

Mendips Residential Care Home Limited

The Mendips Residential Care Home

Inspection report

2-3 Shamrock Road, Upper Eastville,
Bristol, BS5 6RL
Tel: 0117 9518548
Website: N/A

Date of inspection visit: 21 May 2015
Date of publication: 02/07/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires improvement



Is the service safe?

Requires improvement



Is the service effective?

Requires improvement



Is the service responsive?

Requires improvement



Is the service well-led?

Requires improvement



Overall summary

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of The Mendips Residential Care Home on 19 November 2014. Five breaches of the legal requirements were found at that time. After the inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet the legal requirements.

We undertook a focused inspection on 21 May 2015 to check the provider had followed their plan and to confirm they now met the legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to these areas. You can

read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'All reports' link for 'The Mendips Residential Care Home' on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

The Mendips Residential Care Home is a care home without nursing for up to nine adults with mental health needs. There were six people living at the home at the time of our inspection.

There was a registered manager in post. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like

Summary of findings

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 our focused inspection on 21 May 2015 we found that the provider had taken action in order to meet the legal requirements.

Action had been taken to improve the way people's medicines were managed. We also found the documentation had improved in respect of people's mental capacity. The records showed people's rights were being protected in accordance with the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

People told us they could talk to staff or the registered manager about changes in their needs. Action had been taken since the last inspection to ensure people's care plans were kept up to date. For example, a change in one person's health had been recorded in their care plan and information added about how this affected their diet.

The provider was meeting the legal requirements by ensuring the Commission was notified of certain events. Audits were being undertaken in order to check standards in the home and to identify where any improvements were needed.

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?

We found that action had been taken to improve the way people's medicines were managed and to meet the legal requirements.

Records of the administration of medicines were maintained and kept up to date. Another record showed that people's medicines were being returned to the pharmacist when no longer needed.

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 safe at the next planned comprehensive inspection.

Requires improvement



Is the service effective?

We found that action had been taken to improve the documentation in relation to consent and mental capacity. The records showed more clearly that the provider was complying with the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

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 effective at the next planned comprehensive inspection.

Requires improvement



Is the service responsive?

We found that action had been taken to meet the legal requirements. People's care needs were being reviewed and their care plans updated to reflect any changes.

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 comprehensive inspection.

Requires improvement



Is the service well-led?

We found that action had been taken to meet the legal requirements. The Commission had been notified when certain events had arisen, as is required under the regulations.

Audits were being undertaken each month. These were a way of checking standards in the home and identifying where improvements were needed.

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 well led at the next planned comprehensive inspection.

Requires improvement



The Mendips Residential Care 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. 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.

We undertook a focused inspection of The Mendips Residential Care Home on 21 May 2015. We checked that the improvements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 19 November 2014 had been made.

This involved inspecting the service against four of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe, is the service effective, is the service responsive and is the service well led. This is because the breaches found at the last inspection were in relation to these questions.

The inspection was unannounced and undertaken by one inspector. Before carrying out the inspection, we reviewed the information we held about the home. This included the report we received from the provider which set out the action they would take to meet legal requirements. We looked at the notifications we had received. Notifications are information about important events which the provider is required to tell us about by law.

During our inspection we spoke with two people who lived at the home, a staff member and the registered manager. We looked at two people's care records, together with other records relating to their support and the running of the service. These included records relating to medicines and quality assurance.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At the inspection of The Mendips on 19 November 2014 we found that people's medicines were not always being managed in a safe way. There were shortcomings in the recording of medicines and in their disposal.

This was a breach of Regulation 12(2)(g) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our focused inspection on 21 May 2015 we found the provider had taken most of the actions they had planned to in order to meet this regulation.

A record was kept of medicines received into the home. Records showed that people's medicines were being administered to them as prescribed. Another record showed that medicines had been returned to the pharmacist when no longer needed. The registered manager told us there were currently no medicines waiting to be disposed of.

Medicines were being kept in a locked facility. We reported at the last inspection that the registered manager was making changes, which included moving the cabinet from the dining room to an area that was more private.

A staff member said they supported people with their medicines and followed procedures to ensure this was done safely. They understood that people had the right to refuse their medicines if they chose to. A record of such occasions was being kept, which provided information for when people's needs were being reviewed.

Overall, we found that improvements had been made in the management of people's medicines. The registered manager told us they completed a weekly check of the medicines to ensure stock levels were appropriate and the records were being completed accurately. These checks were not being recorded however. The registered manager told us they would start to keep a record of the checks. They also confirmed that any handwritten entries in the medicines records would in future always be signed by the staff member who had made the entry. This was not happening consistently.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At the inspection of The Mendips on 19 November 2014 there had been a lack of documentation in relation to consent and mental capacity. The records did not clearly show that people's rights were being protected in accordance with the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

This was a breach of the Regulation 11 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our focused inspection on 21 May 2015 we found the provider had taken the action they had planned in order to

meet this regulation. We saw a new form was being used to document the outcome of mental capacity assessments. This was designed to ensure there was a clear record of the assessments undertaken on a decision by decision basis.

We saw examples of the assessment forms on people's files. They showed that people's capacity to make decisions had been assessed in a number of areas. These included, for example, the ability to manage their own finances and to provide 'meaningful consent' to living at the home.

Information had also been recorded about the support people needed with making decisions. We read, for example, it was important that staff spoke to one person about their medicines to ensure they had a good understanding of what was prescribed and when they needed to take this.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At the inspection of The Mendips on 19 November 2014 we found people were at risk of receiving care that did not meet their needs. This was because accurate and up to date records were not being maintained. There was a lack of information about reviews of people's care plans and assessments.

This was a breach of Regulation 17(2) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our focused inspection on 21 May 2015 we found the provider had taken the action they had planned in order to meet this regulation. Reviews of people's needs were taking place; their care plans had been updated to reflect the changes which had been made in their care.

A staff member told us they thought the care plans gave a good picture of people's current needs. The registered manager said it was the intention to review people's care plans every six months or sooner if the need arose. They told us a schedule for review meetings had been produced to ensure they were planned in advance and took place at regular intervals.

People told us they could talk to staff and to the registered manager about their needs and the support they received. We heard that one person's health needs had changed since the last inspection. They had a care plan dated 25 February 2015; this had been updated in April 2015 to reflect the changes in the person's needs. Information had been recorded about their health and a change in diet that had been made.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At the inspection on 19 November 2014 we found the registered person had not always notified the Commission as required when certain events had arisen. This was a breach of Regulation 18 of the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009.

The registered person had also been in breach of Regulation 17 of The Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. This was because they did not have an effective system in place for assessing and monitoring the quality of the service. Areas in need of improvement were not always being identified and followed up.

We found that the provider had taken action to comply with these regulations. Since the last inspection we have received information, through the notification process, of

significant events at the home. At our focused inspection 21 May 2015, the registered manager confirmed they were aware of the different type of events which they were required to tell us about.

In respect of Regulation 17, the registered manager had completed a number of monthly audits since the last inspection. A number of areas were looked at each month through the audit process. These included the completion of care documentation, risk assessments and other records. The audits also involved gaining feedback from people who used the service and from staff.

The audits provided a means of monitoring standards in the home and of gaining feedback about the service. The outcome of the monthly audits had been recorded, although there were gaps where certain sections had not been completed. However, improvements had been made and the registered manager confirmed a more consistent approach would be taken in the future to completing each part of the audit form.