

Adiemus Care Limited Ravenscroft

Inspection report

44 Hilperton Road
Trowbridge
Wiltshire
BA14 7JQ

Tel: 01225 752087

Website: www.orchardcarehomes.com

Date of inspection visit: 24 November 2015

Date of publication: 04/01/2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inadequate



Is the service safe?

Inadequate



Overall summary

At the comprehensive inspection at this service in September 2015 we identified eleven breaches of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. We issued the provider with two warning notices nine requirements stating that they must take action to address these breaches. We shared our concerns with the local authority safeguarding and commissioning teams.

This focused inspection was carried out to assess whether the provider had taken the necessary actions to meet the two warning notices we had issued. We will carry out a further unannounced comprehensive inspection to assess whether the actions taken in relation to the warning notices have been sustained, to assess whether action has been taken in relation to the nine requirement notices and to provide an overall quality rating for the service.

This report only covers our findings in relation to the warning notices we issued and we have not changed the ratings since the inspection in September 2015. The

overall rating for this service is 'Inadequate' and the service is therefore in 'special measures'. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection by selecting 'all reports' links for Ravenscroft on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

At this inspection we found the provider had taken action to address the issues highlighted in the warning notices. The home manager had developed a comprehensive action plan to address the warning notices and other requirements in the inspection report where they were found to be in breach of regulations. The plan was being updated to reflect the progress being made with improving the service. Meetings had been held with people using the service, their relatives and staff. The meetings were used to explain the actions they were taking, the improvements they wanted achieve and to seek feedback.

Summary of findings

As the home is currently not fully occupied those rooms that required attention had been decommissioned pending a programme of refurbishment. People and their relatives had been consulted with and had been moved to other rooms within the home.

At our last inspection we found that not all people using the service had their own slings with which they could hoisted. We also found there was no information to indicate if or when slings had been cleaned. This meant people were at risk of cross contamination because the slings were shared and no cleaning schedule was in place. At this inspection people had all been allocated their own slings. Their were schedules in place which identified which slings were to be cleaned on each day.

Schedules were also in place to ensure that equipment was cleaned each week, which included hoists and wheelchairs. There were also resources made available to ensure that hoists were cleaned in-between each use.

New cleaning schedules were in place and the home had recruited additional housekeeping staff.

Some chairs and flooring had been replaced and the home had a programme of refurbishment in place. The landlord had dedicated money to support bringing the home up to standard. Quotes for work still outstanding were being sought.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

We found action had been taken to improve infection control processes within the home.

There was a programme of refurbishment in place.

Schedules had been put in place to ensure that daily and weekly cleaning took place. The maintenance person had a daily task list to support them to prioritise work that needed to be completed.

Inadequate



Ravenscroft

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.

We undertook a focused inspection of Ravenscroft Care Home on the 24 November 2015. This inspection was completed to ensure improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection 10, 11 and 14 September 2015 had been completed. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about the services: is the

service safe. This was because the service was not meeting legal requirements in relation to that question and we had issued warning notices following the comprehensive inspection.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector. 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 the legal requirements.

During our inspection we spoke with two people who lived there, one visitor, the manager, five staff members, including housekeeping and laundry staff. We reviewed a range of records which included quality monitoring documents, cleaning schedules and correspondence with contractors regarding refurbishment requirements. We looked around the premises to review the refurbishment work that had been completed.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of Ravenscroft on 10, 11 and 14 September 2015 we found that people were not always protected by the prevention and control of infection procedures. Whilst there were systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection staff working in the service did not consistently comply with infection control practices. Hoist slings were hung from hooks in bathrooms and there was no information available for staff to indicate if slings had been cleaned or which person they should be used for. When we asked staff how often slings were washed they told us this happened weekly. However, when we asked how they would know the slings had been washed they confirmed they would not know this information. This meant people were at risk of cross contamination because the slings were shared and there was no cleaning schedule in place.

We saw equipment such as hoists and safety mats were not clean. We observed two members of staff hoisting a person. The base of the hoist was visibly dirty. We asked them when it was last cleaned and they did not know. The provider's policy stated 'Hoists should be cleaned with hot soapy water between residents' and 'Hoist slings are for single resident use'. This practice was not being followed as identified in the provider's policy and procedure. Staff were not able to tell us how often hoists and equipment were cleaned or who was responsible for cleaning them. The dirty equipment and the communal use of slings meant there was a risk of cross infection between people.

People were not always protected by the prevention and control of infection procedures. During our last inspection in May 2014 we found the provider has not satisfied all the legal requirements with infection control. The provider wrote to us with an action plan of improvements that would be made. We found at this inspection the provider had taken steps to make some of the necessary improvements that were identified during our last inspection. However the areas identified had still not been improved upon. The provider told us chairs that were stained had been identified and a replacement programme actioned. During this visit we found chairs in the communal lounges that were stained and dirty. Skirting boards remained damaged and difficult to clean.

There were processes in place to maintain standards of cleanliness and hygiene in the home. For example, there

was a cleaning schedule which was completed by housekeeping staff to ensure all areas of the home were appropriately cleaned. However there had been some staff shortages and there was evidence in the daily cleaning log that the premises had not been cleaned at all on some days.

