

Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd

Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd

Inspection report

Suite A312 Liverpool Business Centre
25 Goodlass Road
Liverpool
Merseyside
L24 9HJ

Tel: 01517283190
Website: www.keycareandsupport.com

Date of inspection visit:
18 August 2016

Date of publication:
14 October 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service effective?

Good ●

Is the service caring?

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We visited Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd on 18 August 2016. Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd provides support to people living in their own homes in the Merseyside area. At the time of our visit, the service was providing support for five people, all of whom were in receipt of 24 hour support. There were 30 staff employed by the service including senior support workers and support workers.

The service 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. The registered manager, operations manager, care manager and quality and compliance manager were in attendance at the time of the inspection.

The provider had systems in place to ensure that people were protected from the risk of harm or abuse. We saw there were procedures in place to guide staff in relation to safeguarding adults and all staff had undergone training about both safeguarding and whistleblowing.

We found that robust recruitment practices were in place which included the completion of pre-employment checks prior to a new member of staff working at the service. Staff received a comprehensive induction programme and had regular training to enable them to work safely and effectively.

All of the responses from people who spoke with the inspector was that the service was either very good or excellent. People told us they were very happy with the staff and felt that the staff understood the support needs of the people using the service. All of the people we spoke with had no complaints about the service.

The support documents we looked at contained good information about the support people required and recognised people's needs. All records we saw were complete and up to date. We found that people were involved in decisions about their care and support. We also saw that medications were handled appropriately and safely.

The staff employed by Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd knew the people they were supporting and the care they needed. People who used the domiciliary service and staff told us that Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd was well led and staff told us that they felt well supported in their roles. We saw that the manager was a visible presence and it was obvious that they knew the people who they supported well.

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

Staff had been recruited safely. Appropriate recruitment and other employment policies were in place.

Staff managed people's medication safely when required.

Each person had risk assessments that were personalised.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective

Staff had undertaken relevant and appropriate training including mental capacity training.

Staff were provided with regular supervision and an annual appraisal of their work performance.

People said they had given consent for support to be provided.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring

People we spoke with praised the staff and management.

People were given appropriate information about Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd.

The confidentiality of people's records was maintained.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive

People who used the service were involved in their plan of care and, where appropriate, their relatives or representatives.

Suitable processes were in place to deal with complaints appropriately.

We saw each person had a care plan that met their individual needs.

Is the service well-led?

Good 

- The service was well led
- The service had a manager who was registered with the Care Quality Commission.
- Staff felt supported in their role.
- There was a well organised office team that had clear responsibilities.

Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd

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.

The provider was given 24 hours' notice because the location provides a domiciliary care service and we needed to make sure that someone would be available. The inspection was carried out by one adult social care inspector.

Before our inspection, we looked at information the Care Quality Commission (CQC) had received about the service including notifications received from the registered manager. We checked that we had received these in a timely manner. We also looked at safeguarding referrals, complaints and any other information from members of the public.

Before the inspection, the provider completed 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 visited the office on 18 August 2016 and looked at records, which included two people's care records, five staff files and other records relating to the management of the service. We also visited the home of one person using the service.

During the inspection we spoke to the registered manager, the operations manager, the care manager and the quality and compliance manager. Following this visit we made phone calls to staff, relatives of the people who used the service and other professionals.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Relatives of the people we spoke to felt the service was safe. We saw that staff had received training in safeguarding adult's and updates were undertaken regularly. The staff were able to tell us what to do to both prevent abuse and to report it should it occur. We were told by relatives that people using the service were safe with the staff.

Staff we spoke to were aware of the need to report any concerns to a senior person and they had knowledge of their own responsibility to report any concerns about their workplace to an outside body if necessary. One staff member told us that they would have no hesitation in reporting any concerns to CQC.

We saw that staff had received training surrounding whistleblowing and we asked staff about their knowledge and their responsibilities. Staff were able to tell us that they would feel they could whistle blow if they felt the need and that it would be acted on. One staff member told us "Oh yes, I wouldn't hesitate".

We saw that risks to people's safety and well-being had been identified and plans put in place to minimise risk. The risk assessments had been updated annually or sooner if there was any change in the person's needs. Risk assessments had been completed with regard to finances, self neglect, handling medicines, people's physical health as well as additional risks. We also saw how infection control was managed in relation to staff working with people who had infectious health issues and how guidance was in the person's file for the benefit of the staff.

