

MyCapers Limited

Bluebird Care (Kensington and Chelsea)

Inspection report

76 Pembroke Road
London
W8 6NX

Date of inspection visit:
05 January 2017

Date of publication:
30 January 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection of this service on 11 and 12 August 2016. A breach of legal requirements was found. After the comprehensive inspection the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to staff recruitment.

We undertook this focused inspection on 5 January 2017 to check they had followed their plan and to confirm they now met legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for Bluebird Care (Kensington and Chelsea) on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

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.

At our previous inspection we found that the provider was not taking sufficient steps to ensure that staff were suitable for their roles. This was because they had not always obtained satisfactory references for staff prior to starting work. At this inspection we found that the provider were obtaining satisfactory references for new staff where possible, and had satisfactory systems of audit to ensure that the required information was held on staff files. The provider had revised their policies to ensure that where two references could not be obtained, they carried out a risk assessment to ensure that staff were fit for their roles.

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 ●

We found that action had been taken to improve the safety of the service.

The provider had obtained satisfactory references for new staff and had conducted an audit of existing staff. Where references could not be obtained they had carried out a risk assessment to demonstrate that staff were suitable for their roles.

Bluebird Care (Kensington and Chelsea)

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.

We undertook an announced focused inspection of Bluebird Care (Kensington and Chelsea) on 5 January 2017. The provider was given 48 hours' notice of this inspection. This is because the service provides a domiciliary care service; we needed to be sure that someone would be in. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our inspection on 11 and 12 August 2016 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about service: Is the service safe? This is because the service was not meeting some legal requirements.

The inspection was carried out by a single inspector. During our inspection we spoke with the registered manager and the director of the company. We reviewed personnel files relating to five staff who had been recruited since our last inspection and audits of staff files which had been carried out by the management team.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our last inspection in August 2016 we found that the service may not be safe. This was because the provider had not always obtained satisfactory references for staff before they started work to ensure they were suitable to work with people using the service.

At this inspection we found that improvements had been made.

The provider had updated their recruitment policy to state that satisfactory results should be obtained on psychometric tests prior to employment, and where two references could not be obtained for a member of staff, the registered manager was required to carry out a risk assessment to determine whether the candidate could be deemed ready for work. This included assessing whether there was evidence that the provider had tried to gain references, and summarising other information about the candidate's suitability obtained as part of the recruitment process, including from interview notes, psychometric testing and feedback from when the staff member had shadowed other members of staff. Risk assessments also assessed whether the person had previously worked in a health and social care setting, in which case they were required to obtain evidence of satisfactory conduct.

The registered manager showed us that since the last inspection, they had carried out an audit of staff files. This audit assessed whether there was a satisfactory work history in place, whether references had been sought and obtained and whether managers had correctly completed a staff file checklist. The registered manager told us that they now audited five staff files every month. Where staff did not have two references on file, a risk assessment had been carried out to demonstrate what steps had been taken to rectify this and to determine whether they were considered suitable for their roles.

We reviewed the files of five staff who had been recruited since our last inspection and saw that satisfactory references had been obtained, including where the staff member had a relevant work history in a health and social care setting.

We have improved the rating for this question from requires improvement to good because we found that concerns had been addressed and sustained over a period of time.