

ROC Northwest Limited Head Office

Inspection report

Heyes House, 41 Silverdale Road, Arnside Carnforth
Lancashire, LA5 0AL
Tel: 01524 762222
Website: www.rocnorthwest.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 27 March 2015
Date of publication: 18/05/2015

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

We carried out this announced inspection on 27 March 2015. We last inspected this service on 9 October 2013. At that inspection we found that the provider was meeting all of the regulations that we assessed.

ROC Northwest Limited Head Office provides support to children and young people living in their own homes. The agency is a specialist service that provides personal care and supports children and young people to take part in activities in the local community. The service is based in offices in Arnside and support is primarily provided to people living in Cumbria, North Yorkshire and Lancashire. When we carried out this inspection the agency was providing support in the home of one family.

There was a registered manager employed at the service. 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.

Young people were safe receiving support from this agency. They were protected from the risk of harm because care staff were trained in how to identify and report abuse.

Summary of findings

Safe systems were in place to check that care staff were suitable to work with young people in their homes. There were enough staff to support young people. Care staff were trained to ensure they had the skills and knowledge to provide the support young people required.

Medicines were handled safely and young people received their medication as prescribed by their doctor.

Young people and their families were asked for their views about the care provided and the service they received. The service was responsive to young people's needs. Young people and their families could influence how their support was provided.

Care staff were caring and treated young people and their families with respect. Support was provided in a way that promoted young people's privacy and dignity.

The service was well managed. People knew how to contact a senior person in the service if they needed to. The registered provider set high standards for staff to work to. The registered manager carried out checks to ensure people received a high quality of service from this agency.

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 is safe.

Young people who used the service were protected against the risk of abuse or harm.

There were sufficient staff to support young people.

Medicines were handled safely.

Good



Is the service effective?

The service is effective.

Care staff had received appropriate training to give them the skills and knowledge to support young people.

Young people and their families were included in agreeing to the support provided in their homes.

Good



Is the service caring?

The service is caring.

Staff were caring and treated young people and their families with respect.

Support was provided in a way that promoted young people's privacy and dignity.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

Young people and their families were asked for their views about the care provided and the service they received.

Young people and their families could influence how their support was provided.

The registered provider had a clear procedure for receiving and handling complaints. People knew how they could raise a concern if they needed to.

Good



Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

The registered provider set high standards for staff to work to. The registered manager carried out checks to ensure people received a high quality of service from this agency.

Young people and their families were asked for their views about the service and action was taken in response to their comments.

Good



Head Office

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 inspection took place on 27 March 2014 and was announced. We gave the provider 48 hours' notice because the location provides a domiciliary care service.

The inspection was carried out by one Adult Social Care inspector.

Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service.

This was a small service and one family received care in their home when we inspected. We spoke with a member of the family and with the support worker who visited them. We also looked at care records, staff personnel and training records and records relating to the management of the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

The relative we spoke with told us they were confident this service was safe. They told us that they had “no concerns at all” about the service their family received. They told us that their family had been supported by this agency for a number of years. They said that all the staff who had supported them in this time had treated their home and family with respect.

The relative told us that the staff who visited them had received training in how to use the equipment in their home safely. They told us about the actions that care staff took to ensure that they provided care in a safe way.

The support worker we spoke with showed they had a very good understanding of how to ensure young people were protected from harm or abuse. They said that they had received training in child protection and that this was updated regularly. We saw that this was also included in the care records that we looked at.

We saw that thorough risk assessments had been carried out to ensure that young people were safe receiving support from the service. The risks assessments showed the actions that staff had to take to ensure they provided care in a way that protected themselves and the young people they supported. The staff member we spoke with demonstrated that they knew how to protect a young person in their care.

There were sufficient staff to provide the support that people required. The relative we spoke with told us that, over the time their family had used this service, they had always received the support they needed. They said that any new staff member had always worked with an experienced care worker before providing care on their own.

The relative told us that they were confident that the care worker who supported their family handled medicines safely. We saw that a clear procedure was in place for handling medicines in the family’s home. The support worker told us how they did this. We found that the process was specific to the family’s home and appropriate for the setting. The procedure ensured the safety of the young person and other people in the family home. Families who used this service could be confident young people would receive their medicines safely and as their doctor had prescribed.

No new care staff had been recruited since our last inspection at this agency. The registered provider had good procedures to ensure new staff were recruited safely. All new staff had to provide proof of their identity and have a Disclosure and Barring Service check. This checked that they were not barred from working in a care service and that they had no criminal convictions which made them unsuitable to work in people’s homes. In line with best practice the Disclosure and Barring Service checks were renewed regularly to ensure care staff were suitable to work with young people.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The relative we spoke with told us the service they received was “excellent” and said that they were confident that the care workers who had supported them were always well trained. They told us “[The care worker] really knows what she is doing” and said, “We don’t have to check what [the care worker] is doing, we know that everything we need will be done”.

