

Athena Healthcare (Park Road) Limited

Parklands Lodge

Inspection report

80 Park Road
Southport
Merseyside
PR9 9JL

Tel: 01704771111

Website: www.parklandslodge.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
02 March 2021

Date of publication:
28 April 2021

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement 

Is the service safe?

Good 

Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement 

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Parklands Lodge is a purpose-built service and provides residential and nursing care to older people, including those living with dementia. The service was supporting 20 people at the time of the inspection.

People's experience of using the service and what we found

We inspected the service following some concerns about the management of infection control following a recent outbreak of COVID-19 at the home. There had been progress made regarding the concerns raised. We found the service was following good practice guidance regarding the management of COVID-19 and maintaining standards of hygiene and infection control.

People reported good support regarding the management of their medicines and told us they got their medicines on time. The medications records supported best practice although we fed back some minor anomalies to make records clearer. Staff administering medicines were suitably trained and competent.

We found good ongoing checks of the environment helped ensure people were safe.

The home was staffed appropriately at the time of the inspection. Use of regular staff had improved following the recent infectious outbreak where there had been some reliance on agency staff. This helped to maintain a consistency of care for people. People and their relatives told us they felt safe living at Parklands Lodge.

Since the last comprehensive inspection there had been three changes of management. The current manager was providing leadership and was supported by a senior management team. There were a series of quality assurance processes and audits carried out internally and externally by the home manager and senior managers. The new manager for the service had ensured key management systems had been applied in the home although we fed back some improvements to be made to the auditing cycle to further ensure consistency and development of the service.

People's experience of using the service was positive. People received the care and support they needed when required. The feedback we received showed staff were helpful and kind and treated people with dignity and respect.

A relative commented, "Communication has been an issue as there have been a lot of managers; this has improved recently and [manager] is good." A person we spoke with commented, "I've always felt safe; staff are there when I need them."

Risks associated with people's care were identified and managed to minimise harm. Supporting care records identified risks and there were plans in place to help keep people safe.

Rating at last inspection and update

The last rating for this service was Requires improvement (published 10 February 2021). The service remains rated requires improvement. This service has been rated requires improvement since the last comprehensive inspection in July 2019.

Why we inspected

The inspection was prompted due to concerns received about aspects of the overall management of the home including the outcome of a recent audit carried by the local infection control team following an outbreak of COVID-19 at Parklands Lodge. The Commission is aware that the provider disputes the content of the LA/CCG infection control audit.

A decision was made for us to inspect and examine those risks. We undertook a focused inspection to review the key questions of safe and well-led only.

The ratings from the previous comprehensive inspection for those key questions not looked at on this occasion were used in calculating the overall rating at this inspection. The overall rating for the service has remained Requires improvement. This is based on the findings 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 coronavirus and other infection outbreaks effectively.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Parklands Lodge 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?

The service was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

The service was not always well led.

Details are in our well led findings below.

Requires Improvement ●

Parklands Lodge

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. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

As part of this inspection we also 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 was completed by two inspectors.

Service and service type

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

The service did not have a manager registered with the CQC although an application had been made. This means that the provider is legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

Notice of inspection

Day one of this inspection was announced an hour before our visit. This was to check on the situation regarding COVID-19. Day two was used to complete telephone conversations with relatives. We also took time to analyse further information we had asked to be forwarded.

What we did before inspection

Before the inspection we checked the information that we held about the service. This included statutory notifications sent to us by the provider about incidents and events that had occurred at the service. A

notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law.

We did not ask the provider to complete a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make.

We also obtained feedback from the local authority and healthcare professionals. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We looked around the premises, observed the interactions between people living at the service and staff, care delivery and activities provided at the service. Due to the increased risk of cross-infection we were unable to complete more extensive observations.

We spoke with three people living at the service, three relatives and nine staff, including the manager, care staff, ancillary staff, including domestic staff and senior managers visiting on the day of the inspection.

We looked at a range of documentation including six people's care records, medication records, staff files, accident and incident records, health and safety records, audits and records relating to the quality checks undertaken by staff and other management records.

After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found. We looked at training data, risk assessments and quality assurance records.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

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 Requires improvement. At this inspection this key question had improved to Good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

How well are people protected by the prevention and control of infection

- People were protected from the risk of infection. We found there had been some concerns raised during a recent infection control audit, however, the provider had made progress in addressing the issues identified.
- 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 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 using PPE effectively and safely.
- We were assured that the provider was accessing testing for people using the service and staff.
- We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.

Using medicines safely

- People received their medicines at the right time and appropriate administration records were maintained.
- Staff told us they had training to administer medicines and that managers assessed their competence to administer safely.
- Medicine administration and safety was audited on a regular basis.
- We signposted further improvements to some supporting records.

Staffing and recruitment

- There was enough staff to meet people's needs.
- People told us they received support when needed and they felt care staff were competent. One person commented, "Staffing is fine. When I need staff, I can press my [call bell] and they always come."
- All staff felt supported by the current manager at the home and reported a good morale. One staff told us, "Given the difficulties [COVID-19] morale is good and has improved generally over the past year."
- There were policies and procedures in place to ensure staff had been recruited safely to work with vulnerable people. Staff had been recruited safely.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risk assessments were completed to identify areas of risk and how people needed to be supported.
- Risk assessments were reviewed regularly to reflect people's current care needs.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- The provider had effective safeguarding systems in place.
- People we spoke with and their relatives told us they felt the home was safe.
- Staff understood their safeguarding responsibilities and had confidence in managers to address any concerns.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- There had been a positive response and improvements made in the short time following a recent poor infection control audit. We discussed how internal audits and checks could be improved to ensure greater consistency in the future.
- Incidents and accidents were recorded and reviewed with respect to reducing future risk for individuals. We signposted the need to ensure accidents and incidents are analysed to assess any overall trends.

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 deteriorated to Requires improvement. This meant the service management and leadership was inconsistent. Leaders and the culture they created did not always support the delivery of high-quality, person-centred care.

Continuous learning and improving care

- Quality assurance systems continued to be developed and identified areas for ongoing improvements. Internal infection control audits could be further improved as discussed on the inspection.
- There was discussion that in order to promote high quality care, the home needed consistent leadership. There had been three managers over the past 18 months. The current manager had made improvements in terms of communication and support for staff.
- The manager and senior managers were responsive to the feedback we delivered during the inspection and were positive regarding continuing to improve the service.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements; 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 service had experienced changes of managers since our last comprehensive inspection in May 2019. A new manager was in post and had applied for registration with CQC.
- The feedback from people living at the service evidenced a more settled and consistent approach by the new manager.
- Systems and processes were in place to monitor the quality and safety of the service being provided and these helped to continuously improve the service.
- The service had failed to send recent statutory notifications informing us of changes and events in the home as required. These were sent during the period of the inspection.

Working in partnership with others

- The manager and staff worked with local authorities and healthcare commissioners.
- We spoke with the Local Authority Commissioners as part of the inspection who expressed concern about the recent inconsistencies in standards around infection control.
- Referrals to health services were managed well and appropriately followed up on.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- People told us they received the support they needed to meet their needs.
- Staff told us they enjoyed working for the service and that staffing was relatively settled considering the

pressures around COVID-19. Staff reported recent management and staff changes had provided more stability in the home. One staff member told us, "The atmosphere is really positive."

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

- Regular reviews took place for people using the service to ensure the support was meeting their needs.
- People told us they were listened to and involved as much as possible.
- People had been provided with information regarding COVID-19 and changes that were being implemented to keep people safe.