

Manor Care Group Limited

Manor House Residential Home

Inspection report

1 Walsall Road
Willenhall
West Midlands
WV13 2EH

Tel: 01902603754

Date of inspection visit:
14 March 2023

Date of publication:
05 April 2023

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Manor House Residential Home is a residential care home providing personal care and accommodation to up to 30 people. The service provides support to older people and people with dementia. At the time of our inspection there were 29 people using the service.

People's experience of using this service and what we found.

The provider had safeguarding systems and processes in place to keep people safe. Staff knew about the risks to people and followed the assessments to ensure they met people's needs.

People received their medicines safely and as prescribed and were supported by sufficient numbers of staff to ensure that risk of harm was minimised.

Staff had been recruited appropriately and had received relevant training, so they were able to support people with their individual care and support needs.

People felt safe and were supported by staff who knew how to protect them from avoidable harm.

Staff sought people's consent before providing care and support. People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way and in their best interests: the policies and systems in the service supported this practice. People's individual communication needs were considered to support them to be involved in their care.

Audits undertaken by the provider were effective at monitoring the quality of the service. Staff spoke positively about working for the provider. They felt well supported and that they could talk to the management team at any time, feeling confident any concerns would be acted on promptly. They felt valued and happy in their role.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection and update

The last rating for the service was good (published on 19 December 2019).

Why we inspected

This inspection was prompted by a review of the information we held about this service. A decision was made for us to inspect and examine the information we had reviewed. As a result, we undertook a focused inspection to review the key questions of safe and well led.

For those key questions not inspected, we used the ratings awarded at the last inspection to calculate the overall rating. The overall rating for the service has remained good. This is based on the findings at this

inspection.

We looked at infection prevention and control measures under the safe key question. We look at this in all care home inspections even if no concerns or risks have been identified. This is to provide assurance that the service can respond to COVID-19 and other infection outbreaks effectively.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Manor House Residential Home on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service, which will help inform when we next inspect.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Good ●

The service was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well led.

Details are in our well-led findings below.

Manor House Residential Home

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by 1 inspector, 1 specialist advisor who was a nurse and 1 Expert by Experience. An Expert by Experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

Service and service type

Manor House Residential Home is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

Registered manager

This service is required to have a registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

At the time of our inspection there were two registered managers in post.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return. This is information providers are required to send us with key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. This information helps support our inspections. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We spoke with 4 people who used the service and 9 relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with one visiting professional, 5 members of staff including the registered manager, senior care staff, team leader and care workers.

We reviewed a range of records. This included 8 people's care records, quality assurance records and multiple medication records. We looked at 2 staff files in relation to recruitment and staff supervision. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including policies and procedures were reviewed.

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found, including information about the provider's staff training program and medicines documentation.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At the last inspection we rated this key question requires improvement. At this inspection the rating for this key question has changed good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People and their relatives explained how staff maintained people's safety. A relative told us, "[Name of person] is safe, every time I see them, they have improved. [Name of person] was in poor health and frail; they are happy now."
- People were protected from potential abuse by staff who had regular safeguarding training and knew about the different types of abuse. One staff member told us, "There are many different types of abuse such as physical, verbal, emotional, financial and institutional."
- The provider had safeguarding systems in place and staff had a good understanding of what to do to make sure people were protected from avoidable harm or abuse. One staff member told us, "If I witnessed or became aware of any type of abuse, I report it to the management. If I was unhappy with how it was dealt with, I would contact the safeguarding local authority team and CQC."

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risk to people had been appropriately managed. There were robust risk assessments in place to guide staff to how they should support people safely.
- The provider assessed risk from both people and the environment, we found risk assessments contained information to keep people safe. For example, people who had a visual impairment had risk assessments in place with detailed instructions for staff to follow to keep them safe.
- People had individual personal evacuation plans (PEEPS) to ensure they were supported safely in the case of an emergency.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The MCA requires that, as far as possible, people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the Mental Capacity Act (MCA). In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)

- We found the service was working within the principles of the MCA.
- We found the provider had sent Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) authorisation requests for people who lacked capacity and for some of these were waiting for applications to be authorised by the

local authority.

