Review of compliance

Meadowblue Ltd

Marine Court Residential Home

Region:	East
Location address:	25 North Drive, Gt Yarmouth Norfolk NR30 4EW
Type of service:	Care Home without nursing
Date the review was completed:	July 2011
Overview of the service:	Marine Court is a care home without nursing for up to 40 older people who may be living with dementia. There is a registered manager in place. The regulated activity it is registered for is:- Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care

Summary of our findings
for the essential standards of quality and safety

What we found overall

We found that Marine Court was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety we reviewed.

The summary below describes why we carried out the review, what we found and any action required.

Why we carried out this review

We carried out this review as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews.

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, carried out a visit on 13 June 2011, observed how people were being cared for, talked with people who use services, talked with staff, checked the provider's records, and looked at records of people who use services.

What people told us

We spoke with ten from the thirty nine people currently living at Marine Court; the discussion mainly took place at the dining table and various parts of the large lounge. We also spoke with two visitors.

People with whom we spoke told us they felt safe living at Marine Court.

One person said "The staff are really good here, they take there time, and always ask me what I want".

Another said "The people are very friendly".

"The staff are always talking to us, they ask us if I want tea or coffee, and what I want for my dinner" and "Sometimes I like painting and talking about my family".

"During the summer we go over the road for tea and cake, it's nice to watch the holidaymakers, I used to be one of them".

One visitor told us "I am happy to leave my father here the staff treat him really well".

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Marine Court was meeting them

Outcome 1: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run
Staff support people living at Marine Court to make their own decisions respecting their wishes.

- Overall, we found that Marine Court was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 4: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights
People have their care needs reviewed and are supported by a skilled team of staff.

- Overall, we found that Marine Court was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 7: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights
People can feel safe and are supported by a well trained staff team.

- Overall, we found that Marine Court was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 10: People should be cared for in safe and accessible surroundings that support their health and welfare
People are offered a safe, clean and homely environment to live in.

- Overall, we found that Marine Court was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care
Peoples views are taken into account to make sure the people living there continue to receive a good quality and safe service.

- Overall, we found that Marine Court was meeting this essential standard.

Action we have asked the service to take

None

What we found
for each essential standard of quality and safety we reviewed

The following pages detail our findings and our regulatory judgement for each essential standard and outcome that we reviewed, linked to specific regulated activities where appropriate.

We will have reached one of the following judgements for each essential standard.

Compliant means that people who use services are experiencing the outcomes relating to the essential standard.

A **minor concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard.

A **moderate concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and there is an impact on their health and wellbeing because of this.

A **major concern** means that people who use services are not experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and are not protected from unsafe or inappropriate care, treatment and support.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary improvements are made. Where there are a number of concerns, we may look at them together to decide the level of action to take.

More information about each of the outcomes can be found in the *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*.

Outcome 1:
Respecting and involving people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
- Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
- Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
- Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 1: Respecting and involving people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People with whom we spoke with told us that they either visited the home before moving in or their relatives visited in their place.

One person said “My daughter came to look at the home because I was in hospital, and she told me I would have my own room”.

A second person told us “The staff are always talking to us, they ask us if I want tea or coffee, and what I want for my dinner”.

A visitor told us “The staff ask my father if he would like his meal or a drink and when he tells them ‘no’ they respect his wishes, they do try an alternative at another time”.

Other evidence

The information we received told us ‘Staff gain an understanding of a residents needs and treat them with respect’.The manager told us that any person who considers moving into Marine Court is visited by one of the management team to discuss in private, their care needs, support required and discuss how these can be

achieved. In some cases due to memory impairment their relatives are also involved at this stage to gain as much background information to make an assessment whether the staff can meet their individual needs.

The quality assurance survey gave us examples of comments from both prospective residents and their relatives that they had been given sufficient information about the service when deciding if they should live there.

It was observed during this that staff spoke with people living there in a quiet, friendly manner, and sat down at eye level when necessary to make sure they understood the question or comment and gave people time to answer.

Our judgement
Staff support people living at Marine Court to make their own decisions respecting their wishes.

Outcome 4:
Care and welfare of people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meet their needs and protect their rights.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 4: Care and welfare of people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People with whom we spoke told us they knew there were records about them but some could not remember what these were.

One visitor told us they were regularly consulted about changes to their relatives condition.

Other evidence

The information told us that a pre-admission assessment is carried out for all new people considering moving into the home with an offer of a trial period before they decide to stay. Additional information is received from other professionals which the manager collates to make an overall pre-admission assessment of peoples needs.

During the trial period a key worker is allocated to the new person who liaises with them and their family, and contributes towards the care requirements within their care plan.

One care plan was read and this was seen to contain the persons individual care needs, risk assessments to enable them to maintain their lifestyle. The person's mental health was continually assessed for people living with dementia with the staff developing memory joggers or reminiscence to reduce deterioration.

It was observed how interactive the staff were with people within the large lounge and dining room. There was several groups taking part in social activities and conversation and one person was helping domestic staff wipe down the dining tables, the general atmosphere was one of quietness with none of the people living there in a distressed state.

There were also some people sitting quietly watching others. One person on his own who we spoke to told us that they preferred to watch other people enjoying themselves and did not want to take part with activities, and the staff respected his decision.

A member of staff told us how they worked as a key worker and gave examples of the extra tasks they undertake for their residents. They told us how often the care plans were reviewed and how they acknowledged the persons changing needs and in some cases input was obtained from family members.

The care records showed that other health professionals regularly visited to assess peoples changing needs and advise staff on good practice methods. People were supported to attend hospital or clinic appointments with Consultants although usually if medical attention was required their own GP tended to visit them at the service.

