

Jasmine Healthcare Limited

St Andrew's Nursing and Care Home

Inspection report

Main Street
Ewerby
Sleaford
Lincolnshire
NG34 9PL

Tel: 01529460286

Website: www.standrewscarehome.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
20 September 2016

Date of publication:
18 October 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

This was an unannounced inspection carried out on 20 September 2016.

St Andrew's Nursing and Care Home can provide nursing care and personal care for 45 older people and people who live with dementia. There were 40 people living in the service at the time of our inspection.

There was a registered manager. 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.

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 10 February 2016 when we found that there was a breach of a legal requirement. This was because the registered persons had not consistently completed robust checks to monitor and assure the quality of all the facilities and care provided in the service. This had resulted in shortfalls in the care and facilities provided for people not being quickly addressed.

After our inspection of 10 February 2016 the registered persons wrote to us to say what improvements they intended to make in order to meet the legal requirement in relation to the breach. They said that a series of new and more robust quality checks would be introduced to ensure that in future people consistently benefited from receiving all the care and facilities they needed and expected. They said that the necessary improvements would be completed by 22 March 2016.

This report only covers our findings in relation to the action taken by the registered persons to meet the breach of legal requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for Jasmine Healthcare Ltd on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

At this inspection, we found that the registered persons had introduced most of the quality checks that were necessary to ensure that people reliably received all of the care and facilities they needed. This meant that the breach of the legal requirement had been met. However, some further improvements were still needed. These included strengthening the way in which people were consulted about the development of the service. In addition, more steps needed to be taken to address some remaining defects in the accommodation.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service well-led?

The registered persons had introduced most of the quality checks that were necessary to ensure that people reliably received all of the care and facilities they needed. However, some further improvements were still needed to better enable people to contribute to the development of the service. Also, additional steps needed to be taken to address some remaining defects in the accommodation.

We have not revised the rating for this key question, to improve the rating to 'Good'. This is because we need to be sure that the registered persons continue to develop the way in which quality checks are completed. This is necessary to ensure that people fully benefit from receiving care and facilities that meet their needs and wishes.

We will review our rating for 'well led' at the next comprehensive inspection.

Requires Improvement ●

St Andrew's Nursing and Care Home

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We undertook a focused inspection of St Andrew's Nursing and Care Home on 20 September 2016 to follow up on a breach of a legal requirement we had identified at our comprehensive inspection on 10 February 2016. This inspection was completed to check that the registered persons had made the improvements necessary to ensure that people who lived in the service reliably benefited from having all of the care and facilities they needed and expected to receive.

Our inspection was unannounced and the inspection team consisted of a single inspector.

We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service well-led? This was because at our earlier inspection the registered persons were not meeting a legal requirement in relation to this section.

During our inspection we spoke with six people who lived in the service. We also spoke with two health care assistants, the laundry manager, two maintenance managers, the chef, a nurse, the activities manager, the deputy and the registered manager. In addition, we examined documents and records that described the systems and processes used by the registered persons to monitor and assure the quality of the care provided in the service. We also examined parts of the accommodation and equipment provided by the service, observed the arrangements used to support people to enjoy their meals and established how well people were being supported to participate in social activities.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

When we carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 10 February 2016 we found that there was a breach of a legal requirement. This was because the registered persons had not consistently completed robust checks to closely monitor the quality of all the care and facilities provided in the service. This had resulted in there being a number of shortfalls in how the service was run that had not been quickly put right.

The problems we noted included robust recruitment checks not always being completed. This had reduced the registered persons' ability to establish that applicants could demonstrate their previous good conduct and were suitable people to work in the service. We also identified various defects in the accommodation that increased the risk of people falling and injuring themselves. These included trip hazards resulting from worn floor coverings. There was also a frame surrounding a toilet that was intended to give people a secure grip but which was loose. In addition, the access to one toilet was difficult due to items of equipment that were inappropriately stored in the room. Other defects in the accommodation included damaged decorative finishes, broken light pull-chords, doors that did not have signs to explain where they led to and clocks in public areas showing the wrong time.

We also noted that people had not always been protected from the risk of acquiring an avoidable infection. This was because not all parts of the medicines store room were neat and clean. A further issue involved there not being enough slings that attached to the hoists which were used to assist people who had limited mobility. As a result of this people often had to be assisted with slings that had been used by other people and which may have needed to be cleaned before being used again.