We looked at a sample of five staff files. Records showed that full recruitment and checking processes had been carried out when staff were recruited. This included a Criminal Records Bureau (now Disclosure and Barring Service) disclosure and two written references. This helped to ensure staff were safe and suitable to work with vulnerable people.

We looked at how Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd supported people with their medication. Some people were prompted to take their medication, whilst other people needed support with administration of their medication. Medication Administration Record sheets (MARs) were available within the care files, and we saw these had been completed appropriately. Staff had received training in medication administration and competencies were checked periodically by their line manager, this was supported by staff who were spoken to throughout the inspection. One staff member told us "Oh yes, everything was checked. They're pretty smart about it".

We saw that the service ensured that accident and incident records were completed in full. We were also able to see how incidents were investigated and that new protocols had been devised and implemented on how to effectively deal with any reported incidents. We also saw how incidents had been reported to other appropriate professionals such as social workers and district nurses.

There were sufficient staff to meet the needs of people and we were told staff were regular and known to the person they were supporting and that consistency was maintained. One relative told us how Key Care and

Support Merseyside Ltd had recruited for the support team for their family member and that it was now fully staffed. A person who used the service told us "I love all my staff now, all done and dusted".

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People we spoke with told us that the staff calling on them were fully trained and had the relevant skills. One relative said about the staff "They all come with their own skills and now they're learning about [person], they're just so willing to learn". One staff member told us "They are forever texting about training".

We reviewed five staff files in relation to the staff employed and saw evidence that staff had received an induction when they first started working at the service. Staff who were new to care had started the Care Certificate, which was accredited by 'Skills for Care' this is a national qualification. We saw that the service employed an assessor who had responsibility for ensuring staff who were completing the Care Certificate were reaching the appropriate levels of competency.

Records showed that a range of training was undertaken by the staff team and this was confirmed by the staff we spoke with. The training subjects that had been covered included dignity, inclusion, information governance, health and safety, infection control, basic first aid, food safety, moving and handling and medication. We were told by staff that Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd ensure that reminders were sent out to staff two months prior to the training expiry so that all training was up to date. All staff that we spoke to told us that if the training had not been attended then the staff were not allowed to work with people who used the service. One staff member told us "The training has been good and relevant to the services I've been in".

We were also told how Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd provided staff with specialised training according to the people they were working with. One staff member told us how one training course was in a person's home to help staff with strategies surrounding behaviours, they said " They put scenarios in to help with how to manage and what to do, I got a lot from that". We also saw how staff were training within a hospital environment for the specific support for a person using the service.

The service were able to show how they were an accredited provider for Management of Actual or Potential Aggression (MAPA), this training had been attended by all staff spoken to during the inspection . This training equips the staff with management and intervention techniques to support people with escalating behaviour in a professional and safe manner.

We saw that support staff had received individual supervision meetings and this was supported in conversations held with staff during the inspection. This was used as an opportunity to inform them of any changes or issues. Records showed that some of the supervisions took the form of supervised practice and staff had an annual appraisal and we saw that the appraisals were up to date.

The registered manager and operations manager explained to us that information regarding mental capacity was incorporated into the training being delivered to the staff. This gave staff guidance when providing care for people who may not have capacity to make some of the decisions needed in relation to their support. Everyone we spoke to told us their choices were respected, one relative said "[Manager] doesn't put anything in unless he's spoken to me first". Peoples support plans contained information

regarding their mental capacity, an example being that even though one person had limited communication they still had capacity to make their own decisions.

We were able to speak to professionals who dealt with the service. One person told us "The quality of staffing provided is of high calibre and all staff have been vetted and trained in accordance with our requirements".

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People told us that staff were always kind and compassionate when attending to them. One relative said "[Name] absolutely adores [staff]", another relative told us "I've never been so happy". One person who used the service told us "I had a meet and greet with the new staff, lovely".

People who used the service and relatives were asked to complete a satisfaction survey and we saw the following comments that had been made by a person receiving support "Very dedicated, motivated team". People said they usually received care and support from a consistent team of support workers and that they had been able to build trusting relationships with them.

The people we spoke to felt they were well informed and were also involved in the support being delivered. We were told by relatives how they had been involved in arranging the support package for their family member and how they had been working with the service to implement and review the care and request that it is adapted if the need had been identified. Relatives told us that there was always communication between them and the service and they felt they were kept informed of any issues. We were also told by another professional how responsive staff and management were with the people who received care and that communication between the services was good.

We observed that confidential information was kept secure whilst we were in attendance in the office because we saw that paper based records were kept locked and only accessed by staff and electronic information was also secured appropriately.

