

Thomas Henry Mallaband Limited

Windmill Court

Inspection report

St Minver
Wadebridge
PL27 6RD
Tel: 01208 863831
Website: www.windmillcourt@mmcg.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 29 May 2015
Date of publication: 25/06/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Is the service safe?

Good 

Is the service responsive?

Good 

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 7 October 2014. We found the service was not meeting the legal requirements. This was because some records relating to people's medicines and creams were not always accurate or regularly completed by staff. Charts that recorded when people were moved in order to prevent pressure areas developing were not adequately kept.

After the comprehensive inspection the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet the legal requirements in relation to the breach. We undertook a focussed inspection on 29 May 2015 to check they had followed their plan and to confirm they now met legal requirements.

This report only covers our findings in relation to these topics. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Windmill Court on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Windmill Court is a care home that provides nursing and personal care for up to 34 people. At the time of the inspection there were 30 people living at Windmill Court.

The service is required to have a registered manager and at the time of our inspection a registered manager was 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 29 May 2015 we found the provider had made improvements to record keeping in relation to people's medicines and the monitoring of pressure areas. Therefore we found the legal requirements had been met.

Summary of findings

People were supported to take their medicines safely. Staff kept accurate records of when and how people were given their medicines. This included when prescribed creams were used and the daily monitoring of the position of pain patches.

Records showed that people who were cared for in bed were regularly re-positioned, in line with their care plan, to help prevent and monitor pressure damage to their skin.

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?

The service was safe. We found that action had been taken to improve the safety of the service.

People were supported with their medicines in a safe way because records of when and how people were given their medicines were accurate and appropriately kept by staff.

This meant the provider was now meeting the legal requirements.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive. We found that action had been taken to improve the safety of the service.

Records showed that staff meet people's needs in relation to preventing and monitoring pressure damage to their skin.

This meant the provider was now meeting the legal requirements.

Good



Windmill Court

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 Windmill Court on 29 May 2015. This inspection was completed to check that improvements to meet legal requirements after our comprehensive inspection on 7 October 2014 had been

made. We inspected the service against two of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe and is the service responsive. This is because the service was not meeting legal requirements in relation to these questions.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector. Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the home, this included the provider's action plan, which set out the action they would take to meet the legal requirements. During the inspection we spoke with the nurse in charge and looked at medicines records and the care records for four people. After the inspection we spoke with the registered manager.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our inspection on 7 October 2014 we found some records relating to people's medicines and creams were not always accurate or regularly completed by staff. This meant it was not always possible to establish if people had received their prescribed medicines or creams.

This was a breach of regulation 20 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 which corresponds to regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our focused inspection on 29 May 2015 we found that the provider had taken action to address the shortfalls in relation to the requirements of regulation 17 described above. We looked at the Medication Administration Records (MAR) for everyone living at the service and found all were completed correctly. Some people had pain relief patches applied every three days. Systems were in place to record when the next patch was due as well as daily checks from care staff to check the patch was still in position. We found all records in relation to pain relief patches were accurately completed. Where people required prescription creams to be applied staff completed records which were kept in folders in people's rooms. Records had been completed to show that creams had been applied each day in line with people's individual's medicine records.

Some people were prescribed pain relieving medicine to take as and when they requested them. For these people the service used a pain assessment tool which nurses were required to complete whenever the person was in pain and requested their pain relieving medicine. We found that the pain assessment tool had not been completed for everyone each time pain relieving medicines were given. Daily nursing notes did record when people had asked for pain relieve and also described individual's level of pain each time pain relieved was given. The nurse in charge told us any concerns or changes to people's needs in relation to their medicines were updated in their care plan. Changes would be monitored and discussed with people's GP when it became necessary.

It was therefore possible to evidence that the service was monitoring people's pain levels, checking if any medicine reviews may be necessary and taking the appropriate action. We discussed with the registered manager that the system the service used to assess and record people's pain levels was not being maintained. The registered manager told us they would meet with staff in the service and the organisation's quality lead to agree the most effective system to use.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At our inspection on 7 October 2014 we found some charts that recorded when people were moved in order to prevent pressure areas developing were not adequately kept.

This was a breach of regulation 20 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 which corresponds to regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our focused inspection of 29 May 2015 we found that the registered manager had taken action to address the

shortfalls in relation to the requirements of regulation 17 described above. Some people were cared for in bed and unable to re-position themselves without assistance from staff. We looked at the records for four people who were cared for in bed and whose care plans identified that staff needed to change the person's position regularly. Care plans stated how often people should be re-positioned and into what positions. For example on either their left or right side or their back. We found records were being completed to show when staff re-positioned people, noting the time and the position they had been moved into.