

Accommodating Care Newent Limited

Highfield Residential Home

Inspection report

Culver Street
Newent
Gloucestershire
GL18 1JA

Tel: 01531 821007

Website: www.highfieldshome.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 07/07/2015

Date of publication: 03/08/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires improvement



Is the service safe?

Inadequate



Is the service effective?

Requires improvement



Is the service well-led?

Requires improvement



Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 27 February and 2 March 2015. Part of our inspection was to check breaches of legal requirements found at our inspection of 27 August 2014. We found the outstanding breaches of regulations had not been met and we found new breaches of regulations. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to breaches of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and a breach of the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009.

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 and the last focused inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for (location's name) on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

People were protected from the risk of being cared for by unsuitable staff because robust recruitment practices were operated. We found improvements to the procedures for recruiting staff. Improvements had also been made to the management of people's medicines.

People's rights were protected by the correct use of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the associated Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Summary of findings

The manager demonstrated an awareness of the events affecting people using the service which we must be notified about. We had received the appropriate notifications.

Highfield Residential Home had a registered manager although this person was not in post at the time of our inspection. A new manager had started who was

currently applying for registration. 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.

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?

Action had been taken to improve the safety of the service.

People's medicines were managed safely.

People were now protected from the risk of the appointment of unsuitable staff because robust recruitment practices were operated.

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

Inadequate



Is the service effective?

Action had been taken to improve the effectiveness of the service.

People's rights were protected by the correct use of the MCA and DoLS.

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

Requires improvement



Is the service well-led?

Action had been taken to improve the leadership of the service.

Required information in the form of notifications about events affecting people using the service had been sent to the CQC.

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

Requires improvement



Highfield Residential Home

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.

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of Highfield Residential Home on 7 July 2015. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal

requirements planned by the provider after our 27 February and 2 March 2015 inspection had been made. We inspected the service against three of the five questions we ask about services: Is the service safe? Is the service effective? Is the service well led? This is because the service was not meeting some legal requirements.

Our inspection team consisted of one inspector. We spoke with the manager and administrator of the service. We spoke with one member of staff. We examined records relating to the care and support of people using the service and one staff recruitment file.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our inspection of 27 February and 2 March 2015 we checked a breach of regulation relating to the safe management of medicines from a previous inspection in August 2014. This included handwritten entries on the Medicine Administration Records (MAR) not being signed by two staff to indicate the information was correct. There were also gaps on the MAR where staff should have signed to indicate if medicines had been given or not. We found people were still not protected against the risks associated with the unsafe management of their medicines. Some MAR charts had been handwritten for people who had recently moved in to the home. There was no signature of the staff who entered the directions for when medicines should be given on the administration chart. There was no evidence that the directions had been checked as correct by another member of staff. We also found that there were gaps in the recording of when people had taken their medicines. There were no signatures or codes recorded on the MAR for when medicines were taken or not taken for some people for 28 February and the 1 March 2015. The temperature of medicines stored in one cupboard were not being monitored therefore it was not clear if these medicines had been stored at the correct temperature. If medicines are not stored properly they may not work in the way they were intended and so pose a potential risk to the health and wellbeing of the person receiving the medicine.

The 'Administration of Medication Policy' in use and reviewed in October 2014 did not reflect the practices for looking after and giving people their medicines at Highfield Residential Home. For example the policy referred to a domiciliary care agency and to practices that may have been found when care is provided to people in their own homes.

At this inspection we found improvements to how people's medicines were managed. The provider had followed the action plan they had written to meet the shortfalls we identified.

Handwritten entries had been signed and checked by a second member of staff. We found no gaps in the recording of when people were given their medicines on the charts we looked at covering 8 June 2015 to 5 July 2015. Storage temperatures were checked daily and records showed these were within correct limits. A new medicines policy was in place which reflected the practices in use at Highfield Residential Home. The manager told us all staff had now received medicines training even if their role involved just applying topical creams and ointments. There were records of checks on competencies by the manager based on observations of staff giving people their medicines.

At our inspection of 27 February and 2 March 2015 we found staff recruitment practices at the home did not protect people from staff who may be unsuitable to work with vulnerable people. Out of three staff recruitment files we looked at, one staff member had been employed without checks of their conduct during all of their previous employment. Their reasons for leaving previous employment which involved caring for vulnerable adults had also not been checked. The care home's recruitment and selection policy did not reflect current regulations relating to employment checks for staff working with vulnerable adults.

We checked the staff recruitment file for the one member of staff employed since our last inspection. We found improvements to recruitment procedures. These included checks on relevant previous employment which involved working with vulnerable adults. We discussed recruitment procedures with the manager and the administrator who both demonstrated an awareness of the checks required before new staff were employed. People were protected from the risk of the employment of unsuitable staff.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our inspection of 27 February and 2 March 2015 we found People's rights were not protected by the correct use of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) (MCA) and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The MCA provides a legal framework for acting and making decisions on behalf of adults who lack the capacity to make certain specific decisions for themselves. The DoLS protect people in care homes from inappropriate or unnecessary restrictions on their freedom. People's care plans included an assessment of their mental capacity however the assessments were general in nature and did not relate to a specific decision. At the time of our inspection visit there had been no assessments of people relating to restrictions on their liberty. For example, one person had recently moved into the home for a short stay, we discussed their needs with the registered manager who acknowledged that the person may try to leave the care home and staff would have to prevent them. No application had been made for authorisation to deprive this person of their liberty.

At this inspection we found improvements to how decisions taken in peoples' best interests under the MCA were made and recorded. In addition three applications had been made to restrict people of their liberty under DoLS, these were still awaiting a decision from the supervisory body. The provider had followed the action plan they had written to meet the shortfalls we identified.

Best interests decisions had been made and recorded for 'day to day' decisions for people using the service such as personal care. The manager explained how people's relatives had been contacted to gain their views to support the assessment relating to a person's mental capacity. The manager was also preparing for a best interests review meeting with health and social care professionals for one person about their decision to choose to move from Highfield Residential Home to private accommodation. The manager told us, since our inspection in February and March 2015 all staff in the home had received training in the MCA. People's rights were protected by the appropriate use of the MCA and DoLS.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At our inspection of 27 February and 2 March 2015 we found important events affecting people using the service had not been notified to us, this is a legal requirement. We had not been notified of two allegations of abuse; one in September 2014 and the other in November 2014 both were allegations of neglect. CQC monitors important events

affecting the welfare, health and safety of people living in the home through the notifications sent to us by providers. The provider had followed the action plan they had written to meet the shortfalls we identified.

At the time of this inspection visit we had received notifications relating to important events affecting people using the service. We discussed notifications with the manager who demonstrated a clear understanding of the types of events to notify us about.