In addition, we saw that at lunchtime some people were not offered the opportunity to leave their armchairs and enjoy having their meals in the dining area. Another issue involved the tables in the dining area not being laid out in attractive way because there were no individual place settings and condiments were not provided. These oversights had reduced people's ability to enjoy their dining experience.

Another problem involved the way in which people were invited to participate in social activities. Some people thought that they were not offered the opportunity to enjoy social activities frequently enough. Also, records did not clearly show how well this aspect of the service was meeting people's needs and expectations.

Although none of these shortfalls has resulted in people experiencing direct harm they had reduced their ability to benefit from receiving all of the care and facilities they needed.

After our inspection of 10 February 2016 the registered persons wrote to us to say what improvements they intended to make in order to meet the legal requirement in relation to the breach. They said that a series of new and more robust quality checks would be introduced to ensure that in future people consistently benefited from receiving the care and facilities they needed and expected. In particular, they said that each of the problems we have noted above would be put right so that the service reliably met people's needs and

wishes. They said that all of the necessary improvements would be completed by 22 March 2016.

At this inspection we found that new and more robust quality checks had been introduced. These improvements had resulted in effective action being taken to resolve most of the shortfalls we previously noted in the care and facilities provided in the service. We found that quality checks had resulted in the recruitment system being strengthened. Records showed that this had helped to ensure that suitable assurances had been received about applicants' previous good conduct before new staff were appointed.

We also saw that quality checks of the accommodation had ensured that repairs had been completed to reduce the risk of people tripping and falling. In addition, significant progress had been made in addressing shortfalls in the general standard of the decoration including most painted wood finishes, the condition of light chord pulls, most signage on doors and the correct setting of the time on clocks in communal areas. However, we found that quality checks had not resulted in all environmental defects being addressed. In particular, further improvements were needed to put right a small number of areas where decorative finishes remained scuffed or marked. Also, further attention was needed to ensure that clear signs were displayed to support people to be familiar with the layout of their home.

We found that quality checks had resulted in suitable provision being made to reduce the risk of people acquiring avoidable infections. We noted that additional slings had been provided so that people only used their own items when being assisted to transfer by using a hoist. In addition, we found that the medicines store room had been extensively refurbished so that it could be kept in a neat, clean and hygienic condition.

However, other quality checks completed by the registered persons had not always quickly resolved issues that were important to some of the people who lived in the service. Although new arrangements had been made to enable more people to have their meals in the dining area a number of people told us that further improvements needed to be made to the quality of the meals they were offered. Summarising these comments a person said, "I think that some of the meals are quite poor and no one seems to question when food is returned to the kitchen uneaten." Another person remarked, "I would like to be asked my opinion more about things like the meals we get but no one encourages this sort of contribution."

We were told that the chef regularly consulted with people about the dishes they would like to be offered. However, this process was not recorded and so the registered persons could not readily check how well this arrangement was working. We raised this matter with the registered manager who said that in future they would ensure that the discussions in question would be recorded. They also said that they would check these records to better ensure that any suggested improvements were quickly introduced. In addition, after our inspection visit the Care and Operations Director provided us with further assurances that people were being actively consulted about the catering arrangements. They submitted records to show that in the course of 2016 people had been invited to complete a quality questionnaire to give feedback about how well the catering system was meeting their expectations.

Some people also expressed reservations about how well they were supported to pursue their hobbies and interests. One of them said, "It can be a long day here without anything much to do. There is an activities coordinator but she can't get around to everyone and then on some days she has to help out with care if they're short of staff." Another person said, "I'd like to be asked more about social activities and other things to do with the running of the place. The people who live here can best say what's right and what's not after all."

The activities manager said that they regularly supported people to enjoy participating in a range of events such as quizzes, games and gentle exercises. However, we noted that the registered manager had not

regularly checked records that described how well people were being supported to pursue their hobbies and interests. This oversight had increased the risk that people would not be offered all of the opportunities they wanted to enjoy social activities. We raised this matter with the registered manager who said that steps would promptly be taken to consult with each person about the hobbies and interests they wanted to pursue. They also said that they would regularly check to ensure that each person was satisfied with this aspect of the support they received.