

Mr Chander Shekher Kainth & Mr Sohan Lal Kainth Pollard House

Inspection report

62 Pollard Lane
Undercliffe
Bradford
BD2 4RW
Tel: 01274 636208
Website: www.pollardhouse.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 8 October 2015
Date of publication: 10/11/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Is the service safe?

Requires improvement



Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 10 December 2014. A breach of legal requirements was found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the management of medicines.

We undertook this focused inspection 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 those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for (Pollard House) on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

The inspection took place on 8 October 2015 and was unannounced.

Pollard House provides accommodation and personal care for up to 28 older people at any one time.

A registered manager was in place. 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 the last inspection on 10 December 2014 we found a breach of Regulation 13 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010. We found medicines were not safely managed. Following the inspection the provider sent us an action plan detailing the improvements it would make to ensure it met the regulations.

At this inspection we found improvements had been made. Medication records were fully completed and provided evidence people received their medicines as prescribed. Medicines were administered in a safe and kind way by care workers.

We did not change the rating for this domain as to do so requires evidence of sustained improvement over time.

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?

Improvements had been made to the medicine management system and medicines were now managed safely. People received their medicines as prescribed. Medicines were stored appropriately.

We did not change the rating for this domain as to do so requires evidence of sustained improvement over time.

Requires improvement



Pollard House

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 an unannounced focused inspection of Pollard House on 8 October 2015. This inspection was done

to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 10 December 2014 inspection had been made. The team 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 some legal requirements.

The inspection team consisted of a pharmacy inspector.

During the inspection we spoke with care workers and the registered manager. We reviewed documentation related to medicines management which included medicine administration records and the controlled drugs register.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At the last inspection in December 2014 we found that some improvements were required in the way medicines were managed. At this inspection we found that action had been taken and medicines were now managed safely.

We looked at the medicine charts that belonged to half of the people that lived at the service. Records of whether people had received their medicines, including emollient and barrier creams, were completed. The actual time a medicine was administered was recorded if this was substantially different from the time printed on the chart. This ensured that people did not receive medicines too close together. The receipt and disposal of medicines was also recorded so all medicines could be accounted for. Any changes to the dose of a person's medicine were confirmed in writing by their doctor.

We watched people being given their medicines at lunchtime and saw that the senior carer administered medicines in a safe and kind way. People prescribed a mild

painkiller 'when required' were asked if they needed this medicine. However, there were no written guidelines (protocols) to help staff decide if a person needed this medicine. This meant that 'when required' medicines might not be used as intended by the doctor.

Medicines that are controlled drugs (CDs) were stored in a cupboard that complied with the law. Records in the CD register were complete and the stock balances of three CDs we chose at random to check, were correct. We saw that CDs were administered at the right times so that people's pain was well controlled.

Medicines were stored safely and kept at the right temperatures. However, the temperature of the medicine refrigerator was not consistently monitored in the right way. The manager carried out a detailed medicines audit every two weeks to make sure medicines were used safely. Any concerns were acted upon.

We did not change the rating for this domain as to do so requires evidence of sustained improvement over time.