

Stocks Hall Care Homes Limited

Stocks Hall Mawdesley

Inspection report

Hall Lane
Mawdesley
Ormskirk
Lancashire
L40 2QZ

Date of inspection visit:
10 December 2021

Date of publication:
11 January 2022

Tel: 01704778178

Website: www.stockshalliving.co.uk

Ratings

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

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Stocks Hall, Mawdesley is a residential care home providing personal and nursing care for up to 42 adults. The home is also registered to accommodate people who are living with dementia. At the time of our inspection there were 39 people living at the home.

People's experience of using this service and what we found.

Medicines were generally managed safely across the service. However, we have made some recommendations in this area.

The provider had established robust recruitment practices and records showed a good number of staff were employed. However, some people and some relatives felt staffing levels could be increased, particularly at night-time. We discussed this with the management team, who assured us the deployment of staff at night would be re-assessed.

People were mainly kept safe and protected from the risk of infections, including the transmission of Covid-19. We discussed good infection control practices around staff wearing face masks correctly with the acting manager at the time of our site visit, who assured us these would be addressed without delay.

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

People's needs were being assessed and they were supported by staff who were trained and knowledgeable. The home worked closely with a range of community professionals so that people's health and social care needs were being met.

People received safe care and support. Their preferences and wishes were respected by the staff team and independence was safely promoted. We observed some lovely interactions by staff members, who were clearly committed to the people who lived at Stocks Hall. One relative told us, "If I mention something to one of the carers or nurses, I know it will be done. The staff are really good and very proactive."

People were provided with a good quality service, which was regularly assessed and closely monitored. Any shortfalls identified were addressed without delay. People provided us with positive feedback about the staff team and the management of the home. People looked relaxed in the company of staff and the senior staff were visible around the home.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection: The last rating for this service was good (published 19 November 2018).

Why we inspected

The inspection was prompted in part due to concerns received about the presence of pet dogs within the home. A decision was made for us to inspect and examine those risks. As a result, we undertook a focused inspection to review the key questions of safe and well-led only.

We reviewed the information we held about the service. No areas of concern were identified in the other key questions. We therefore did not inspect them. Ratings from previous comprehensive inspections for those key questions were used in calculating the overall rating at this inspection.

We looked at infection prevention and control measures under the Safe key question. We look at this in all care home inspections even if no concerns or risks have been identified. This is to provide assurance that the service can respond to COVID-19 and other infection outbreaks effectively.

The overall rating for the service remains good. This is based on the findings at this inspection.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Stocks Hall Mawdesley on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

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 ●

The service was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

Details are in our well-Led findings below.

Stocks Hall Mawdesley

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

As part of this inspection we looked at the infection control and prevention measures in place. This was conducted so we can understand the preparedness of the service in preventing or managing an infection outbreak, and to identify good practice we can share with other services.

Inspection team

The inspection team consisted of one inspector and a medicines inspector on site. Another inspector reviewed some documentation remotely and an Expert by Experience contacted people and their relatives by telephone for feedback.

An Expert by Experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

Service and service type

Stocks Hall Mawdesley (Stocks Hall) is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection. Stocks Hall provides both nursing and personal care.

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided. However, the registered manager was on leave at the time of our inspection. The acting manager was in charge of the day to day operation of the home.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. We used all this information to plan our inspection.

The provider had completed a provider information return prior to this inspection. This is information we require providers to send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We took this into account when we inspected the service and made the judgements in this report.

During the inspection

We spoke with five people who used the service and ten relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with six members of staff including the acting manager, senior care worker, care workers and receptionist.

We reviewed a range of records. This included three people's care records and four staff files in relation to recruitment practices. A variety of records relating to the management of the service were also reviewed.

After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the acting manager to validate evidence found. We also reviewed quality assurance records.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Using medicines safely

- We saw that medicines for one person were not reconciled correctly.
- Staff had a system for ordering medicines and took action when the pharmacy did not supply them on time.
- Staff used body maps to show where medicines patches could be applied.
- Allergies were recorded for eight out of nine people we looked at.
- Whilst fridge temperatures were recorded daily, staff did not always reset the thermometer correctly.

We recommend the provider ensures systems for reconciling medicines (the process of accurately listing medicines for a person) are reviewed, allergies are recorded for each person and the fridge thermometer is reset each day.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management; learning lessons when things go wrong

- The provider had systems in place which helped to ensure potential risks to people's health, welfare and safety were being protected.
- The manager had implemented systems for regularly monitoring and managing risk, so that people were protected from harm.
- Installations and equipment had been serviced to ensure they were safe and fit for use.
- The environment was safe and well-maintained throughout.
- Accidents and incidents had been recorded and the provider had introduced systems so that lessons were learned following any untoward event.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- The provider had systems in place which helped to protect people from the risk of abuse.
- Staff were aware of the home's safeguarding procedures and whistle-blowing policies. Safeguarding events had been well-recorded.
- Staff had received training in safeguarding people and were confident in reporting any concerns. They felt people were safe living at the home and their rights were being protected. One person told us, "They [staff] are really lovely. They always give you a wave and have a chat with you. They make sure we are all OK."

