

Here 4 You Domiciliary Care Agency

Here 4 You Domiciliary Care Agency

Inspection report

98 Burlington Road
Thornton Heath
Surrey
CR7 8PF
Tel: 020 8240 6332
Website: www.here-4-you.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 24 November 2014
Date of publication: 14/01/2015

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 

Overall summary

Here 4 You Domiciliary Care Agency provides support including personal care to people living in their own homes. This announced inspection took place on 24 November 2014. At the time of the inspection two people received support with personal care from the service. The previous inspection of the service took place on 2 December 2013 when it was found to meet all the regulations inspected at that time.

The provider of the service is in day to day contact with people. Consequently, the Care Quality Commission does not require the service to have a registered manager.

The service met people's needs safely. People told us the service was reliable and people received their support visits as planned and staff had sufficient time to give them the assistance they required. The provider had ensured through the use of robust recruitment

Summary of findings

procedures that staff were suitable for their work role. Risks to people were assessed and plans were put in place to reduce the likelihood of them experiencing harm.

The provider had ensured staff received training and support to carry out their duties. People told us they received the help they wanted and the provider and staff

listened to them. They said staff were caring and polite and they had positive relationships with them. People's support was regularly reviewed to make sure it was appropriate and met their needs. The provider checked the quality of the service people received by observing how staff supported people.

Summary of findings

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. People received reliable support and staff were allocated enough time to meet their needs. Potential risks had been identified and plans put in place to keep people safe. The provider had ensured people's needs were met by staff who were suitable to carry out support work.

Good



Is the service effective?

The service was effective. The provider had ensured staff understood their responsibilities and acquired the skills to meet people's needs. Staff received on going support from the provider to ensure people received appropriate care.

Good



Is the service caring?

The service was caring. People said they were happy with the staff who supported them because they were kind and caring. People said staff respected their privacy and they consented to the way they were cared for.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive. People's needs were assessed and their support planned and delivered with their involvement. People said they were listened to and their preferences were met.

Good



Is the service well-led?

The service was well led. People told us the provider asked them for their views of the quality of the service. The provider directly observed how people were supported to ensure they received appropriate support. Care records were accurate and up to date.

Good



Here 4 You Domiciliary Care Agency

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 checked 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 inspection was carried out by two inspectors and took place on 24 November 2014. The provider was given 48

hours' notice in advance of the inspection because the location provides a domiciliary care service and we needed to be sure that we could meet with staff and access care and staff records.

During the inspection we attended a staff meeting and observed a staff training session. We reviewed two people's care records and two staff records. We spoke with the provider and three members of staff. We telephoned two people who use the service to ask them for their views of it.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People told us the service was safe. A person told us, “I have found all the staff to be honest and trustworthy.” Another person said of the member of staff who provided their support, “They always come on time and always stay the full amount of time.”

People told us they received support from regular staff and said if their regular worker was absent for any reason they received support from another member of staff who they knew. They told us this made them feel safe.

People’s records included information about any risks to their health and safety. For example, there was information about how people moved around their home and the type of support they required from staff to ensure they were safe. Reports from occupational therapists about how people should be safely assisted were included in the care records. Daily records were made by staff which demonstrated they followed these guidelines.

Staff we spoke with had all received training on the recognition and reporting of abuse and neglect. They were able to tell us what signs of potential harm to look out for

and the response they would make. They understood they could report any concerns that the provider was not keeping people safe to the local authority using whistle blowing procedures.

Staff told us they had received training in responding to emergencies. They told us about situations where they had responded to incidents which demonstrated that they knew how to take prompt and effective action. For example, they had arranged urgent medical treatment for people when appropriate.

We checked two staff recruitment files. These evidenced that the provider had taken steps to ensure that people received support from staff who were suitable. They had undertaken criminal records checks, taken up references and ensured staff had appropriate knowledge, experience and qualifications. Staff had been interviewed and a record kept of how they had demonstrated relevant skills such as how to communicate with people.

At the time of the inspection none of the people using the service required support from staff in the administration of their medicines so we were unable to inspect the safety of the service in relation to this subject.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People told us they were very happy with the way staff supported them and said staff were skilled and knowledgeable.

Staff told us they had completed an induction when they started at the service. They said that during this period they had read key policies and procedures and been introduced to the people they supported. They said the provider explained to them key points about how people should be cared for and they had read people's individual care records. Staff told us they had the skills they required to give people support to meet their needs. A member of staff told us, "We do a lot of our training on line, we are sent an email to remind us when it is due. [The provider] asks what we have learnt afterwards." Staff records confirmed staff had received recent training in relevant topics such as safeguarding vulnerable adults and hand hygiene.

We observed a short training session that the provider held for staff. This included a role play about supporting a person with personal care to facilitate a discussion on the important factors for staff to consider when providing this type of care. The provider ensured during the session that staff understood how to communicate well with people whilst they supported them.

