

The Shaw Foundation Limited

Treetops

Inspection report

St Clements Road
Keynsham
Bristol
BS31 1AF

Tel: 01179869700
Website: www.shaw.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
01 February 2016

Date of publication:
22 February 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

Inadequate ●

Is the service responsive?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out a focused inspection of Treetops on 4 September 2015. Following this inspection, we served two Warning Notices for a breach of two regulations of the Health and Social Care Act 2008. One Warning Notice related to premises and equipment. The home's garden was unsafe for people due to a number of hazards. The other Warning Notice concerned good governance. We had found significant omissions in records relating to food and fluid and repositioning. People were at risk of unsafe care because accurate records were not being maintained.

We undertook a focused inspection on 1 February 2016 to check the provider was meeting the legal requirements of the regulations they had breached and had complied with the Warning Notices. This report only covers our findings in relation to these areas. You can read the report from our last comprehensive and focused inspections, by selecting the 'All reports' link for 'Treetops' on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Treetops is a care home with nursing for up to 24 people. The home mainly provides support for older people who are living with dementia. There were 19 people living at Treetops at the time of our inspection.

A registered manager was in post at the time of our inspection. 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.

At this inspection, we found the provider had taken action to comply with the Warning Notices.

The garden had been made safe. Hazardous items had been removed or made safe. However regular checks were not being completed to ensure that safety issues were identified and addressed.

Improvements had been made in record keeping. Repositioning, food and fluid and personal evacuation plans were completed. However there was a lack of effective monitoring which could lead to unsafe care.

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 garden to make it safer for people. However, checks designed to ensure that a safe environment was maintained were not being carried out consistently.

We could not improve the rating for this key question from inadequate. There are additional areas for improvement required under this key question. In addition we would require a record of consistent good practice over time. We will review our rating for safe at the next planned inspection.

Inadequate ●

Is the service responsive?

Improvements had been made to personal evacuation plans and repositioning records.

The recording of food and fluid had improved. However, records were not being monitored regularly to ensure good standards were maintained.

We could not improve the rating for this key question from requires improvement; to do so would require a record of consistent good practice over time. We will review our rating for responsive at the next planned inspection.

Requires Improvement ●

Treetops

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. The inspection was planned to check whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

Following our inspection on 4 September 2015, we served two Warning Notices for breaches of two regulations of the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

We undertook a focused inspection of Treetops on 1 February 2016. During this inspection we checked that the improvements required by the provider after our last inspection had been made.

The inspection was unannounced and undertaken by one inspector. We inspected the service against two of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe, and is the service responsive. This is because the breaches found at the last inspection for which the Warning Notices were served were in relation to these questions.

During our focused inspection we spoke with the area manager and deputy manager. The registered manager was unavailable at the time of our inspection. We looked at seven people's care and support records and other records relating to their needs. These included food and fluid records, repositioning records and personal emergency evacuation plans.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our focused inspection of Treetops on 4 September 2015 we found that the outside area was hazardous and not safe or suitable for people. This was due to uneven paving, objects that were trip hazards, sharp and hazardous objects which could cause injury to people and clutter which could attract rodents.

At this inspection, we found the provider had taken sufficient action to achieve compliance with the Warning Notice and regulation.

We observed that the outside area was no longer hazardous or unsafe for people. The hazardous items and clutter had been removed. Outside taps were now safely covered. The paving was currently even and safe. The area manager told us this was being monitored as the tree causing the paving to lift may have to be removed if it reoccurs.

A handyman was now in post and had begun employment a week prior to our inspection. They were on site at least one day per week.

Although hazardous items had been removed, there were a large number of discarded cigarettes ends; the area manager said a suitable disposal method would be acquired immediately.

Records showed that a daily walk around was not being completed. The provider had identified these checks as being a way to ensure the outside area continued to remain safe. These checks had only been completed on 12 occasions from 1 December 2015 to 31 January 2016. These checks did not record any action or follow up to issues identified.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At our focused inspection of Treetops on 4 September 2015 we found that record keeping was insufficient to fully protect people from unsafe care and treatment. This was specifically in relation to food and fluid records, repositioning records and personal emergency evacuation plans.

We reviewed a sample of repositioning records. These records were fully complete. However there was no monitoring of these records by a team leader or manager to ensure that any concerns or issues were identified and followed up.

We reviewed food and fluid records for three people. These records contained accurate information about what people had eaten and the fluid they had consumed. However there continued to be inconsistent totalling of the fluids a person had in a 12 hour period. There was also a lack of monitoring by a team leader, as records were not consistently signed. We did find that when fluid consumption was low, this had been recorded at handover and followed through at the next shift to ensure this was monitored.

We reviewed a sample of four care records. Three out of four files contained a personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP). Therefore we looked at a further three records and these all contained a PEEP. We reviewed the 'grab and go' emergency file. This contained 17 PEEP records, however there were currently 19 people living at the home. The deputy manager said the two outstanding personal evacuation plans would be completed and both put in the person's file and the 'grab and go' file.