

Care Homes UK Ltd

Woodley Hall Care Home

Inspection report

1 Gill Court
Brunswick Village
Newcastle upon Tyne
Tyne and Wear
NE13 7DU

Date of inspection visit:
29 March 2018

Date of publication:
15 May 2018

Tel: 01912368205

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good ●
Is the service safe?	Good ●
Is the service effective?	Good ●
Is the service caring?	Good ●
Is the service responsive?	Good ●
Is the service well-led?	Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Woodley Hall Care Home is a residential care home for 21 people, some of whom are living with dementia. At the time of this inspection there were 19 people living at the home.

At our last inspection we rated the service good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

People and relatives told us they were happy with the care provided at the home. They also said the staff team were kind and caring.

People and staff felt the home was safe. Staff knew how to raise concerns if required.

Although staff felt more staff would be useful, staffing levels at the time of our inspection were appropriate to meet people's needs.

The provider completed recruitment checks to ensure only suitable staff worked at the home.

Medicines were managed safely. Only trained staff administered people's medicines and accurate records were maintained.

Staff carried out regular health and safety checks. There were procedures to ensure people received care in emergency situations.

Staff were well supported and received appropriate training.

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

People were supported to meet their nutritional and healthcare needs.

People's needs had been assessed. The information gathered was used to develop personalised care plans. These were evaluated regularly keep them up to date.

Care staff provided opportunities for people to participate in activities in the absence of the dedicated activity co-ordinator.

Although people gave good feedback about their care, they also knew how to raise concerns if required.

The home had an established registered manager. People, relatives and staff said the registered manager was supportive and approachable.

There were opportunities for people, relatives and staff to give their views about the home and the care provided.

The provider carried out quality assurance checks to help ensure people received a good standard of care.

Further information is in the detailed findings below.

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 remains Good.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Woodley Hall 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. 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.

This inspection took place on 29 March 2018 and was unannounced. One inspector carried out the inspection.

Before the inspection we reviewed all the information we held about the service, this included notifications of significant changes or events. We also reviewed the most recent inspection report from the local authority commissioners of the service.

During our inspection we spoke with four people who used the service and two relatives. We spoke with a range of staff including the registered manager, a senior care worker and a care worker. We reviewed a range of records including three people's care records, medicine records, training records and other records relating to the quality and safety of the service.

Our findings

When we last inspected Woodley Hall Care Home we concluded the home was safe and rated it Good. Following this inspection we found the home was still safe and our rating remains Good.

People told us the home was a safe place to live. One person commented, "I am very safe." Another person said, "I do feel safe here." A third person told us, "Oh you do (feel safe). Everybody is alright." One relative told us, "It gives me peace of mind knowing how well they are looking after [family member]."

Staff also felt the home was safe. One staff member commented, "The home is safe because you know who everybody is. There is a keypad system in place. The carers are second to none." Another staff member said, "I think it is a safe place to be." Staff were aware of the systems available to raise concerns such as safeguarding and whistle blowing. Staff told us they would raise concerns if required.

Staffing levels were appropriate to meet people's needs. One person commented, "They come as soon as they can. You have to appreciate they may be looking after somebody else who needs more help. You don't have to wait for long." Another person told us, "They answer the buzzer straightaway." We observed there was visible staff presence around the home throughout the time we spent there. The registered manager monitored staffing levels based on the needs of people living at the home. We viewed a dependency tool which showed more staff were employed than the tool suggested.

We spoke with staff about the staffing levels at the home. Although they said it would be nice to have more staff, people were safe and their needs met with the number of staff currently deployed. The registered manager told us they were aware of the pressure on the staff team and were actively recruiting more staff. One staff member told us, "We would always like more staff but the staffing levels are safe." Another staff member commented, "Staffing levels could be a little bit more, maybe a floater." A third staff member commented, "I know [registered manager] is employing people."

We found the home was clean and well maintained. Some areas of the home were in need of refurbishment, such as the carpets. The registered manager discussed this with a relative at the relatives' meeting. They confirmed plans were in place to address this. One person told us, "Everything is beautiful and clean."

The provider carried out pre-employment checks to make sure new staff were suitable to work at the home. This included requesting and receiving references and checks with the disclosure and barring service (DBS). DBS checks are carried out to confirm whether prospective new staff had a criminal record or were barred

from working with vulnerable people. The registered manager kept a matrix of DBS checks and updated the checks periodically.

The provider managed medicines safely. Staff completed relevant training and medicines were stored securely. Medicines related records were accurate, such as for medicines administration records (MARs) and records for the receipt and disposal of medicines. Medicines care plans had been written for each person. These described the support people needed from staff to ensure they had their medicines safely.

Regular health and safety checks and risk assessments were carried out to help maintain a safe environment. Each person had a personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP) to help ensure they were supported appropriately in an emergency situation. Detailed records were kept of incidents and accidents that took place in the home. The registered manager completed an in-depth analysis of incidents which ensured lessons were learnt and the appropriate actions taken to keep people safe.



Our findings

When we last inspected Woodley Hall Care Home we concluded the home was effective and rated it Good. Following this inspection we found the home was still effective and our rating remains Good.

People's needs had been assessed to identify the care and support they needed. This information gathered was used as a starting point to develop their care plans.

Staff were well supported and received the training they needed. One staff member commented, "I am getting support from [registered manager]. A lot of support from the care staff. I get supervision and they are no bother with training." Another staff member told us, "I am very much supported, you can go to [registered manager] if you have problems. She listens to you, tells it as it is." Records showed training, supervision and appraisals were up to date.