The care worker we spoke with showed that they knew how to ensure support was provided with a young person’s consent. They explained how they gave young people information about their support and how they ensured young people’s rights were upheld. The relative we spoke with told us that they were always included in decisions about how the service was delivered in their home.

The care worker told us that they had been provided with appropriate training to ensure they had the skills and

knowledge to provide the support a young person needed. The staff records we looked at showed that care workers completed a qualification in working with young people. We saw that care staff also completed training including; child protection, emergency first aid, fire safety and safe handling of medication.

When we carried out our inspection the agency was not responsible for providing meals to any young people or for arranging health services on their behalf. The care worker we spoke with told us that, if they were concerned that a young person was unwell, they would report this immediately to the young person’s family.

The Care Quality Commission is responsible for reporting on how services are meeting the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. This was not relevant to this service as, at the time we inspected, there was no one over the age of 16 receiving support from the agency.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

The relative we spoke with told us that all the care staff who had supported their family were caring. They said that the care staff were “fantastic” and “excellent” and told us, “You couldn’t ask for better”. They told us that there was “always a lot of laughter” when the staff worked in their home. The relative told us that all of the care staff who had supported them had developed positive relationships with their family. They said they were comfortable having the care staff in their home.

The relative told us that they had been included in agreeing the support that care staff provided to their family. They said the care worker and managers of the service asked their family for their views about how they wanted support to be provided.

The records we looked at showed that young people who received support from the agency were asked for their

views of the care they received. The care worker we spoke with told us that they included the young people they supported in making decisions about the care they received.

The care worker showed that they knew the action to take if a young person in their care became distressed. We saw that the care records included the actions the staff member needed to take if a young person they were supporting was distressed. This meant that the care staff had information about how to comfort and support a young person.

The relative told us that they were confident the staff who visited them respected their confidentiality. They said that the care staff who had supported their family knew how to respect young people’s privacy and dignity. The care records we looked at included guidance for staff about how to maintain a young person’s dignity. The staff member we spoke with described how they ensured a young person’s privacy and dignity were promoted. Families who used the service could be confident that young people’s privacy and dignity would be maintained.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

The relative we spoke with told us that this service was responsive to the wishes of their family. They told us that the family had requested a change to the support they received and this had been agreed by the service. The relative told us that they were very happy the change had been agreed.

The relative told us that their family had agreed to the support to be provided by this service. They said they were included in all decisions about the support the agency provided in their home. They told us that they knew how they could raise a concern or complaint with the agency but said they had never needed to do this.

The care records we looked at showed that young people received support that was focused on them and the support their family needed. We saw that the support plans were written in a positive way, describing what a young person could do independently and the support they required from the care staff. The support plans were detailed and gave care staff information about the assistance a young person required and how they wanted this to be provided.

The care worker we spoke with showed they were knowledgeable about the support young people required. They said the support plans gave them the information they required in order to provide the care a young person needed. They said that, if the support a young person required changed, they would speak to one of the managers in the service and the individual's support plan would be reviewed to ensure it remained accurate and up to date.

The records we looked at showed that the registered provider had systems in place to ensure information was provided in a format that was accessible to families who used the service. We saw that, if a person's preferred language was not English, the provider could provide information in their preferred language. This helped to ensure people had access to information in an appropriate format.

The registered provider had a formal procedure for receiving and handling complaints. A copy of this was given to families who used the service. The registered manager told us they had not received any complaints about the service. The relative we spoke with told us, "We have no complaints at all".

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The relative and care worker we spoke with told us that this service was well managed. The relative told us, “The managers really are good” and said, “The managers bend over backwards to help, nothing is too much trouble, they are fantastic”.

The service had a registered manager in post. The registered manager was supported by local team managers who were responsible for supporting the care staff who worked in their locality. The relative told us that they knew how they could contact the registered manager or the local team manager if they needed to.

The care worker we spoke with told us the managers of the service set high standards. They told us that they knew what the registered manager and family they supported expected of them.

The relative told us that they were asked for their views of the service. They said the local team manager held regular

meetings with them to review the support provided by the agency. They said they were asked for their views about the service at the review meetings. This was confirmed by the care records we looked at. We also saw that young people who used the service were given opportunities to share their views if they wished. The registered provider also asked families to complete a quality survey to share their views about the service. We saw that the support provided to young people had been changed in response to their family's request. This showed that the registered manager listened to people's views and took action in response to their comments.

The registered manager carried out their own checks on the service to ensure a high quality was maintained. We saw that the records held in the agency office were of a high standard and were well organised. This meant that important information could be found promptly when required.