

Morris Care Limited Corbrook Park

Inspection report

Audlem Road Audlem Crewe Cheshire CW3 0HF Date of inspection visit: 12 January 2021

Date of publication: 02 February 2021

Tel: 01270812324 Website: www.morriscare.co.uk

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inspected but not rated

Is the service safe?

Inspected but not rated

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Corbrook Park accommodates up to 80 people across two separate units, each of which have separate adapted facilities. One of the units specialises in providing care to people living with dementia. At the time of the inspection there were 61 people living at the home.

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

There were enough staff to meet the needs of people using the service. People and their relatives were positive about the responsiveness of staff and communication at the home.

There had been some changes to the way staff were deployed throughout the building and this approach was still being embedded. Whilst some staff described feeling busy and rushed, overall staff told us they had time to meet people's individual needs. Staffing levels were adjusted depending on the dependency of people being supported.

There was a focus on the recruitment of new staff, with a plan in place along with a new strategy to retain staff, with support and mentoring. Staff were safely recruited to work at the home.

Risks to people were assessed and measures taken to minimise risk. The provider had identified issues with recording onto the new electronic system, to demonstrate the care people had received. Training was in progress.

Following the inspection, the manager sought guidance from the local authority and further training is being arranged in relation to local safeguarding procedures.

We were assured staff were following relevant guidance and procedures in relation to infection control and prevention. Appropriate measures were in place to manage the current outbreak of Covid–19 at the home. They had experienced a delay in the supply of further lateral flow devices, impacting of aspects of testing, this was appropriately escalated and has now been resolved.

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

Rating at last inspection.

The last rating for this service was good (published 23 March 2018).

Why we inspected

The inspection was prompted in part due to concerns received about staffing levels and the safe management of risk in relation to falls and the development of pressure ulcers. A decision was made for us to inspect and examine those risks.

CQC have introduced targeted inspections to follow up on Warning Notices or to check specific concerns. They do not look at an entire key question, only the part of the key question we are specifically concerned about. Targeted inspections do not change the rating from the previous inspection. This is because they do not assess all areas of a key question.

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 coronavirus and other infection outbreaks effectively.

We found no evidence during this inspection that people were at risk of harm from this concern. Please see the safe section of this full report.

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

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our reinspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Further information is in the detailed findings below.

Inspected but not rated



Corbrook Park

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

This was a targeted inspection to check on a specific concern we had about staffing levels and the safe management of risk.

As part of this inspection we looked at the infection control and prevention measures in place. This was conducted so we can understand the preparedness of the service in preventing or managing an infection outbreak, and to identify good practice we can share with other services.

Inspection team The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Service and service type

Corbrook Park 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.

The service did not have a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. A registered manager and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided. There was a manager in post who had started the process to register with CQC.

Notice of inspection

We gave a short notice period of the inspection because of the risks associated with Covid-19. This meant that we could discuss how to ensure everyone remained safe during the inspection.

What we did before inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We gathered feedback from the local authority who commission some people's care at the service. We used this information to plan our inspection. The provider was not asked to complete a provider information return prior to this inspection. This is information we require providers to send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make.

Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic we were mindful about the amount of time the inspector was on site. This was to reduce the risk of transmitting any infection. We therefore asked the manager to send some records for us to review and gathered some feedback via telephone.

During the inspection

We spoke with five people who used the service and contacted a further three relatives over the telephone, about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with seven members of staff including the manager, head of operations, nurses, care workers and domestic staff. We made observations of the care provided.

We reviewed a range of records both onsite and remotely, including records relating to staffing, the management of risk, policies and procedures, audits and accident and incident records. We reviewed a sample of seven people's care records.

After the inspection

We carried out telephone interviews with a further six staff, including kitchen and night staff. We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found.

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 this key question was rated as good. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we have only looked at the part of the key question we had specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to check a specific concern we had about staffing levels and the management of risk, including falls and pressure ulcers. We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

Staffing and recruitment

- There were enough staff to meet the needs of people using the service.
- The provider had reviewed the deployment of staff and were promoting a "whole team" approach throughout the building, which needed to be further embedded. A tool was used to assess the staffing required against the dependency of people living at the home. This was due to be reviewed to ensure the layout of the building was considered within the assessment.
- Staff views varied, some described being rushed, whilst other said they had time to meet people's individual needs and that staffing would be adjusted if needed.
- People were currently being encouraged to self-isolate in their rooms due to Covid-19 which impacted on staff time and staffing had been adjusted.
- People told us staff were responsive and knew their needs well. Comments included, "I love it here" and "Staff are usually prompt with the call bell." Some people liked to have a daily bath or shower and staff were able to meet these preferences.
- The service had been utilising agency staff. The provider had recently implemented a recruitment plan along with a retention strategy, including ways to support and mentor new staff.
- Safer staff recruitment procedures were in place and being followed.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risk assessments were carried out and action was taken to mitigate risk, such as providing sensor mats, low beds and bed rails where necessary. These measures helped to reduce the risk of people falling.
- Relatives were very positive about the safety, support and communication at the home. They told us "I wouldn't want (name) anywhere else" and "(Name's) dementia has deteriorated and I can't fault them."
- Risks in relation to the prevention of pressure ulcers were monitored. The management team had robust oversight of any wounds. Those which had developed due to pressure, had in the main been resolved, demonstrating that appropriate care had been provided.
- Records were kept to evidence positional turns were carried out, but these were not always in line with the requirements of the person's care plan. We were assured this was a recording issue due to the new electronic recording system and further staff training was in progress.
- Accidents and incidents were recorded and monitored. There had been some recent issues with the inputting of information on to the system, which meant there appeared to be more incidents than had

occurred in the previous month. These had been reviewed and action taken to manage any future risk had been considered.

• Where necessary support from appropriate professionals was sought in response to concerns or risk. However, there was an incident which had not been referred under to the local authority under procedures where required. This has now been referred. The manager was relatively new to the area and has subsequently sought guidance from the LA and further training is being arranged.

Preventing and controlling infection

• The service had experienced a delay in the receipt of Lateral Flow Device (LFD) supplies. This meant they had been unable to follow the guidance around aspects of testing in response to an outbreak. However, they had appropriately escalated the situation to the relevant body. Other testing was being carried out.

- We were assured that the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.
- We were assured that the provider was meeting shielding and social distancing rules.
- We were assured that the provider was admitting people safely to the service.
- We were assured that the provider was using PPE effectively and safely.
- We were assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises.

• We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.

• We were assured that the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.