

Mrs Brenda Tapsell

The Granleys

Inspection report

21 Griffiths Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 7BE

Tel: 01242521721
Website: www.thegranleys.com

Date of inspection visit:
10 December 2015

Date of publication:
06 January 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 23 and 24 September 2015 at which a breach of legal requirements was found. This was because the registered person had not protected people against the risks of injury or harm. People's medicines had not been administered safely.

After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. We undertook a focused inspection on 10 December 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 'The Granleys' on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

The Granleys had 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 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

At our unannounced focused inspection on 10 December 2015 we found the provider had followed the action plan which they had told us would be completed by 30 November 2015 and legal requirements had been met.

The Granleys provides accommodation for up to 17 people with a learning disability. At the time of our inspection there were 17 people living there. People had a range of support needs including help with their personal care, moving about and assistance if they became anxious. Staff support was provided at the home at all times and people required supervision by a member of staff when away from the home. Each person had their own bedroom. They shared a bathroom and shower rooms as well as living and dining areas. The home was surrounded by gardens which were accessible to people.

People were protected against the risks of harm or injury. Action had been taken to prevent further accidents and incidents to people. Referrals to health care professionals had been followed up and their recommendations followed. Medicines were being administered safely and in line with national guidance.

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 safety. People were being protected against the risks of injury or harm. Systems for the administration of medicines had improved, following national guidance.

We could not improve the rating for safe to good because to do so requires consistent good practice over time. We will check this during our next planned comprehensive inspection.

Requires Improvement ●

The Granleys

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 is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

We undertook a focused inspection of The Granleys on 10 December 2015. This inspection was completed to check that improvements to meet legal requirements, in relation to the breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014, planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 23 and 24 September 2015 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe. This is because the service was not meeting legal requirements in relation to that question. The inspection was undertaken by one inspector and was unannounced.

Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service. This included the provider's action plan, which set out the action they would take to meet legal requirements and examples of the new records they planned to use.

During the visit we spoke with the registered manager, two staff and reviewed the care records for three people who used the service. We looked at accident and incident records as well as medicines administration records. We spent time observing the care and support provided to people. We contacted one health care professional.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of The Granleys on 23 and 24 September 2015 we found the registered person had not protected people against risks and action had not been taken to prevent the potential of harm. People's medicines were not managed safely. This was a breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our focused inspection on 10 December 2015 we found the provider had followed their action plan to meet shortfalls in relation to the requirements of Regulation 12 described above. Records evidenced contact with health care professionals seeking their advice and support to keep one person safe. An assessment of the person in October 2015 had resulted in the provision of bed sides to be used at night when they were being changed, moved or repositioned in bed. The registered manager confirmed the bed-sides were not used whilst the person slept but to prevent them from rolling out of bed when receiving support from staff. An occupational therapist had advised how to support a person with their mobility and was considering equipment which could be provided to make showering safe. Staff confirmed until they had this equipment the person was being supported by two staff when having a full body wash. They were not using the shower. Their care records reflected this. Staff said these additional safeguards had prevented the person from having any more falls. Other people at risk of falls had safeguards in place to keep them safe. Staff described how they monitored people closely when moving around the home. People were being protected against known risks.

People's medicines were being managed safely. Medicines were supplied each week and the medicine administration record (MAR) recorded stock levels for medicines delivered in blister packs. Records had been designed to audit the stock records for medicines kept in boxes or given to people as needed. There was evidence of authorisation from the GP for the use of homely remedies. Where medicines were given to people in their drink or food, there was evidence of an assessment confirming they were unable to consent to this and that their medicines were given this way in their best interests. The staff and health care professionals involved in this decision had been signed this record.