

Greenfield Care Homes Limited

Greenfield Care Home

Inspection report

385-387 London Road
Mitcham
Surrey
CR4 4BF

Tel: 02086873131

Date of inspection visit:
08 February 2017

Date of publication:
13 March 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good ●
Is the service safe?	Good ●
Is the service caring?	Good ●
Is the service responsive?	Good ●
Is the service well-led?	Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Greenfield Care Home provides accommodation for up to nine people who require personal care and support on a daily basis in a care home setting. The home specialises in caring for adults with a learning disability. At the time of our visit, there were nine people using the service. The provider is also registered to provide personal care from Greenfield Care Home to people living in their own homes but at the time of the inspection, there were no people using that service.

The home had a registered manager at the time of the inspection. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) 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.

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 2 August 2016. A breach of legal requirements was found in "Well-Led" because the provider did not have effective arrangements to assess, monitor and improve the quality of the service. They had not identified the areas where improvements were required that we found during our inspection. We asked the provider to take action to make improvements and comply with the breach of legal requirements we found.

At that time the service was rated 'Requires Improvement' overall and in the following four key questions 'Is the service safe?' 'Is the service caring?' 'Is the service responsive?' and 'Is the service well led.' The key question 'Is the service effective' was rated good.

At this inspection we found the provider had made the necessary improvements against the breach, most notably to the way the premises were kept safe for people through the weekly and monthly audits which were now more comprehensive and effective.

We also found the provider had made good overall improvements under safe, caring and responsive and we have provided our findings on the improvements made by the provider in the main section of our report. As a result we have changed the rating for 'Is the service safe?' 'Is the service caring?' 'Is the service responsive?' and 'Is the service well led' to 'Good' and the overall rating to 'Good.'

At this inspection we found people's care plans had been updated with information with regards to what people could eat to remain safe from choking. Recordings of the fridge and freezers temperatures were now more accurate, mitigating the risk of food being stored at the wrong temperatures.

Newly installed emergency call bells and pull cords were available and positioned where a person could access them when needed. Staff told us people were using the pull cords to summon help when required. Cupboards containing hazardous cleaning materials were now locked. This helped to mitigate the risks associated with hazardous materials. Overall the home looked and smelt clean and fresh.

The registered manager explained that individualised decision making tools were being tried to establish the best way of helping a person make informed choices about their care. These measures will help to ensure where possible people can make decisions about their care for themselves.

We found additional staff were employed at times when people were at home, so that there were sufficient staff to support people in the activities they liked to do. We saw details taken from the monthly review of care plans outlined the activities that had taken place. Overall records showed people were being given more opportunity to engage in an activity of their choice.

We found the provider was meeting the breach of regulation because they had implemented a new system to assess, monitor and improve the quality of the service. These quality assurance visits and reports worked in conjunction with the registered manager's weekly and monthly health and safety checks of the premises and helped to keep people, staff and visitors safe.

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

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Good ●

We found that action had been taken to improve safety in the home.

The provider had identified risks within the home environment and had taken steps to rectify those risks

The premises were clean. Emergency pull cords were within reach so people could summon help if needed.

We have improved the rating for safe from requires improvement to good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

We found that action had been taken to improve the involvement of people in decision making.

New processes were in place to help ensure where possible people were involved in planning and making decisions about their care.

We have improved the rating for caring from requires improvement to good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

We found that action had been taken to improve people's choices in the activities they could participate in.

We have improved the rating for responsive from requires improvement to good. □

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

We found that action had been taken to improve the service and to meet the breach of legal requirements.

The provider carried out a range of checks and audits to monitor the quality of the service that were effective in identifying areas for improvement.

We have improved the rating for well led from requires improvement to good. □

Greenfield 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 was an unannounced focused inspection of Greenfield Care Home on 8 February 2017. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 2 August 2016 had been made.

We inspected the service against four of the five key questions we ask about services: is the service safe?, is the service caring?, is the service responsive? and is the service well led?

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector. During our inspection we spoke with the registered manager, the deputy manager and one person who used the service.

After the inspection one of the directors sent us copies of the monthly reports of the quality assurance visits they undertook.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our last inspection of the service in August 2016 when answering the key question 'is the service safe?' we gave the service a rating of 'requires improvement'. This was because although the provider had made improvements from our previous inspection of April 2016 when we rated this key question 'inadequate', to ensure effective systems were in place to assess, monitor and mitigate the risks relating to the health, safety and welfare of people and others, we found other areas where the provider still had more improvements to make. These were in relation to care plans being updated with information from the Speech and Language Therapist [SALT], where a person was at risk of choking, inaccurate recording of fridge and freezers temperatures, cords for the new emergency call bell system being tied up so people could not reach them and the old call bell system not yet removed from the walls. Cupboards containing hazardous cleaning materials were not locked and the small kitchen door that should be locked at all times was unlocked. Also several areas of the home were not clean.

