and the temporary manager.

We considered information contained in some of the records held at the service. This included the care records for eight people and other records kept by the manager as part of their management and auditing of the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

During our inspection on 16 March 2016 we found there was a breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. We found that risks to people's health and safety were not assessed and not everything that was reasonably practicable to mitigate any risk was done. We told the provider they needed to make improvements in relation to this. During this inspection we found the provider had made the required improvements. Although we saw improvements in the areas we focused on, we will consider whether there has been an improvement in the rating when we undertake our next comprehensive inspection.

At our last inspection we found people may not receive the support they required because there was a lack of guidance in care plans on how people should be supported. Some staff were unaware of the support people required to meet their needs and records made did not show people had been provided with the care they required. During this visit we found that staff knew what support people required and the monitoring records completed showed this was provided. These included monitoring people's food and fluid intake, regular repositioning to protect their skin integrity and carrying out regular wellbeing checks on people. A relative told us, "Staff are more aware of what they are doing. I am not having to chase staff up anymore because things are done." The relative also told us how their relation's health and wellbeing had improved and they believed this was as a result of the improved standard of care within the home. Another relative said their relation received, "Individualised care."

There were details of the support people required in their care plans. One person told us they were given the care we saw described in their care plan. A relative said their relation was, "Well cared for" and told us how staff had acted promptly to ensure their relation's needs were met. Staff described providing careful and sensitive care to people and spoke of respecting their wishes. One staff member spoke of keeping people, "Comfortable and clean without causing them any distress." We saw that when required there was the appropriate equipment in place to ensure people received their care safely.

One person had recently had some significant changes in their needs and this had been updated in the key areas of their care plan. There were some sections that were outdated because of the person's change of need but these were reviewed during our visit. The temporary manager told us there were plans in place for the person to have a full care plan review.

At our last inspection we found some people did not have a plan of all the care they required. At this inspection we found people's care plans contained detailed information about their needs and how these should be met. This included information that we found had not been included at the last inspection. We asked staff about people's needs and they were able to tell us about these. We judged from the answers staff gave us they had a good knowledge of people's needs and how these should be met.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

During our inspection on 16 March 2016 we found there was a breach of Regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. We found that the provider was not assessing, monitoring and improving the quality and safety of the services provided or mitigating the risks relating to the health, safety and welfare of service users. We also found the provider was not maintaining securely an accurate, complete and contemporaneous record in respect of each person who used the service.

During this visit people told us they felt their views were listened to and acted upon. One person said they felt any issues or problems would be sorted out and a relative told us the temporary manager sorted things out when they asked them. Another relative said, "If you mention something it is taken on board and dealt with." A relative told us they had previously made comment about the cleanliness of the home. They said they felt the cleanliness of the home had improved and we found the areas of the home we visited were clean and tidy. Staff also told us they felt able to speak out if they had any issues and any instructions they were given were clearly explained to them.

People told us their choices were respected and their independence was encouraged. One person told us, "They (staff) make sure I have things close to me to keep me independent." They also said that staff responded to them promptly when they required assistance. Other people told us they made choices such as staying in their room. People were well presented and happy with their care. One person said, "I wouldn't like to move, I am happy here."

At our last inspection we found staff morale at the service was low, and staff did not feel listened to. During this visit each member of staff described their morale as being good and also felt this was the case for all members of staff. One staff member told us the atmosphere in the home was, "Cheerful" and another said, "There is less stress, morale has improved." Other comments included, "Our support is amazing", "We are definitely getting there", and "I would recommend this home to my friends as a place to work."

Staff told us about a recent initiative that had a positive effect on everyone's morale entitled 'Fun Fridays' where a different theme for the day was introduced. This included a sporting theme during the Wimbledon tennis tournament and we saw pictures of people playing indoor tennis. Staff told us another theme had been 'wrong trouser day' which had been good fun.

People were cared for by staff who presented a positive image. One person said the staff were very nice and a relative told us they felt the staff were lovely. Another relative told us they felt staff were a lot happier in their work. We saw staff were going about their duties in a cheerful manner and interacted with people in a positive way. Staff were relaxed when speaking with us and spoke positively about their work.

We saw minutes of recent residents, staff and clinical governance meetings. These all showed changes taking place within the home. One comment in the resident meeting minutes was that, "Staff smile more." Another comment was complimentary about the new management within the home. The issues of concern we found at our last inspection had been discussed in the staff meeting and when we spoke with staff they

were aware of the concerns we had found. This was an example of the open culture the temporary manager was creating and involved staff as part of the solution in making the improvements that were needed. We also saw a plan showing when staff were provided with individual supervision to discuss their work and provide an opportunity for them to raise any issues.

At our last inspection we found auditing systems were not being followed so they were not effective. The temporary manager showed us the auditing systems they followed which included a daily report following a tour of the home. This was carried out by another senior staff member when the temporary manager was not working. We saw the notes made from the walk around on the day of our visit where the wellbeing of three people had been reported on. The temporary manager had also introduced a 'Resident of the day' scheme where a different person was reviewed each day to ensure their needs were being met.

The temporary manager had also introduced a new weekly audit to inform them about certain issues regarding people's wellbeing. We saw monitoring charts completed in people's rooms were checked regularly to ensure people were receiving the care they required and action was taken if an entry had not been made on the monitoring form to identify why it had not been completed. There was an audit completed on medicines used in the home and monthly checks undertaken on equipment used. When needed there was an action plan prepared detailing the improvements needed. We saw a record in the clinical governance meeting minutes of the action the temporary manager had taken when some staff had not followed through on an action plan they had produced.

The provider operated an electronic feedback system in the entrance hall and we saw positive comments had been left on this by relatives. We spoke with one relative who had left a positive comment who told us how much the service had improved. They said, "Since the new manager has come it is like the difference between night and day."

We have not reviewed the rating for this question as we need to see that the improvements made are sustained. We would also require there to be a registered manager in post to improve the rating for well led.