

Barchester Healthcare Homes Limited

Magnolia Court

Inspection report

181 Granville Road
Hampstead
London
NW2 2LH

Tel: 02087319881
Website: www.barchester.com

Date of inspection visit:
20 June 2017

Date of publication:
07 July 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 23 June 2016. At which a breach of legal requirement was found. We found that a sufficient number of staff were not deployed to meet people's needs effectively.

After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to this breach.

We undertook a focused inspection on the 20 June 2017 to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to this topic. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Magnolia Court on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Magnolia Court is a nursing home registered to provide accommodation, nursing and personal care for up to 54 older people including people with dementia. The home is operated and run by the Barchester Healthcare Homes Limited. At the time of our inspection, 52 people were living in the home.

The home has 54 bedrooms with en-suite toilet facilities split into two units on two floors. Each floor has two shower rooms, one assisted bathroom, dining area and lounge. The ground floor has the main dining room with two lounge areas. The two floors are accessible via two lifts and there is an accessible garden.

The home had a registered manager who has been registered with the Care Quality Commission since 30 June 2015. 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.

At our focused inspection on the 20 June 2017, we found that the provider had followed their plan and legal requirements had now been met.

We found that the provider had employed additional bank and permanent care staff and accessed spare staff from neighbouring Barchester Healthcare operated care homes to cover staff absences and emergencies, staff had been deployed appropriately to meet people's needs effectively.

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 ●

We found that action had been taken to improve the safety to people who used the service.

The service deployed sufficient numbers of staff to meet people's individual health and care needs.

This meant that the provider was now meeting legal requirements and the service was safe.

Magnolia Court

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 was 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.

We undertook a focused inspection of Magnolia Court on 20 June 2017. This inspection was completed to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection 23 June 2016 had been made.

We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe? This is because the service was not meeting legal requirements in relation to this question.

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector, an inspection manager and two expert by experience. An Expert by Experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the home, this included the provider's action plan, which set out the action they would take to meet legal requirements.

We spoke with eight people who used the service and seven relatives, the registered manager, the deputy manager, the regional manager, two nurses, two care staff and four newly recruited staff. At the visit we looked at staffing rotas and staff recruitment records, and we also observed people having lunch on all three floors of the home and activities carried out before and after lunch time.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of Magnolia Court on 23 June 2016 we found that adequate number of staff were not deployed to meet people's needs. This led to some people having to wait longer than others during meal times, and despite having a range of activities, people were not always assisted by staff to access those activities.

This was a breach of Regulation 18 (1) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our focused inspection on 20 June 2017 we found the provider had followed the action plan they had written to meet shortfalls in relation to the requirements of Regulation 18 (1) described above.

People and relatives told us the service was safe and they felt safe with staff. People using the service, relatives and staff said they had seen improvements in staffing numbers since last inspection. We asked people and relatives if they could easily get hold of staff and most people responded positively. One person commented, "Yes. The staff are absolutely excellent. Very nice and caring." Another person said, "Yes, there is always somebody around. I rarely need them at night. One time I upset a jug of water and they changed the bed at 3 o'clock in the morning. It was beautifully organised."

We asked people if staff attended call bells on time and majority of people replied positively. Their comments included, "Yes, I haven't [got] any complaints", "I guess so. I hail them as they pass." And "I have not had any trouble up until now."

During our inspection we saw staff were visible in the communal areas and saw them promptly and patiently attending to people's requests. The atmosphere at the home was calm and relaxed. We saw people were appropriately and timely supported during meal times. We observed lunchtime meal with majority of people eating in the dining area across three floors and some people choosing to eat in their bedrooms. People that required assistance with their meals were suitably supported by staff. We saw during lunchtime meal, activities and kitchen staff joined-in to provide support to people. The registered manager told us activities and kitchen staff were trained in providing meal time assistance. Relatives confirmed activities and kitchen staff supported people during lunch time, and engaged and interacted very well with people. On the day of inspection, there were some visitors who had joined in during lunchtime meal and overall people seemed to be well supported and enjoying the food and company of staff and visitors. We saw there were jugs of water and juices in the communal areas and people were encouraged and assisted to drink throughout our visit. We saw staff including volunteers assisting people in accessing activities. There were sufficient staff to meet people's needs.

We spoke to the registered manager regarding the changes they had implemented to effectively deploy staff to meet people's needs. They told us more bank and permanent staff were recruited including creating more senior care staff positions. Bank staff were recruited on temporary contracts but trained at the same level as permanent staff and used to cover staff absences. The registered manager told us they preferred

using bank staff than agency staff as the bank staff were trained to the provider's required standards and using the same bank staff on a regular basis meant staff knew and understood people's needs and likes and wishes better.

The service also introduced a system where they had an easy access to additional staff on duty at provider's other neighbouring care homes. This meant in the event of an emergency the service had access to additional staff should bank staff be unavailable. The registered manager and the deputy manager told us the system was working well.

The registered manager told us they were recruiting staff on an ongoing basis as although, they had managed to retain their nurse team for a number of years, due to the nature of the sector they were struggling to retain care staff. We saw that the service had a recruitment banner displayed outside the home to attract potential staff to apply for a job. The registered manager said that it was important for them to recruit staff of the right calibre and met the provider's standards. Since the last inspection the service had recruited two permanent and four bank staff, recruitment records seen confirm this.

Staff told us staffing levels had improved since the last inspection and there were sufficient numbers of staff. Their comments included, "There is enough staffing every day, any absences and sickness is always covered and [the cover staff] arrive on time", "Using bank staff from [provider's] other homes...there is a turnover of carers but getting better in covering" and "In my opinion we have enough staff to give a quality care service to people."

We saw staff rotas that demonstrated equal numbers of staff were deployed throughout the week and the deputy manager worked as supernumerary, meaning they were available to support with care and nursing responsibilities if staff needed additional help. The service continued using the provider's dependency assessment tool to assess and calculate staffing levels based on people's individual health and care needs. The registered manager said and the deputy manager confirmed that even when there were less people using the service, they did not reduce staffing numbers "As it can demotivate staff." Staff told us they felt well supported by the management and the staff allocations were done effectively to provide people with safe care.