People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). DoLS authorisations were in place for all relevant people. The registered manager kept a matrix as a reminder of which people had DoLS in place and when they needed to be renewed.

Staff had a good understanding of how to support people with day to day decisions and choices. For example, they told us about how they described things for one person who was registered blind to enable them to make clothing choices. For another person, they showed items for them to point out their choice.

People were supported with their nutritional needs. Staff had a good knowledge of people's dietary needs. They told us about some people who required altered textures such as a 'fork mashable' diet. One person had specific dietary requirements due to their cultural background. These needs were supported appropriately.

People gave us positive feedback about the meals provided at the home. One person commented, "The food is very good." Another person told us, "The food is lovely. [Cook] is a lovely lad. [Staff name] the other cook is also really good." One relative said, "The meals are good." One staff member commented, "There is a lot of home cooking."

People were supported to access health care services when needed. Records showed people regularly had

input from a range of health professionals. This included GPs, specialist nurses, community nurses and speech and language therapists (SALT). Where specific guidance had been provided this was incorporated into people's care plans for staff to follow.



Our findings

When we last inspected Woodley Hall Care Home we concluded the home was caring and rated it Good. Following this inspection we found the home was still caring and our rating remains Good.

People gave us very good feedback about the care provided at the home. They also told us staff were kind and caring. One person told us, "It's lovely here. They look after all the residents very well, they are all good. I love it here, I am so happy." Another person commented they liked "everything about the home". They said, "The staff are all lovely, you couldn't fault any of them. They come to see that you are alright, to see that you have everything you want." A third person said, "The staff are very nice. I can't complain." One relative said, "I am pleased with it. The staff are nice, caring. They look after [family member]. They look after me as well."

We observed good relationships between people and staff. There was lots of chatting and laughter throughout the day. One staff member said, "We can give the residents a lot of one to one care and attention and their family as well." Another staff member told us, "We get on really well with the residents. All the residents are lovely."

People were treated with dignity and respect. We observed staff were respectful when speaking with people and discreetly offered reassurance when needed. They always knocked on people's doors before entering their rooms. One person commented, "I am kept clean, that is the main thing." One staff member commented, "I think of them as my own parents."

Staff supported people to be as independent as possible. One staff member told us, "We let them do as much as they possibly can. Whatever people can't do, we offer help." We observed this during our time at the home. For example, staff offered prompts to encourage one person to eat their lunch independently.

Care records were personalised and included information about people's care preferences such as their likes and dislikes. A life history had been developed with involvement from relatives where possible. This meant information was available to help staff get to know people better.

Although nobody at the home had input from an advocate, information about advocacy services was displayed at the home.

Our findings

When we last inspected Woodley Hall Care Home we concluded the home was responsive and rated it Good. Following this inspection we found the home was still responsive and our rating remains Good.

People had care plans which were personalised and sufficiently detailed. These clearly described the care each person needed from staff. Where people had preferred routines or things that were important to them, this was described in the plan to help ensure they received consistent care. For example, one person wanted staff to consult with relatives before making decisions about aspects of their care. Care plans were evaluated monthly so that they remained relevant to people's current circumstances. For instance, the risk of one person experiencing skin damage had increased from a high risk to a very high risk. We noted as a consequence their risk assessment and care plan had been updated accordingly. The person was also referred to an external health care professional for additional advice. Other risk assessments were also completed for all people such as whether they were potentially at risk of falling and poor nutrition.

There were regular reviews of people's care involving relatives where appropriate. These were usually completed every six months. We noted from records that relatives' views about their family member's care were documented. Feedback from relatives had been positive in all the review records we looked at.

People were able to spend time doing activities they liked. For example one person commented, "I like reading, knitting and talking to people. I like listening to music." At the time of our inspection the home did not have a dedicated activity co-ordinator as they were currently absent from work. The registered manager told us an interim activity co-ordinator had recently left but their own activity co-ordinator was due back to work soon. In the meantime care staff and the registered manager were providing some activities on an afternoon. We observed one staff member spending time with a person doing their nails and chatting.

People and relatives gave positive feedback about the home. One person commented, "I have no complaints. I would talk to the senior but I haven't got any concerns." One relative told us, "I have none (complaints) whatsoever." There had been no recent complaints made about the home.

Our findings

When we last inspected Woodley Hall Care Home we concluded the home was well-led and rated it Good. Following this inspection we found the home was still well-led and our rating remains Good.

The home 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 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run. One person told us, "The [registered manager] is nice." Another person commented, "[Registered manager] is nice. They are all lovely." One relative commented, "I see [registered manager] occasionally. She is definitely approachable." One staff member told us, "I have every trust in [registered manager]. She is very approachable. She knows who all the residents are. I can turn to her with anything and she will do what she can to help."

Relatives and staff described the home as homely and friendly. One relative told us, "It has a homely atmosphere." One staff member commented the home was, "Homely, lovely and warm and friendly. Everyone is approachable." Another staff member said the atmosphere was "happy we all get on well with each other".

There were opportunities for people, relatives and staff to provide feedback about the home and the care provided. We viewed the feedback from the last consultation with residents and relatives dated January 2017. The feedback was positive with 100% of the seven replies stating they were either 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' with the atmosphere in the home, the standard of care and management of the home. The provider continued to hold regular meetings for residents, relatives and staff.

The provider continued to have a structured approach to quality assurance. This included regular checks of medicines management, care records and health and safety. Senior management, external to the home, also carried out checks on the home. These usually found the home to be meeting the expected standards with some minor suggestions made. On the day of our inspection a financial audit and a fire service inspection were also being carried out.