The manager told us that frailer peoples care needs were looked after with the staff team following the Gold Framework Standard for end of life care, this reduces anxieties for people and supports people at this final stage of life, to stay at the service with people familiar to them, giving them the care and attention they need.

One visitor told us "they felt much happier with this option in place for their father, who would hate to go to hospital".

Our judgement

People have their care needs reviewed and are supported by a skilled team of staff.

Outcome 7:
Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:
- Are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are respected and upheld.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 7: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People with whom we spoke told us they felt safe living at Marine Court.

One person said “The staff are really good here, they take there time, and always ask me what I want”.

Another said “The people are very friendly”.

One visitor told us “I am happy to leave my father here the staff treat him really well”.

Other evidence

The information we received told us that all the staff team from care staff to domestic and maintenance staff attend the safeguarding adults, dementia awareness and challenging behaviour training, due to all staff coming into contact with people living there.

Staff files showed that safeguarding training had taken place and the staff member told us they understood how to report any bad practice.

The manager told us that all new staff are vetted, have their skills and qualifications checked before commencing work under supervision. They attend training to include the deprivation of liberty and mental capacity act and dementia awareness training to help them develop an understanding of their role in caring for people living with dementia.

Our judgement
People can feel safe and are supported by a well trained staff team.

Outcome 10:
Safety and suitability of premises

What the outcome says

This is what people should expect.

People who use services and people who work in or visit the premises:

- Are in safe, accessible surroundings that promote their wellbeing.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 10: Safety and suitability of premises

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We did not speak to people living at Marine Court about the premises.

Visitors spoken with told us there were some areas that could do with the paint 'touching up'. They were very happy with their relative's bedroom, and they had brought in some of their fathers personal possessions to make it more homely for him.

Other evidence

Marine Court consists of thirty nine bedrooms on two floors all of which were occupied at the time of this visit. The majority of bedrooms have en suite facilities. There are two communal rooms and everyone has access to the enclosed patio area. The large rear lounge and adjoining dining room also contains an area where chairs are situated in small groups .The other lounge contains a television with a small group of people watching this. Throughout the premises there are chairs situated for people if they needed a rest, these do not block any fire exits or escape routes.

The home has furniture and décor coinciding with the age of the building. Some

areas needed the paintwork ‘touching up’, the staff bathroom needed some updating, and there was subtle lighting throughout the building.

None of the maintenance records were checked as there had been no concerns from past visits.

Our judgement

People are offered a safe, clean and homely environment to live in.

Outcome 16:
Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- Benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support, due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People with whom we spoke told us that they liked living at Marine Court.

One person said “The staff are very kind to me, sometimes I can’t remember what day it is, and they remind me”.

“I always get asked if I want tea or coffee, because I change my mind”.

Visitors told us “The manager asks us regularly if we are happy with the care, I think the staff do a wonderful job”.

Some comments from the quality assurance survey were “the staff are wonderful, I salute them”, staff initiate memory games to help residents coordination and speed up response times”. “Having people around all the time, I don’t feel lonely anymore”. “Don’t like the Jim Reeves tape”. ”Dark entrance hall” and a comment from visitors that some of the décor requires updating.

Other evidence

The information we received told us the manager organises a quality assurance survey each year by asking residents, relatives and visiting professionals to complete a questionnaire about the service.

The last quality survey results had been received by us and showed us what the manager had put in place from the comments received.

The manager told us that regular resident, relatives and staff meetings are held throughout the year to ensure communication is maintained for planning activities and outings, and future development of the premises. The minutes of these meetings were displayed within the large communal room.

The provider of the service regularly visits and maintains regular contact with people living there.

Our judgement
People views are taken into account to make sure the people living there continue to receive a good quality and safe service.

Action
we have asked the provider to take

None

What is a review of compliance?

By law, providers of certain adult social care and health care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has written guidance about what people who use services should experience when providers are meeting essential standards, called *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*.

CQC licenses services if they meet essential standards and will constantly monitor whether they continue to do so. We formally review services when we receive information that is of concern and as a result decide we need to check whether a service is still meeting one or more of the essential standards. We also formally review them at least every two years to check whether a service is meeting all of the essential standards in each of their locations. Our reviews include checking all available information and intelligence we hold about a provider. We may seek further information by contacting people who use services, public representative groups and organisations such as other regulators. We may also ask for further information from the provider and carry out a visit with direct observations of care.

When making our judgements about whether services are meeting essential standards, we decide whether we need to take further regulatory action. This might include discussions with the provider about how they could improve. We only use this approach where issues can be resolved quickly, easily and where there is no immediate risk of serious harm to people.

Where we have concerns that providers are not meeting essential standards, or where we judge that they are not going to keep meeting them, we may also set improvement actions or compliance actions, or take enforcement action:

Improvement actions: These are actions a provider should take so that they **maintain** continuous compliance with essential standards. Where a provider is complying with essential standards, but we are concerned that they will not be able to maintain this, we ask them to send us a report describing the improvements they will make to enable them to do so.

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. Where a provider is not meeting the essential standards but people are not at immediate risk of serious harm, we ask them to send us a report that says what they will do to make sure they comply. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action to make sure that essential standards are met.

Enforcement action: These are actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Adult Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers are set out in the law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

Information for the reader

Document purpose	Review of compliance report
Author	Care Quality Commission
Audience	The general public
Further copies from	03000 616161 / www.cqc.org.uk
Copyright	Copyright © (2010) Care Quality Commission (CQC). This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part, free of charge, in any format or medium provided that it is not used for commercial gain. This consent is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and on proviso that it is not used in a derogatory manner or misleading context. The material should be acknowledged as CQC copyright, with the title and date of publication of the document specified.

Care Quality Commission

Website	www.cqc.org.uk
Telephone	03000 616161
Email address	enquiries@cqc.org.uk
Postal address	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA