

By Your Side Limited

# By Your Side Homecare

## Inspection report

50 Newfield Lane  
Hemel Hempstead  
Hertfordshire  
HP2 4DX

Tel: 01442219746

Date of inspection visit:  
05 October 2017  
09 October 2017  
10 October 2017

Date of publication:  
01 November 2017

### 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

The inspection took place on the 5, 9 and 10 October 2017. On the 5 October, we inspected the office and on 9 and 10 October 2017, we contacted people, relatives and staff to obtain feedback about the service they received. By Your Side is a domiciliary care service that provides care and support to people in their own homes. At the time of our inspection, By Your Side was providing support to 12 people. At By Your Side, the provider is also the registered manager.

There was a manager in post who had registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC). A registered manager is a person who has registered with the CQC 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 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

Recruitment processes were completed to ensure staff employed to deliver care and support for people were of a good character and suitable to meet people's needs safely. There were sufficient numbers of staff available to meet people's individual needs, and the service provided to people was flexible.

Staff were able to identify potential risks to people's health and well-being and they knew how to report concerns to protect people from harm. Staff received training in how to safeguard people from potential abuse.

Relatives told us that family members were kept safe and well cared for when they were being supported by the service.

People told us that they were involved with their care and staff always asked for their consent when providing care.

People told us staff supported them to take their medicines safely. Staff were trained in safe administration of medicine and had their competency regularly checked by the provider.

People and their relatives were very complimentary about the abilities and experience of the staff that provided care and support. Staff received training and regular updates to ensure they were up to date with their knowledge and best practice guidance.

Staff developed appropriate positive and caring relationships with the people they supported and their families.

People and their relatives where appropriate, were involved in the planning of the care and support people received. People's personal information was stored securely to maintain confidentiality.

People felt the staff provided care and support that promoted their dignity and respected their privacy. Staff

were knowledgeable about people`s preferred routines and delivered care that was individualised to the person they were supporting.

People told us they felt that staff listened to them and responded to them in a kind and caring way. People and their relatives knew how to raise concerns and they were confident that the provider would take appropriate action to address any concerns in a timely way.

People were asked to provide feedback about the service they received and we saw an independent survey that reflected people were happy with the care and support they received.

People and their relatives were positive about the staff and the provider. The provider regularly audited the service and made the required improvements.

## 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.

People were kept safe by staff trained to recognise and respond effectively to the risks of abuse.

Sufficient numbers of staff were available to meet people's individual needs at all times.

Safe and effective recruitment practices were followed to ensure that all staff were fit, able and qualified to do their jobs.

People were supported to take their medicines safely by trained staff.

Potential risks to people's health and well-being were identified and managed effectively in a way that promoted their independence.

### Is the service effective?

Good 

The service was effective.

Consent was obtained by staff before care and support was provided.

People were supported by staff that were well trained and received the appropriate support.

People were assisted to eat a healthy balanced diet, when required.

People were happy with the support and care they received and were supported to access other professionals if required.

### Is the service caring?

Good 

The service was caring

People were cared for in a kind and compassionate way by staff that knew them well and were familiar with their needs.

Staff and people had developed good relationships

People were involved in the planning, delivery and reviews of the care and support provided.

People's privacy and dignity was promoted.

### **Is the service responsive?**

**Good** ●

The service was responsive.

People received personalised care that met their needs and took account of their preferences and personal circumstances.

People and where appropriate relatives, were involved in the planning and reviews of the care and support.

Guidance available to staff enabled them to provide person centred care and support.

People and their relatives were confident to raise concerns, which were dealt with promptly.

### **Is the service well-led?**

**Good** ●

The service was well led.

People, staff and relatives were all positive about the service.

Effective systems were in place to quality assure the services provided, manage risks and drive improvement.

Staff understood their roles and responsibilities and felt supported by the provider.

# By Your Side Homecare

## **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.

This inspection took place over three days 5, 9 and 10 October 2017 and carried out by one inspector. We told the provider 48 hours before our visit that we would be coming to ensure we could access the information we needed. Before the inspection, we asked the provider to complete a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that requires them to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make.

We also reviewed information we held about the service including statutory notifications relating to the service. Statutory notifications include information about important events that the provider is required to send us.

During the inspection we spoke with four people who used the service, two relatives, four support staff and the provider. We looked at two care plans, three employment files and other relevant documents relating to how the service operated.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People told us they felt the service they received was safe and met their needs. One person said, "I feel safe with the staff, it's a good company." A relative commented, "I would completely recommend them [By Your Side] because of the experience I have had. They excel in meeting [relatives] needs. I feel they are completely safe in [By Your Side] hands."