Staffing and recruitment

- The provider had adopted thorough recruitment practices and records showed a good number of staff were employed at the home. However, some people who lived at the home and some relatives felt the home

was short staffed, particularly at night-time. One person told us, "I feel safe most of the time, but at night we don't have enough staff and sometimes they are inexperienced agency staff." We discussed this with the management team, who assured us the deployment of staff at night-time would be reassessed.

- Evidence was available to demonstrate robust disciplinary procedures were being followed. This helped to ensure appropriate action was being taken in response to staff misconduct.
- At the time of our site visit, we noted a calm and relaxed atmosphere and staff members were seen to be spending time with those who lived at the home.

Preventing and controlling infection

- We found the environment to be clean and hygienic throughout. One relative told us, "It's really clean with no smells. It's like going into a 5 star hotel."
- On the day of our site visit we noted there were four domestic staff on duty and cleaning protocols were in place.
- The laundry department was well organised in order to prevent the risk of cross infection.
- Although we were assured most of the staff team were following current guidance in relation to Covid-19, we did observe a small number of staff not wearing face masks correctly and we discussed possible additional support for one member of staff with the acting manager, who assured us the highlighted areas would be addressed without delay in order to mitigate any potential risk. Relatives told us the home had stringent practices in place to prevent the spread of infection and everyone we spoke with felt the pandemic was well managed. One relative commented, "They have been quite strict on access [during the pandemic]. It's one of the things I have found reassuring. They seem to go above and beyond."
- Infection prevention and control policies were in place and storerooms for PPE supplies were available on each unit. There was a good supply of PPE available on each unit of the home.
- Staff and relatives spoken with confirmed that Covid-19 tests were conducted, in order to protect those who lived at the home.

- We were assured that the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.

- We were assured that the provider was meeting shielding and social distancing rules.

- We were assured that the provider was admitting people safely to the service.

- We were assured that the provider was using PPE effectively and safely. However,

- We were assured that the provider was accessing testing for people using the service and staff.

- We were assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises.

- We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.

- We were assured that the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.

- We were assured the provider was facilitating visits for people living in the home in accordance with the current guidance.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-Led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people; How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong

- The provider had developed systems which effectively achieved good outcomes for those who lived at the home.
- The acting manager and staff team knew people well. We observed people being supported to make decisions and care records demonstrated people's preferences and wishes were considered. One person told us, "It's amazing here. Absolutely wonderful. It's like being at home."
- The acting manager was visible around the service and people told us they knew who she was. Staff described the culture of the service as open and honest. They said the management team was approachable and they felt they were listened to.
- People and their relatives told us they were happy with the service and were involved in the decision-making process. We noted many written compliments had been received by the home. One relative told us, "They [staff] are excellent and I would recommend them to anyone."

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- At the time of our inspection the registered manager was on long term leave. However, the acting manager was clear about her role and regulatory requirements. She was managing the service well. One person told us, "I cannot find any faults with this place. It is marvellous." Another commented, "I'm loving living here. I feel very safe. The staff are brilliant."
- Staff told us they enjoyed working at the home and felt supported. They understood their individual responsibilities to service delivery.
- Effective systems were in place to check the quality of service provided and to monitor staff practice. Action had been taken to address any shortfalls with clear evidence improvements had taken place.
- Risks to people's health and safety had been assessed and recorded well. Strategies had been implemented which helped to protect people from the risk of harm.
- A business continuity plan provided staff with clear guidance about action staff needed to take in the event of an environmental emergency. This helped to keep people safe from harm.

Continuous learning and improving care

- The provider had systems in place which supported the staff team to continually learn and improve care.
- Clear guidance was easily accessible for staff, which helped them to develop as a team and to support

people in a consistent and meaningful way. A wide range of policies and procedures were in place, including information around safeguarding, complaints and oral health.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- The provider had systems in place which helped to engage and involve anyone who had an interest in the service.
- Clear systems were in place which provided staff with guidance about people's risks and how these were to be best managed.
- Service user and staff meetings were held, which enabled topics to be discussed in an open forum and allowed relevant information to be shared amongst service users and the staff team.
- Feedback was actively sought through customer satisfaction questionnaires to make sure people, relatives and staff were happy with the service provided and action had been taken to address any suggestions received.
- There were effective communication systems in place to ensure people were kept up to date with any changes.

Working in partnership with others

- The acting manager and staff team worked in partnership with other agencies, including commissioning teams and health and social care professionals. This enabled effective, coordinated care and support for people.
- Relatives told us how the home had effectively worked in partnership with them during the pandemic and lockdown. One family member told us, "They [staff] are very good at communicating. They phone us at home and in between visits. We also phone the home and never have a problem getting through."