

Morris Care Limited

Corbrook Park

Inspection report

Corbrook Court, Audlem, Cheshire, CW3 0HF

Tel: 01270 812324

Website: <http://www.morriscare.co.uk/our-homes/corbrook-park>

Date of inspection visit: 11 August 2015

Date of publication: 12/10/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires improvement



Is the service responsive?

Good



Overall summary

Throughout this report we refer to the location as Corbrook Park. This is because although the home was called Corbrook Court when we originally inspected it has since changed its name to Corbrook Park.

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 22 and 30 January 2015 at which a breach of legal requirements was found. This was because sometimes people who lived in the home had to wait too long for a member of staff to respond to their call. We served a warning notice and required the registered provider to comply with the relevant regulation by 1 May 2015.

After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breach. We undertook a focused inspection on 11 August 2015 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 this topic. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for 'Corbrook Park' on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Corbrook Park provides accommodation for up to 45 people who require support with their personal care. The home mainly provides support for older people and people living with dementia. There were 28 people living at the home at the time of our inspection.

The home did not have a registered manager at the time of our last inspection. The manager has since registered with the Care Quality Commission. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the CQC 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.

Summary of findings

At our focused inspection on 11 August 2015 we found that the provider had followed their plan which they had told us would be completed by the 1 May 2015 and legal requirements had been met.

People who lived in the home told us that the response to call bells had improved and they did not find themselves having to wait as often as before. We saw that the provider had made improvements to the call bell system so that it had become easier for staff to become aware of calls and to respond to them more promptly. Staff we spoke with welcomed the change.

We saw that the registered manager was monitoring performance in answering calls and investigating any instances of delays. We were able to review electronic logs of call times and found these improved on what we had found at the last inspection.

The registered provider monitored the level of need of the people living in the home and related this to the level of staffing. We saw that over the last months since our inspection the level of staffing had remained stable whereas the level of need had decreased. This meant that there was more staff time available for the people who lived in the home.

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 responsive?

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

The call bell system in the home had been improved and both the people who lived there and the staff reported improvements in the time it took to respond to calls. This was confirmed by electronic call logs. The registered manager was auditing the responses. The relationship between people's needs and the level of staffing in the home was being reviewed monthly to make sure there were sufficient staff to respond to calls in a timely manner.

This meant that the provider was now meeting legal requirements.

We have revised the rating for this key question. We will review our rating for the whole home at the next comprehensive inspection.

Good



Corbrook Park

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 was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

We undertook a focused inspection of Corbrook Park on 11 August 2015. This inspection was completed to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 22 and 30 January 2015 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service responsive? This is because the service was not meeting legal requirements in relation to that question.

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector. Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the home which included the provider's action plan, which set out the action they would take to meet legal requirements.

During the visit to the home we spoke with six people who lived there, five members of care and nursing staff, the registered manager, and the chief operating officer for the company which operates the home.

After the visit we looked at logs of call bell response time with which we had been provided during our visit as well as staff rotas and a recent satisfaction survey.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At the comprehensive inspection of Corbrook Park on 22 and 30 January 2015 we asked people who lived in the home if they received help and assistance promptly when they used the call bell system. They told us they sometimes had to wait too long for a member of staff to respond to their call. We looked at the call bell logs records for some of the bedrooms. Response times were usually under five minutes and sometimes within a minute but the records also showed that on occasions people had had to wait for more than 20 minutes for their call to be answered. The records also recorded some response times in excess of half an hour. This would be too long for someone to wait if they had an urgent personal care need.

This was a continued breach of regulation 9 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010, which corresponds to regulation 9 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

During the current inspection we asked the people who lived in the home about call bell response rates since our last visit. One person told us “The call bells are sorted out. Staffing is ok” and another person said “It’s smashing here. The staff are very good”. A third person told us “They come to you when you buzz the call bell although there can be a delay if they are seeing to someone else” and a fourth said “Call bells are answered promptly”.

After our last inspection the registered provider told us that they would take a number of actions in order to achieve compliance with the regulation. These included supplementing the existing call bell system with additional visual displays and audible alarms with staff also carrying pagers. The registered manager undertook to provide closer monitoring of call bell response times which would be incorporated into the operating company’s audit procedures. The provider also undertook to ensure that the level of need of the people living in the home was regularly assessed and related to the level of staffing since availability of staff to respond to call bells could also be factor in determining response times. The registered provider also planned to deploy additional staff at peak times.

The registered manager told us that she was now reviewing call bell times and particularly investigated anything taking 10 minutes or more. We saw that she maintained a log of her own investigations and was aware of current performance in this area. She was aware that some people used the call bell more frequently and for other purposes than to request personal care and was actively looking for strategies to manage this situation so that it would not impact on those who needed care more immediately.

Staff were very positive about the new arrangements. One told us “The call bell system is fantastic – amazing!” Another told us that they found it much improved over the former system which had partly relied on a walkie-talkie system. Staff took the time to show us how the improved system worked and told us that they had set an aim amongst themselves of responding to calls within four minutes.

We asked for a sample of electronic call bell logs relating to four people who lived in the home. We found from these that the time taken to respond to calls had significantly reduced from what we had observed at our last inspection. The overwhelming majority of calls were answered within two minutes and many in less than sixty seconds.

We saw that monthly assessments were made of people’s needs and compared to the level of staffing to make sure that there were sufficient staff. We saw that the number of nursing and care staff hours had remained constant since February. However the assessed level of need had reduced by nearly 20%. This was partly as a consequence of fewer people living in the home as a result of which the top floor had been closed. As a result there was a higher ratio of staff to people who lived in the home.

We looked at a satisfaction survey which had been carried out in Spring 2015. Key questions with their response rates included “The arrangements for personal care” which had been rated 89% good or better, “Staff availability” which was rated 51% good or better and “Whether things get done when asked” which was rated 83% good or better.