Staff demonstrated they could recognise potential risks to people's health, welfare or safety and appropriately managed and mitigated risks to help keep people safe. For example, one staff member confirmed that whilst giving care, there was an unannounced visitor at the door. The caller had asked for details about the person who was receiving the care but the staff member explained they could not give these details and reported this to the provider. Staff told us that they informed the office about any changes to people's needs. The provider also confirmed that staff communicated any changes. We noted where staff highlighted concerns; the provider responded to these to ensure people were safe. □

All staff received training about safeguarding people from harm. Staff we spoke with were knowledgeable about how to identify any signs of abuse. They demonstrated verbally how they raised concerns both internally and externally. One member of staff told us, "If I see anything that looks dangerous. If I have any concerns, I will raise this with the [registered] manager." The provider ensured staff who were newly employed were introduced to people so people knew the staff who arrived at their homes. Staff confirmed that before starting with a new client, they were made aware of their support needs. One staff said, "We get enough information about clients. [Provider] will meet me to go through the care plan and an introduction to the family."

Safe and effective recruitment practices were followed to make sure that all staff were of good character and suitable for the roles they performed. We noted all the necessary pre-employment and identity checks were in place before staff were permitted to work. This included a criminal records check, verified references and proof of identity.

Care plans contained risk assessments for people and the environment to keep people safe. We noted there was clear guidance for staff on how to support people's needs detailed in their care plans.

There were enough suitably experienced, skilled and qualified staff available at all times to meet people's individual needs. Staff had access to their rotas via an application on their phone. People were allocated regular staff to promote continuity of care. One person told us, "We have the same staff coming around on a regular basis." The provider demonstrated there were systems in place to ensure calls were covered at short notice if required.

There were processes in place to monitor incidents and accidents. Staff were familiar with the reporting and recording procedures. Staff understood that reporting was important to ensure that steps were taken to reduce potential risks. The provider demonstrated they involved other professionals for example GP's and the mobility team to ensure people were safe. Staff documented in people's daily notes and incident forms

were completed. The provider had introduced a new system to ensure accidents and incidents were managed effectively.

People who used the service told us that staff helped and supported them to take their medicines safely. Staff were trained in the safe administration of medicine; staff knew how to ensure people received their medicines safely. We saw evidence that demonstrated staff had regular competency checks, there were also regular spot checks completed to ensure best practice. We saw medicines were audited regularly.



## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

People we spoke with and their relatives were positive about the staff that provided care and support. One person told us, "We really can't compare this service with anything else, but we feel we have struck lucky. Staff in my opinion are caring and go the extra mile." A relative commented, "Lots of agencies say they deal with dementia, but my experience is they don't understand. By Your Side, they know what dementia means. [Name of provider] understands. "The provider confirmed they were a dementia champion and provided their staff with best practice and relevant training to meet people's needs..

Newly employed staff members were required to complete a structured induction programme during which they received training relevant to their role and achieved a nationally recognised `Care Certificate`. One staff member told us, "It's really good; we have lots of training and support. I'm doing my national vocation qualification level two." Staff worked alongside other experienced colleagues, they were not permitted to work unsupervised until they were competent in their duties. A staff member commented, "I was given time to settle in and work with other staff until I was confident. I let my boss [provider] know when I was comfortable. My boss told me I had as much time as I needed. It's one of the best companies I have worked for."

Staff received training in areas such as safeguarding, medicines, health and safety, moving and handling and first aid. Staff were also encouraged and supported to develop with further training. We noted two staff had completed their qualification and credit framework level three.

Staff had 'one to one' supervision meetings where they had the opportunity to review and discuss their performance. One staff member told us, "Yes we have supervisions; [provider] checks my knowledge. They ask questions about what we do well, if I'm happy and do I need support." Staff told us that the provider was approachable. They confirmed they had the opportunity to attend meetings and staff we spoke with felt they had a voice and that the provider listened to them.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The Act requires that as far as possible people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible. At the time of our inspection, we found that the provider was working within the principles of the MCA where necessary and appropriate to the needs of the people they supported.

Staff told us they obtained people`s consent before they offered any support. One staff member said, "One person I support does not have capacity in everything, but they can choose what they want to eat. It's really important to have choice, I encourage [person] to do what [they] want and be involved, it protects [their] independence."

Staff confirmed they supported people with their nutritional needs. They helped and encouraged people to eat a healthy balanced diet. We found that some people needed very little support from staff while others

required staff to cook their food. Staff supported people to access other professionals such as the GP.

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

People and their relatives told us that staff provided support in a kind, compassionate and caring way. One person told us, "Staff are very kind, they are focused on what they have to do, but they always ask if there is anything else you need." Another person commented, "First class care, the personal care you get is great. Staff are excellent."

People told us they had the same staff supporting them; this gave an opportunity to develop relationships. One person said, "We have the same carer's, I have their numbers. We have a good relationship and we have a laugh. They don't just walk in and out; they sit and make time for you. I feel treated like a real person." Another person said, "I have live in carer's and this works well. They [staff] listen to me; they are well trained and meet my needs. We have fun; it has a family feel to it. The [provider] visits and it's like a friend has come to see me. [Providers name] also takes an interest in my relationship and supports me to maintain this."

People we spoke with confirmed that staff promoted their independence and supported them to live at home. People told us that staff were kind and caring and confirmed they were treated with respect. One person said, "Yes, I am happy with the care. Staff respects your privacy and are kind and caring. They always ask me, is it ok to do this or that." One staff member commented, "If I'm giving personal care, it's really important to me that I'm explaining to [people] what I'm doing next. I cover people with towels to maintain their dignity and I get people to do as much for themselves as they can to keep their independence, it's important to them." One person who told us about when they are supported with personal care, they said, "They make me feel comfortable and I feel respected."

One relative told us how they had a social event planned. They asked the provider for extra support. The provider supported the person for the whole day. The relative said, "The care is very flexible, It is like a family run business and we are part of that family. The [provider's name] goes the extra mile as do all the staff."

We were told about one staff member who took time to learn about the person they cared for. They found out what the person liked to watch and listen too. The staff member down loaded lots of their favourite music and programmes for them to enjoy when they wanted.

Records were stored securely and staff understood the importance of respecting confidential information. They only disclosed it to people such as health and social care professionals on a need to know basis.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

One person said, "They [staff] are fantastic, the whole team are caring. They plan things and look ahead. If I ask them to do things they put it in place." People received care and support from staff that had guidance about people's health and care needs.

People who used the service and where appropriate their relatives, were involved in the planning and reviews of the care and support. People we spoke with confirmed they were involved. One person said, "They sit down with me to discuss my care." Another person said, "The [provider] came and sat down, we worked out what I needed. They sat with me for quite a while." One relative commented, "We went through the care, I'm happy with the care [relative] receives."

Staff we spoke with knew people well, we saw that care plans had guidance for staff about the support people required. One relative said, "I feel relaxed; [relative] is getting good care. I have peace of mind; By Your Side was a god send."

There was a system in place to monitor calls to ensure people received their support at the planned time. Staff confirmed they had travel time added to their rotas to support time keeping. The provider monitored the call logs to ensure people received their calls on time and staff stayed for the allotted call times. The provider was very clear that staff should give time to people and not rush the call.

People and their relatives told us staff arrived on time and if they were running late they were contacted to let them know of the delay. The provider had an electronic call system that required staff to scan themselves in and out of calls. This enabled call times and the length of calls to be monitored. Any calls not logged in would generate an alert after fifteen minutes. This resulted in a phone call to staff to check. One person told us, "Staff turn up on time but if they are running late, they call [name of provider] who will contact us to let us know." One member of staff said, "We get enough travel time, we are not rushed. It's well planned. If I am running late, I contact [Provider] and they contact the client." □

There was a complaints procedure in place and people told us they knew how to raise concerns. People were aware of how to make a complaint should they need to. We noted that complaints received had been appropriately dealt with in line with the provider's complaints policy; we also noted compliments about the good care people received.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

People who used the service told us that the service was run well and they felt listened to. One person said, "The [provider] is very involved [they] pop in from time to time to check everything is alright." Another person commented, "The communication is excellent."

The provider was knowledgeable about the people who received support; they completed the initial assessments and provided the initial care to ensure the persons care plan met their needs. This meant that staff had the appropriate guidance and training necessary to meet people's needs at all times. The provider was clear about their values and the purpose of the services provided.

The provider told us that for them it was all about providing good care. For example, the provider did not take on care packages that did not allow sufficient time to provide good care. They stated that it was important to have the right staff in place to provide a high standard of care. They demonstrated they worked with other professionals such as district nurses to provide joined up care. One example we were given about one person who required support with their insulin. The training for staff was completed and the person was supported at home. This prevented the person from having to stay in the hospital.

There were systems in place to monitor the quality of the service. We saw that the registered manager had completed audits of the service to identify improvements. There were action plans in place to make improvements. For example, the provider had recently introduced 'customer contact sheets' this was to improve the way they documented people's concerns. A new electronic system had also been introduced that would allow staff to log onto a portal for forms and documents. Risk assessments could be updated instantly replacing any previous versions. All staff had received training on the new system. This demonstrated the provider was continually reviewing and improving the way they support and deliver good care.

The provider had also advertised in house for a supervisor as they recognised they needed the support to allow them time to complete other duties. They had also advertised for staff who wanted to develop in the champion roles this would support best practice and better knowledge for staff. The provider was a champion for dementia. They told us they wanted their staff to develop. They had introduced an application for the phone that allowed communication between staff and this could be used for staff to ask for support or to provide information for staff. □

Staff were positive about the registered manager of the service and felt there was strong leadership. One staff member said, "It's one of the best companies I have worked for, wonderful clients and staff. The [provider] has been really supportive to me." The provider had enough staff to meet people's needs and they were actively recruiting.

The provider felt supported by another provider they knew. They told us they had regular meetings to talk about any concerns or ideas; there was lots of daily communication. There were links to the local authority for training. The provider told us that they had a good team around them. There was a clear staff structure in

place and staff were aware of their roles and responsibilities. The provider had a clear vision on where they wanted "By Your Side" to be. There was an out of hour's service operated for people to ensure that people had support when required.

People, relatives, staff and other professional's views were sought by independent survey. We noted positive responses were received. The provider had a newsletter that contained current events and feedback for people who used the service. In the issue, we saw they talked about preventing type two diabetes and gave information about home checks for eyes and teeth. There were autumn recipes and puzzles for people to complete. This demonstrated that the provider supported people with information and feedback on a regular basis any relevant changes and ideas.