

Coate Water Care Company (Church View Nursing Home) Limited

Westley Court Care Home

Inspection report

Austcliffe Lane
Cookley
Kidderminster
Worcestershire
DY10 3RT

Tel: 01562 852952

Website: www.coatewatercare.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 21 September 2015

Date of publication: 05/11/2015

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 25 February 2015. A breach of legal requirements was found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to staffing, regulation 18 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated activities) Regulations 2014.

We undertook this focused inspection on 21 September 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 those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Westley Court on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Westley Court provides nursing and personal care to a maximum of 33 people. There were 27 people who lived at Westley Court at the time of our inspection.

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 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 the 21 September 2015, we found that the provider had followed their plan which they had told us would be completed by the 31 July 2015 and legal requirements had been met.

People who we spoke with told us that the care they received reflected their needs and wishes. Staff felt that they had more time to spend with people to provide the care that people wanted.

The registered manager regularly reviewed people's dependency levels and used this to help ensure staffing levels reflected people's needs. Staffing levels were adapted to people's needs and more staff were scheduled to work for the busier times in the home, such as mornings and evening times. Staff told us that this worked well and felt able to attend to people's needs without having to rush.

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 there were enough staff on duty to meet people's needs and keep them safe.

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

Requires improvement



Westley Court 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.

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of Westley Court on 21 September 2015. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 25 February 2015 inspection 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 some legal requirements.

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector.

As part of the inspection we reviewed information we held about the service including statutory notifications that had been submitted. Statutory notifications include information about important events which the provider is required to send us by law. We also spoke with the local authority about information they held about the provider. They told us that they had no concerns about the home and a visit that was undertaken in July 2015 resulted in no action for them to take.

We spoke with five people who used the service and two relatives. We also spoke with four staff, and the registered manager. We reviewed the provider's dependency level charts, staff rotas and relatives' meeting minutes.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of Westley Court on 25 February 2015 we found that people did not always receive the support they needed with their personal care when they required it. People told us that during busy periods at the home they were required to wait for assistance from staff. Staff we spoke with explained how night shifts were unsafe due to staffing levels as people were left alone in communal areas and call bells would be left unanswered until staff became available. We were told how people were assisted to bed earlier than their preferred times due to staffing levels on the night shift.

This was a breach of the Regulation 18 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our focused inspection on 21 September 2015 we found that the provider had followed the action plan they had written to meet shortfalls in relation to the requirements of Regulation 18 described above.

The registered manager had undertaken a review of all people's care. This looked at how people's dependency needs reflected staffing levels and where staff were allocated to work throughout the home. The registered manager told us that following this review, some shift patterns were changed and additional staff were in place to reflect the busier times in the home. For example, the provider had hired an extra staff member to work an evening shift. This additional role was to help people with their evening meals and their bedtime routine. Staff we spoke with confirmed this happened and told us that there was now always a staff member in the communal areas and answering calls bells throughout this busier period in the evening.

People we spoke with told us they felt there was enough staff on duty to keep them safe. We spoke with a person who we had spoken with at our previous inspection. They told us that staff were now, "prompt at answering the call bell". They went on to say that staff always came when they rang the call bell and attended to their needs at the time

and they did not need to wait. They said that when they wished to go out with family, staff assisted them to get ready in good time. We asked whether they were able to go to bed at a time that they preferred; they confirmed that this happened at a time that suited them. They went on to say that, "There is a good team on at night".

Another person who we spoke with confirmed that staff answered the call bell and checked on them regularly, which they were glad of. They said, "someone always helps me". Relatives we spoke with told us that there were enough staff to meet their family member's care needs.

All staff we spoke with told us they had more time to spend with people and did not feel rushed when they were providing care. They told us that the extra staff member during the evening meant that people were not left alone and people's call bells could be answered promptly. Staff told us that they were clear of their roles and responsibilities and worked as a team. Staff told us that more staff were being recruited and how they supported the new staff into the roles. Staff felt positive about the changes, one staff member said, "The [registered manager] has made such a difference here, we are in a different place to where we were last year".

Staff told us that the registered manager was, "hands on" and would help if they were busy or short staffed as the registered manager was also a registered nurse. We spoke with the registered manager about covering unplanned staff absence. The registered manager explained that the use of agency staff was not always required for care staff but sometimes for nursing staff. The registered manager explained that new nurses were going through the provider's recruitment process which would reduce the need for agency nursing staff to be used.

While we found there had been positive improvements in people's experience of care, we could not improve the rating for safe from requires improvement to good. This is because to do so, the provider is required to demonstrate consistent good practice over time. We will check this during our next planned comprehensive inspection.