

Dual Care Limited

# The Rookery Care Home

## Inspection report

130 Church Street  
Eastwood  
Nottingham  
Nottinghamshire  
NG16 3HT

Tel: 01773713176

Date of inspection visit:  
15 February 2016

Date of publication:  
05 April 2016

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inadequate ●

Is the service safe?

**Inadequate** ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

Say when the inspection took place and whether the inspection was announced or unannounced. Where relevant, describe any breaches of legal requirements at your last inspection, and if so whether improvements have been made to meet the relevant requirement(s).

Provide a brief overview of the service (e.g. Type of care provided, size, facilities, number of people using it, whether there is or should be a registered manager etc).

N.B. If there is or should be a registered manager include this statement to describe what a registered manager is:

'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.'

Give a summary of your findings for the service, highlighting what the service does well and drawing attention to areas where improvements could be made. Where a breach of regulation has been identified, summarise, in plain English, how the provider was not meeting the requirements of the law and state 'You can see what action we told the provider to take at the back of the full version of the report.' Please note that the summary section will be used to populate the CQC website. Providers will be asked to share this section with the people who use their service and the staff that work at there.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service safe?

Inadequate 

We inspected this service on 15 February 2016. The Rookery Care Home is in the Eastwood area of Nottingham and owned and run by Dual Care Limited. The inspection was unannounced.

Following our inspection of 13 October 2015 breaches of legal requirements were found. We issued a warning notice for the breach of Regulation 12 Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Safe Care and Treatment.

We undertook this focused inspection to confirm that the provider had met the requirements of the warning notice. 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 The Rookery Care Home on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

The service had a registered manager in place at the time of our inspection. 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 last inspection of 13 October 2015 we asked the provider to take action to ensure safe care and treatment was provided by updating risk assessments and care plans and improving recruitment procedures. We also told the provider they must protect people from risk, the spread of infection and ensure sufficient numbers of staff were on duty to meet people's needs safely.

During this inspection we found that improvements had been made and safe care and treatment was provided. Care plans and risk assessments we looked at had been updated and relevant information included. The necessary improvements in regard to the environment had been made as well as medicine management. Daily cleaning and infection control checks were completed and an audit was in progress. Staff files we reviewed showed that appropriate pre-employment checks were carried

out to assure the provider of the good character, conduct and abilities of staff. Additional staff had been employed to ensure people's needs were met in a timely manner.

Although we found there had been improvements to the quality of the service, the overall rating for this provider remains 'Inadequate' We could not improve the rating from inadequate because to do so requires consistent good practice over time. We will check this during our next planned Comprehensive inspection.

# The Rookery 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 unannounced focused inspection of The Rookery Care Home on 15 February 2016 was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements after our comprehensive inspection on 13 October 2015 had been made. The inspector 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 and we had taken enforcement action which required the service to improve.

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector. During the inspection we spoke with two people who were living at the service. We also spoke with the registered manager, deputy manager and provider. We looked at the care records of four people who used the service as well as staff recruitment records.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

At our last inspection on 13 October 2015 we asked the provider to take action to ensure sufficient numbers of staff were on duty to safely meet people's needs. During this visit we saw that improvements had been made and three additional staff members and a bank staff member had been employed. A bank worker is someone who works as and when required without regular shifts. Additionally we saw that a new shift pattern covering the busiest period between 12:00 and 19:00 pm had been instigated.

We observed that people did not have to wait long for assistance when requested and that care and support was delivered in a calm and efficient manner. Additionally, a new nurse call system had been installed since our last inspection. The system recorded the length of time taken for a request to be answered. Analysis of this record showed that staff were responding to calls in a timely manner.

At our last inspection on 13 October 2015 we asked the provider to improve recruitment procedures and pre-employment checks. During this inspection we looked at the staff files for four newly appointed staff. We found that all four contained references from previous employers, proof of identification and a record of a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. These checks are to assist employers in making safer recruitment decisions.

At our last inspection on 13 October 2015 we asked the provider to improve the level of training supplied to staff to ensure they had the relevant competence, skills and qualifications to support people to remain safe. During this inspection we found that staff had undertaken further moving and handling training and further training in other relevant areas had been booked. The provider had also taken action in regard to addressing the poor practice we saw at our previous inspection.

At our last inspection on 13 October 2015 we asked the provider to ensure the environment was clean and hygienic and protected people from the risk and spread of infection. During this visit we found that the environment was noticeably cleaner and more pleasant. Soiled and damaged furniture had been replaced and daily cleaning checks instigated. The manager had redeployed cleaning staff to cover different areas of the building during the same shift which helped maintain cleanliness.

Hygiene and cleanliness checks were carried out twice a day by the registered manager or a senior staff member. We saw that issues identified were addressed immediately. For example one note stated "Floor in main lounge needs steam cleaning", the person who carried out the cleaning had signed to say the work was completed.

An infection control audit had been started which identified areas for action such as "soiled chairs need replacing." We saw this work had been completed, however the audit had not yet been repeated to identify any further improvements required.

We also asked the provider to make improvements to ensure that the premises were safe and people were not at risk of not being able to be evacuated safely or quickly in the event of a fire. We found that audits had taken place and improvements had been made in regard to ensuring that fire exits were not obstructed and

emergency door releases were not hidden from view.

At our last inspection on 13 October 2015 we asked the provider to ensure risk assessments were updated to reflect the person's current need and to include guidance for staff on how to minimise the risk. During this inspection we looked at the care plans and risk assessments for four people who use the service. Care plans showed all risk assessments had been fully updated and guidance was in place to help staff minimise risk of harm. For example one person was assessed as being at increased risk of falling. Staff were advised to monitor them when walking, check the person's footwear was safe and ensure they had regular eye checks and always had their glasses with them. A second person was also at risk of falling. The assessment recommended moving furniture in the person's room to make it clearer to move around. However the person did not want to move their furniture. As they had been assessed as having capacity to make decisions about their care, staff recorded their wishes and the person signed to say they consented to this.

At our last inspection on 13 October 2015 we asked the provider to ensure care plans were updated to reflect the person's current support needs and ensure relevant information was available to staff. During this inspection we saw that eight of 16 care plans for people who use the service had been fully reviewed and updated, including dates for further review. The remaining eight had all been checked to ensure risk assessments and medical information was updated and dates were set for a full review. We found information was easy to access and staff were able to deliver care that met the person's needs and reflected their wishes using the information available.

At our last inspection on 13 October we found people were not protected from the proper and safe management of medicines. At this inspection found that improvements had been made. Medicine audits were now taking place. In addition to this all bottled medicines and external creams were labelled correctly with the date of opening to ensure that the medicine was used within guidelines and they would be effective for its intended use.