Staff records included evidence that they had received recent supervision from the provider in relation to their work and had discussed people's needs. A staff member said "We discuss what had been happening, whether there any changes or any hazards." Staff told us the provider was very supportive and easy to contact at any time to ask for advice.

People told us they fully consented to the care they received. Staff we spoke with had received training on the key principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and understood how to put these into practice should it become necessary to promote the rights of people who may lack mental capacity.

People's care records included information on how they met their dietary requirements. A person told us they were happy with the way the service supported them with their breakfast. Staff told us the person told them each day what they wanted and they prepared it. None of the people who used the service had complex dietary needs but staff we spoke with told us they had been trained to be alert to signs such as changes in person's eating habits and report them to the provider. We asked the provider about the steps that she would take if she was concerned about someone's nutrition. We were satisfied from her response that she would, with the person's consent take appropriate action such as supporting them to access their GP for advice.

People told us they received the support they needed in relation to their healthcare needs. For example, a person's care records included information from a health professional about their rehabilitation needs following their discharge from hospital. The person's support plan included this guidance and records confirmed the person's support was delivered in accordance with it. Staff told us they were trained to ask people how they were and to be alert to any signs that a person was unwell. They gave us examples of situations when they had ensured people obtained appropriate healthcare.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People told us the service was caring. A person said, “All of the staff are very nice people and caring.” They said relationships with staff were positive, “we chat during the visit.” People we spoke with confirmed that they were cared for as they wished.

People told us the provider had an initial meeting with them and asked them about their wishes in terms of how they wanted to be supported. Care records included detailed information on people’s wishes and preferences. A member of staff told us, “For example, [person’s name] likes their breakfast cooked a certain way. You have to get it right. It’s important they have what they want.”

People we spoke with were clear that they were able to tell staff what to do for them and they had choice and independence. For example, one person said they had

been very specific with the provider about the timing of their support visits and they received support in line with their preferences. They said they continued to be independent with many activities and the support they received promoted this. They said “I asked for help with certain things only – which is what I get.”

People told us staff were respectful towards them and respected their privacy. They said they felt comfortable whilst they were receiving personal care. Staff we spoke with were able to explain the practices they followed to uphold people’s privacy and dignity whilst caring with them.

People told us they had received written information about the support visits they would receive and how their needs would be met. They said they were also given information about the service which included emergency contact numbers.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People told us they got the care they needed and were listened to. A person told us they had been involved in creating their care plan, and were happy with the service they received. They said, “I have given the carers a lot of guidance about how best to provide support. They are still quite new to me and are learning what to do, but have done a good job so far.”

Another person told us how they had been involved in agreeing an initial care plan, and since then had worked with the staff to update it so it met their current needs. They said the staff had listened to them and changed what they have done based upon this feedback. They told us, “[The staff] are willing to learn and willing to add things.”

The provider told us she met with people before they started to use the service to ask them about their support needs. Care records included an initial assessment and a support plan. These were fully completed and set out what

people’s individual needs were in relation to their health and personal care. They had details of people’s circumstances and background and included important information such as key contacts. Care plans were up to date in terms of people’s needs and the support they received. People we spoke with told us that staff completed daily records to confirm that they had delivered their support as planned.

People we spoke with said they were in close touch with the provider. They told us the provider visited them regularly to assist them with their support and also telephoned them to ask for their views of the service. People told us that had no complaints about the service but would have no hesitation in raising a concern with the provider if they needed to. They said they thought she would act on any concerns they had. People told us they had received information about how to make a formal complaint when they started to use the service. Staff we spoke with were aware of the provider’s complaints procedure and how people could use it.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The provider of the service is involved in the day to day operation of the service and the CQC does not therefore require the service to have a registered manager.

People told us they had met the provider when she had assessed their needs and she had also from time to time provided their support. They said she was approachable and friendly. They told us she always asked them for their views of their support and how their experience of the service could be improved. They said their suggestions were acted on, for example in relation to the timing of support visits. People had completed a brief questionnaire about their support. This confirmed they were happy with the service they received.

Staff told us the provider was a good role model in terms of the way she related to people who use the service and staff. They said she was open to their ideas and committed to providing people with a quality service. The said she had made sure they understood the values of the service which were set out in the staff handbook. Staff told us they had

the opportunity to discuss how to improve the service at regular team meetings. We attended a team meeting. The provider involved staff in discussing how to provide a quality service to people. Staff told us they enjoyed working for the service. A member of staff said, “It is a small and friendly team, staff are always willing to step in and support each other.”

Staff said the provider checked the quality of the support they delivered. They said she undertook ‘spot checks’ when she observed how they supported people. Supervision records included brief notes of the provider’s observations of staff practice. These notes covered how staff had communicated with people, upheld their privacy and dignity and how they had completed their duties and met people’s needs in accordance with their support plan. Staff said the provider checked during these visits that their record keeping was accurate and up to date. They said they had received guidance from the provider on how to record the support people had received. A member of staff told us, “We have to put the detail of what we have done on the record.”