

Bonney Care Agency Ltd

Business Base

Inspection report

16 Swan Street
Leicester
Leicestershire
LE3 5AW

Date of inspection visit:
05 October 2017

Date of publication:
31 October 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection of this service on 27 and 29 June 2017. A breach of a legal requirement was found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet the legal requirements in relation to the breaches.

We undertook this focused inspection to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements. This report asks is the service safe? You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Business Base on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Business Base is registered to provide personal care and support for people living within their own homes. At the time of our inspection there were 22 people using the service. This comprised of three people who resided in their own home and 19 people requiring support who had a learning disability or mental health need, and resided within one of three 'supported living' environments based in Leicester.

The inspection was announced. The provider was given 48 hours' notice because the location provides a domiciliary care service and we needed to be sure that someone would be in the office to meet with us.

Business Base had a registered manager. 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.

People's safety and welfare was promoted through comprehensive assessments and on-going review of potential risks to people. Where risks had been identified measures had been put into place to reduce the likelihood of risk and were recorded within people's records and understood and implemented by staff. People's safety was promoted as there were sufficient staff to support people.

Staff upon their recruitment had their application and references validated and were checked as to their suitability to work with people, which enabled the provider to make an informed decision as to their employment. Staff underwent training, which promoted people's safety and welfare. People received the support from with their medicine by staff who had received training.

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.

Risks to people's health and wellbeing were assessed and care plans put in place to promote people's health, safety and welfare.

People were protected from abuse and were provided with information to raise their awareness of how to stay safe.

There were sufficient numbers of staff available to keep people safe. Staff were trained in the delivery of safe care. Safe recruitment systems were followed to ensure staff were suitable to work with the people who used the service.

People received support with their medicines which were managed safely.

Requires Improvement ●

Business Base

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 an announced focused inspection of Business Base on 5 October 2017. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection of 27 and 29 June 2017 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services Is the service safe? This is because the service was not meeting a legal requirement.

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector.

We spoke with the registered manager and two care managers.

We looked at the risk assessments and associated care plans of three people who used the service and other records relating to their care and welfare. We looked at the recruitment and training records of three members of staff. We looked at records in relation to people's medicine. We looked at the provider's policy and procedure for safeguarding and medicine management.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our previous inspection of 27 and 29 June 2017 the provider had failed to ensure people's safety and welfare. This was because people's care plans and risk assessments did not include the information staff needed to reduce risk to people and provide them with safe care and support. We issued a requirement notice under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2015. At this inspection we found improvements had been made.

People's care records included risk assessments which identified risks in relation to their health, independence and wellbeing. The risk assessments were regularly reviewed, updated and used to develop care plans. They were comprehensive and individualised and focused on people's particular needs. For example, if a person had poor skin integrity a risk assessment was in place for this.

Comprehensive and individual risk assessments were also in place and were reflective of the activities people took part in, such as accessing the wider community, along with people's emotional needs and well-being. An example of protecting an individual's safety was for a person whose behaviour could challenge others. The risk assessment identified potential risks for the person within their home or the community. Measures had been taken to reduce risk, which included ensuring a sufficient number of staff were available to support the person and by staff consistently following a clear care plan to reduce risk and promote well-being. Staff completed daily notes about the care and support they provided, which demonstrated that they had followed people's care plans to reduce risk and promote safety and well-being.

People's records contained an assessment of their home environment which identified areas of risk. For example staff had considered the lighting in people's homes to ensure there was sufficient lighting to promote their safety when personal care and support was being delivered. Staff had also carried out visual checks to ensure electrical appliances were safe to use, such as a person's microwave, where staff were responsible for preparing people's meals.

The service user guide, a copy of which was given to each person who used the service, contained information about the service's responsibility in promoting safety. It stated that a risk assessment of their home would be undertaken and staff who provided their support and care would have the appropriate training to support them safely. Information on safeguarding was also included. This stated staff would behave in a professional manner and not take advantage of their position to abuse or otherwise put people at risk. Contact details for external agencies such as the local authority were included so people knew who to contact if they wished to raise a safeguarding concern.

There were sufficient staff with suitable skills and knowledge to meet people's needs. Staff received training on the promotion of people's safety, which included courses on safeguarding, the safe moving and handling of people, emergency first aid, health and safety and the management of behaviour which may challenge.

We looked at staff records and found people's safety was supported by the provider's recruitment processes. Staff records contained a completed application form, a record of their interview and two written

references. A criminal record check had been carried out by the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). DBS checks help employers to make safer recruitment decisions by providing information if a person's has a criminal record. This meant people could be confident that staff had undergone a robust recruitment process to ensure they were suitable to work with them.

People could be confident that their medicines were organised and administered in a safe, competent manner. Staff had received training in medicine management. Some people required their medicine to be administered by staff, whilst others required prompting and monitoring or were supported by family members. Staff had this information so they were able to safely assist people with their medicines.

People's records included information as to the medicine they were taking. There were protocols in place for the administration of medicines that were prescribed on an 'as required' basis (PRN). These included medicines which were to be administered if a person's behaviour challenged the service. The comprehensive documentation in people's care plans promoted their safety as it provided clear guidance for staff to follow in the event of this type of incident.

The rating of this key question has been considered. We have not made any changes to the rating for this key question as the provider needs to evidence that improvements are sustained. This will be considered at the next planned inspection.