This was a breach of regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

As a result of the concerns, we issued a warning notice to the provider. The provider wrote to us with a plan of the actions they were going to take to address the concerns relating to infection control. At this inspection we found the provider had followed the action plan they had written to meet the shortfalls in relation to the requirements of Regulation 12 as described above.

Chairs that were dirty and stained and could not be cleaned had been removed. New chairs were on order. A cleaning machine had been purchased for furniture which could not be wiped clean. Additional equipment had been hired to support the housekeepers with carpet cleaning. Where new flooring had been laid skirting boards had been replaced

Individual slings had been purchased for those people requiring them. Schedules were in place to ensure staff knew which slings were to be washed each day. We saw records to indicate when slings had been cleaned. Staff we spoke with confirmed people all had their own slings and these were washed weekly or as and when required.

There was a cleaning schedule in place for the cleaning of equipment which included hoists and wheelchairs. Equipment was numbered so the manager could check, where staff had recorded they had cleaned equipment number three for example, this had been completed. Hoists had bags attached to them which contained anti-bacterial wipes for staff to use in-between hoisting people. During our inspection we looked around the building and observed that equipment looked cleaned.

Additional housekeeping staff had been recruited to ensure cleaning was undertaken every day. Housekeeping staff said the cleaning schedules and new flooring had made cleaning the building much easier. They said "Maintenance support us once a month to remove the radiator covers so we can clean the radiators. Cleaning now happens every

Is the service safe?

day". Cleaning logs indicated cleaning had been undertaken every day. Schedules included cleaning of communal areas and a programme for deep cleaning every room each month.

Staff we spoke with felt things had improved since our last inspection. One staff member told us "Things are definitely improving. It's easy to know now when and why things have to be cleaned".

At our comprehensive inspection of Ravenscroft on 10, 11 and 14 September 2015 we found the premises were not properly maintained. We saw some carpets and chairs in the communal areas were stained and dirty. Staff explained that as one of the carpets in the lounge area was so worn the carpet cleaner was no longer effectively able to clean it. They said the carpet cleaner was currently broken and had been for several weeks.

We observed that the carpet in one person's bedroom was heavily stained and had an unpleasant odour. The carpet in another person's room was torn and curtains in several rooms were not fully attached to the curtain rail. One person we spoke with told us their eyesight was poor. Their room had a light fitting with three bulbs, but one bulb was missing. They said "One bulb keeps blowing, but it hasn't been replaced".

We saw some areas of the home were damaged. For example skirting boards were chipped and worn, paint was peeling off the walls and door frames were damaged. This meant the cleaning of these areas was difficult.

All of the staff and all of the relatives spoken to said they had concerns in relation to the upkeep of the building. One relative had expressed their concerns regarding the reliability of the lift.

The garden area was well maintained and people were able to see it from one lounge and the dining room. Relatives said "It's a shame we can't get out to the garden, the path is uneven so it's not very safe".

These concerns were a breach of regulation 15 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

As a result of the concerns, we issued a warning notice to the provider. The provider wrote to us with a plan of the actions they were going to take to address the concerns

relating to infection control. At this inspection we found the provider had followed the action plan they had written to meet the shortfalls in relation to the requirements of Regulation 15 as described above.

As the home is currently not fully occupied those rooms that required attention, as identified in the warning notice, had been decommissioned pending a programme of refurbishment. People and their relatives had been consulted with and had been moved to other rooms within the home. One person, who had experienced problems with lighting in their room, told us "I love my new room. There's more space". We saw there room was much more spacious with plenty of lighting.

Where carpets had been torn or worn in one person's room and on the stairwell this had been replaced with laminate flooring which housekeeping told us was much easier to clean. Curtain poles had been reattached and the carpet cleaner fixed. Another carpet cleaner had also been purchased. The carpet in the small lounge area still needed to be replaced. The manager explained that this was part of the on-going refurbishment plan.

Where skirting boards were chipped and worn, paint was peeling off the walls and door frames were damaged we saw that some repairs and replacements had been completed. The manager was in the process of gaining quotes for a complete redecoration of the home as the work was too much for the maintenance person to complete on their own. They had prioritised areas that had needed immediate attention and we saw this work had been completed. The landlord had also committed an amount of money to support bringing the building up to date.

People we spoke with, a relative and staff spoke positively about the improvements that had been made. Comments included "There's been lots of improvement. It's much tidier and the décor has improved" and "It's improving here quite a lot. Things are much more organised".

With regards to the lift, the manager had contacted the company who had serviced the lift. They had not been able to find any on-going issues with the lift. The lift is checked weekly by the maintenance person and any concerns reported.

The manager had met with the landlord to discuss the outside area and making this accessible. This was part of the future refurbishment plan.

Is the service safe?

The manager explained they met each day with the head of housekeeping and maintenance person to discuss the actions required to meet the warning notices. They had also discussed improvements with staff, relatives and people using the service. Quality audits had been undertaken by the provider to ensure improvements were being completed and any further actions identified.

The manage told us they conducted a "Daily walk around" of the building to check on the general appearance and cleanliness. Any actions noted were passed to housekeeping and maintenance as required for action.