Information was available for people who received a service from Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd, this included an overview of the service, the type of support that could be provided, service user rights and how the service delivers care.

We were told by one relative "[Name] communication is much better, they've been brilliant" and another family member told us "They've been amazing people." A person who received care from the service also told us "They give me a hand, when I want".

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

All the people and relatives who we spoke with were satisfied with the way support was provided and felt listened to. They told us that they would certainly be comfortable with expressing concerns about the service if they had any. One person told us about how they hadn't liked one staff member and that the service had changed the person. They were now happy with who was supporting them. One relative told us "I know who to make complaints to but I just can't praise them enough" and another relative said "[Manager] told me to tell him what I want or need and if it's not right then we'll sort it out".

The information that was available for people who received a service from Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd, contained a condensed but clear written complaints procedure and this was given to people when they started using the service. The complaints procedure advised people what to do regarding concerns and complaints and what to do if they were not satisfied with any outcome. It gave contact details for CQC.

Health and social care professionals said they felt the service was responsive to people's needs. Comments included, "Such is the trust I have in Key Care I have recommended them to other organisations who have since used their services and have been equally satisfied".

All people and relatives we spoke with reported that they had full choice in their care and the way it was provided and they all considered they were in control of the care and support that was being received. Management always consulted them about how support was to be provided.

We asked people and relatives if they were involved in the initial assessments and reviews of care. One relative told us "Yes, we've worked closely to get the right people" and another family member told us "They've hand picked the staff for [name]". We also asked if people were involved in the reviews of the care being delivered and everyone said yes, one person said "Oh yes, they listen".

Support plans were personalised and provided details of daily routines specific to each person. For example, there were sections about supporting people with areas such as their lifestyle, health, medication, communication, washing and bathing and mobility. Support plans had been reviewed regularly, to make sure they reflected people's current needs and circumstances. This ensured staff had appropriate guidance on how to support people as and when their needs changed. We saw how people had 'current therapeutic input and engagement' and how this was updated regularly. We also saw how other health professionals such as occupational therapists and dieticians had been involved in people's support. For example there was information and guidance for support staff that had been followed regarding diet/fluid and weight management.

Activities were also included within people's support plans this was seen to be reviewed regularly so that support was relevant and person centred. The support plans also documented the current support aims for the person as well as their daily routines.

The support was agreed by the person requiring a service or a family member. Following this, the manager

gave information about the person to staff and also arranged 'meet and greets' with people to ensure the appropriate and agreed support was going to be provided. One relative told us "They're not sending staff with preconceived ideas, they work with me and [name]." Another person told us how the service had slowly introduced staff to the person receiving the service they said "They've shown patience and understanding, it makes a huge difference."

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The service had a registered manager who had been in post since March 2015. He was supported by an operations manager, care manager and quality and compliance manager. The registered manager worked closely with people and their families from the beginning of the care package. One relative told us "I spoke to [manager] at length, we've worked closely to get the right people".

The managers of the service actively updated their own knowledge by attending networking and best practice events. The registered manager told us that they were well supported by a franchise manager and could contact them at any time for support.

All the staff who spoke with us said the service was well led and that they felt supported. One person told us "They're always there if you want them", another staff member said "Yes they're approachable, you always have someone to go to".

The provider and the office staff understood their responsibilities in relation to the service and to registration with CQC and knew to regularly update us with notifications and other information.

The service had previously identified that the policies and procedures were not fit for purpose and were now in the process of being updated. This meant that staff would have access to up-to-date guidance to support them in their work.

We were able to see how the service worked alongside other professionals such as social workers, hospital staff, occupational therapists, dieticians and G.P.'s to ensure care services were personalised. An example of this was accessing clinical training from the hospital to ensure the care of a person in the community would continue following discharge.

People who used the service were also asked to express their views through a satisfaction survey and the service was in the process of implementing new quality measures, an example being analysis of the questionnaires. The service also had external auditors who come to check the quality of the service. The last audit was carried out March 2016 and had been positive.

We saw that staff meetings had been held, this gave staff the opportunity to air any issues and receive information about the service. We saw that the views of the staff had been asked for regarding how better to support the people who used the service. One staff member told us "The people who are being looked after are at the centre of everything" another staff member said "If I think something could be improved I've rang the director, they've listened".

We asked staff if there was anything else they wanted to tell us about the service and one staff member commented that by working for Key Care and Support Merseyside Ltd they had "Seen a whole new world and it's given me a new career".