- Staff had received training in the MCA and had some basic knowledge of the Act. People were asked for their consent before they received any care and treatment. For example, before assisting people with personal care. Staff involved people in decisions about their care and acted in accordance with their wishes.

Staffing and recruitment

- Staff had been recruited safely. All pre-employment checks had been carried out including reference checks from previous employers and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. A DBS check enables a potential employer to assess a staff member's criminal history to ensure they were suitable for employment
- Our observations during the day, indicated there were enough staff on duty to support people with their care needs. People and their relatives told us there was enough staff to meet people's needs.

Using medicines safely

- People received their medicines safely and as prescribed. People told us they received their medicines when they needed them.
- People's care plans detailed how they preferred to take their medicines including clear protocols for medicines given 'as and when' required.
- The provider had procedures to ensure medicines were stored and managed safely.
- Staff who administered medicines had been specifically trained to do so and the management team completed regular competency checks to ensure procedures were followed.
- Medicine Administration Records (MAR) noted all medicines were administered correctly and medicine count records accurately recorded the total of each medicine in stock.

Preventing and controlling infection

- We were assured the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.
- We were assured the provider was supporting people living at the service to minimise the spread of infection.
- We were assured the provider was admitting people safely to the service.
- We were assured the provider was using PPE effectively and safely.
- We were assured the provider was responding effectively to risks and signs of infection.
- We were assured the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises.
- We were assured the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.
- We were assured the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.

Visiting in care homes

- The provider was facilitating visits for people living in the home in accordance with the current guidance. The registered manager confirmed if the home experienced an infection outbreak, relatives could still visit via a telephone booking system and have temperature checks undertaken upon arrival.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Accident and incident records were completed and monitored by the registered manager to reduce the likelihood of reoccurrence.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

At the last inspection we rated this key question requires improvement. At this inspection the rating for this key question has changed to good. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- Improvements had been made since our last inspection to ensure medicines administered by skin patches were regularly rotated and actions taken recorded.
- Improvements had been made to recruitment documentation ensuring all required records were kept. The management team reviewed records to ensure care records and risk assessments were up to date.
- The provider and registered manager had systems and processes in place to audit the quality of the services provided.
- People were supported by staff who were motivated to carry out their role.
- Staff received regular supervisions where they had the opportunity to discuss their role and performance.
- Staff were aware how to raise a concern and told us they would do if the need arose.
- In accordance with their legal responsibilities, the provider had informed us about significant events which occurred at the service within required timescales.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- People and their relatives spoke positively about the care they received and of the way the service was run.
- One relative said, "The [management team] are very approachable." Another relative told us, "I can book to speak to them [management team], they have an open-door policy."
- All staff were committed to providing people with a high standard of care which was tailored to their needs and preferences.

How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong

- The registered manager understood the duty of candour and was open and honest about where the service needed to improve.
- The provider promoted an ethos of openness and transparency which had been adopted by all staff.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- The registered manager confirmed feedback was obtained from relatives using structured telephone calls,

surveys and questionnaires. We reviewed the results from the last survey and the feedback received was positive.

- People's views were sought daily when receiving support.
- There were regular meetings for staff and their views were encouraged. Staff told us they felt valued and their views were respected. One staff member told us, "We have regular team meetings, we raise improvement ideas and they are then put in place."
- People and their relatives knew how to provide feedback about their experiences of care and the service provided a range of accessible ways to do this such as regular phone calls with the management.

Continuous learning and improving care

- The management team spent time working with staff to identify areas that may need improvement.
- The registered manager ensured they always kept up to date with changing guidance. The management team ensured staff adhered to current guidance and best practice by carrying out spot checks on their practice. They also ensured policies had been updated to reflect these changes.
- Staff had completed training and they have access to continued learning so they had the skills to meet people's needs.

Working in partnership with others

- We found the provider was working in partnership with people's relatives, health professionals, local authority departments and various groups and services within the community to ensure that people were supported appropriately. A visiting nurse from the local authority case management team told us, "They are very good at engaging with us. They take onboard our recommendations; things have improved here and there is a great atmosphere at the home. It's a pleasure to work with them."