At this inspection we found people's care plans had been updated with information from the SALT in regards to what people could eat to minimise the risk of choking. Staff told us that for one person they could now give them food that previously would have caused a choking danger but presented in a different format was safe. They said the person was enjoying eating one of their favourite foods again.

A new thermometer had been purchased and the recording of the fridge and freezers temperatures was now more accurate. Food was now kept safe at the correct temperatures.

We saw emergency call bells and pull cords were available in all the bedrooms, bathrooms and communal areas and the pull cords were untied and hanging down to the floor where a person could access them if they had a fall. Staff told us the new system was working very effectively and people were using the pull cords to summon help when needed. The old call bell system had been removed from the walls.

We saw a cupboard in the laundry room and a cupboard under the sink in the main kitchen contained a variety of cleaning materials was now locked. The door of the small kitchen was also now locked and non-perishable foods and plastic products were no longer stored inside the oven. This helped to mitigate the risks associated with hazardous materials.

An en-suite bathroom with shower area that we had previous seen as not clean and malodorous, was now clean. The registered manager told us the maintenance person had checked to ensure the drain was not blocked and the shower was run regularly to help ensure the shower area was kept clean and fit for use. Front panels of some drawers in the small kitchen and the work surfaces previously seen as dirty were now clean. Overall the home looked and smelt clean and fresh.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At our last inspection of the service in August 2016 when answering the key question 'is the service caring?' we gave the service a rating of 'requires improvement'. This was because although the provider had made improvements from our previous inspection of April 2016, we saw that relatives had been involved in making decisions about a person's care preferences where a person was not able to express themselves verbally. The provider had not identified ways to involve the person in their own care and the decision making tools had not been transferred into easy read or picture format to give the person the opportunity to decide for themselves where possible.

At this inspection we spoke with the registered manager and they explained that individualised decision making tools were being tested and tried to establish the best way of helping a person make informed choices about their care. Where a person could understand picture or easy read formats these were being used. Where this was not possible a person's key worker was talking them through their options in a way that was suitable for the person. These measures helped to ensure where possible people were making decisions about their care for themselves.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At our last inspection of the service in August 2016 when answering the key question 'is the service responsive?' we gave the service a rating of 'requires improvement'. This was because although progress had been made from our previous inspection of April 2016, towards planning and implementing activities there was still more to do.

At this inspection we found additional staff were employed at times when people were at home, so that there were sufficient staff to support people in the activities they liked to do. We saw details taken from the monthly review of care plans outlining the activities that had taken place for example Christmas shopping and a chance to see the Christmas lights, meals out, parties attended and a visit to the pantomime.

One person told us they had visited a specialist horse riding school and they were now on the waiting list to attend. While we were inspecting the home this same person went out with staff to an appointment and on returning was engaged in an activity of their choice. They were happy to sit and talk with us and tell us what they had been doing and when.

The registered manager told us the organisation and planning of activities was on-going and changing all the time, as people's abilities changed but they were constantly looking to ensure people had opportunities to take part in activities of their choosing. Overall records showed people were being given more opportunity to engage in an activity of their choice.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At our last inspection of the service in August 2016 we identified a breach of the regulation in relation to the provider not having effective arrangements to assess, monitor and improve the quality of the service. Although there had been an improvement from our April 2016 inspection when we rated this key question as 'Inadequate', they had not identified some of the areas that needed to be improved which we found during the August 2016 inspection and which we have detailed in the key question of safe. They sent us an action plan and told us they would make the necessary improvements by the end of September 2016.

During this inspection we found the provider was meeting this regulation because they had implemented a new system to assess, monitor and improve the quality of the service. We saw a new monthly report of the quality assurance visits one of the directors undertakes. These quality assurance visits and reports work in conjunction with the registered managers weekly and monthly health and safety checks of the premises.

The quality assurance visits looked in detail at the environment of the home, peoples life style/activities, people's care plans, the consultation with people who used the service, medicines administration records, staff supervision and team and residents meetings. Areas for improvement were put into an action plan with who should take the action and by when. The following months report then showed if these actions had been completed.

We toured the home with the registered manager and saw all the areas of previous concern had been addressed and improvements to the environment had been made. The home was very clean, new carpets were evident in the communal areas and there was fresh paint on surfaces of high use, such as the hall and stairs. Some people had new carpet in their rooms, of a colour and choice of their own choosing. Other people we waiting to having new flooring fitted in the rooms, dependent on their needs. The registered manager explained that for some people a vinyl or laminate flooring would suit their needs better than carpet and this would be fitted as soon as possible. The changes the provider had made helped to ensure people were living in a safe, caring environment that was responsive to their needs.