

Nazareth Care Charitable Trust

Nazareth House - Lancaster

Inspection report

Ashton Road
Lancaster
Lancashire
LA1 5AQ

Tel: 0152432074

Date of inspection visit:
08 December 2016

Date of publication:
13 January 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service effective?

Good ●

Is the service caring?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 04 May 2016, at which two breaches of legal requirements were found. This was because the provider had failed to ensure staff were treated people with dignity and communication was respectful. They failed to ensure food was maintained at the right temperature for the whole mealtime.

After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breaches. We carried out this unannounced focused inspection on 08 December 2016 to check they had followed their plan and to confirm they now met legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to these topics. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Nazareth House on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Nazareth House is registered to accommodate 41 people who require nursing and personal care. Accommodation is provided over four floors with one double room and 39 single rooms, all with en-suite facilities. Established in 1899 by the Sisters of Nazareth, the home is set in landscaped gardens, which include a wildlife pond. There is also a greenhouse for people who like gardening and a sensory garden area where people can relax. Amenities are within easy reach, such as shops, pubs, library, cafes, museums, leisure facilities and public transport links. At the time of our focused inspection, 38 people lived at Nazareth House.

The service had a registered manager 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 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

The home had a Sister Superior, who is in charge of delivering spiritual support to people who live at Nazareth House. However, the home accepts people from all religious backgrounds. The home holds a daily Catholic Mass and other services are held by visiting clergy. There are several nuns who live at Nazareth House who provide social care and spiritual guidance.

At our focused inspection on the 08 December 2016, we found improvements had been made. We observed people being supported and treated with dignity and respect. Staff had received training that had helped them reflect on how they engaged with people.

We observed lunchtime at Nazareth House. We noted staff provided effective support to people. There was a variety of food available, which was checked and served at the appropriate temperature.

We could not improve the rating for effective and caring from requires improvement because to do so requires consistent good practice over time. We will check this during our next planned comprehensive

inspection.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

We found action had been taken to improve the effectiveness of the service.

Action had been taken to improve the effective monitoring and recording of nutrition for people since the last inspection.

People were protected against the risks of dehydration and malnutrition. We saw staff had the knowledge and skills to support people effectively to maintain good health.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

We found action had been taken to improve the care the service delivered.

Action had been taken to ensure people were treated with dignity and respect.

Staff had received training and guidance on dignity and respect.

We observed positive interactions between people and staff. Communication was respectful and staff listened and responded to people appropriately.

Nazareth House - Lancaster

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.

The inspection team consisted of an adult social care inspector.

Prior to this inspection, we reviewed all the information we held about the service, including data about safeguarding and statutory notifications. Statutory notifications are submitted to the Care Quality Commission and tell us about important events that the provider is required to send us. This helped us to gain a balanced overview of what people experienced living at the home. At the time of our inspection there were no safeguarding concerns being investigated by the local authority.

We spoke with a range of people about this service. They included two people who lived at the home, the registered manager and three staff. We spent time observing interactions between people and staff.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of Nazareth House on 04 May 2016, we found the provider had not delivered timely and effective support that ensured people received food that was maintained at the right temperature.

This was a breach of Regulation 14 Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 because the provider had not always protected people from the risks of malnutrition.

On the day of inspection, we observed lunchtime in the upstairs dining room. A choice of foods was available and written on the daily menu. People had the choice of moving to the dining table or eating in their rooms. The atmosphere was relaxed with music playing in the background. There were tablecloths on the table. Individual clothes protectors / tabards were folded and placed on the table to look like napkins. This showed the provider had made changes that ensured the lunchtime experience and environment was positively presented.

When people were supported into the dining room, it was unhurried and effectively completed. People were asked what they would like from the menu. One person did not want what was advertised on the menu. Staff offered alternatives, which once agreed, swiftly arrived. The staff member got a thank you, which was acknowledged, with a smile and a, "You're welcome." We noted one person was visually impaired. They were asked whether they would like their soup in a dish or a cup. Their main meal arrived with a plate guard to support their independence. Comments we overheard about the food included, "The soup here is absolutely lovely." We also heard, "I am counting time round to my meals, they are so good."

There were sufficient staff to meet people's needs. Staff were efficient and attentive and we observed food temperatures were checked and documented before the meal was served. People's views on the food presented was requested and they were asked if they wanted any more. Before, during and after the meal, people were asked if they wanted a drink with several options being offered.

We spoke with the registered manager about mealtimes and changes that had occurred since our last inspection. They told us they had introduced mealtime experience audits. Questions on the audit included, 'describe the meal', 'were drinks given with appropriate choices' and 'were textured diets nicely presented and choices offered'. Responses documented in the audits included, 'the meal was hot', 'there were various selections of drinks', and, 'lots of conversations around the table'. We were also informed the new Sister Superior at Nazareth House was a trained chef and was monitoring the quality of meals presented.

We spoke with staff about mealtimes and support delivered to people. One staff member told us, "We have had meetings to improve and been on food hygiene training." When we asked what had changed they said, "We are probing food to check for the right temperature." A second staff member commented, "After the meetings and training everyone has a better understanding." This showed the provider had systems to protect people from the risks of malnutrition and dehydration.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of Nazareth House on 04 May 2016, we found the provider had failed to make sure they provided care and treatment in a way that ensured people's dignity and treated them with respect at all times.

This was a breach of Regulation 10 Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 because the provider had failed to ensure staff had treated people with dignity and respect and communication was respectful.

On the day of inspection, we observed staff interactions in the lounge and during lunchtime in the dining room. In the lounge, there was a relaxed and calm atmosphere. People were sat together chatting. We observed one person ask about a regular activity that should have occurred that day. They were told it was not happening that morning due to carol singers visiting. On hearing the person was disappointed the staff member rearranged the plans for the afternoon to include the activity. Conversation was respectful with the person's preferences being accommodated.

Our observation at lunchtime provided positive evidence, people received caring support and were treated with dignity and respect. Communication with people was courteous and staff crouched to be at eye level. There was gentle humour used positively in interactions. We noted one family member stayed for lunch with their relative and the registered manager ate their meal alongside people who lived at Nazareth House. There were general discussions throughout the mealtime and people were included in all the conversations. We overheard one person say, "I am enjoying the company, enjoying the chitter chatter." They further commented, "I never thought it would be like this here, it is such a relief. I was worried about going in a home and I feel I am home. This is my home." They went on to praise the staff on the support they received and in particular one staff member who they called their personal assistant. They told the registered manager, "You have made a good selection on your staff. I couldn't have chosen better for myself."

We spoke with staff about the valued support they offered people. Regarding supporting one person with complex needs, one staff member told us, "After the dignity training, I have stepped back, evaluated on their needs." A second staff member commented, "I think we are more aware of dignity and respect now. We are constantly improving here for the residents in how we give person-centred care."

We spoke to the registered manager about the care and support delivered. They told us they had met with individual staff, had group meetings and delivered training on how staff react and interact with people. They said they had met with staff and looked at individual performance and how they could have supported people better. This showed the registered manager had ensured staff had the skills and knowledge to support and respect people's personal preferences, lifestyle and care choices.