

Mr Brian Llewellyn

24 Formosa Drive

Inspection report

24 Formosa Drive
Liverpool
Merseyside
L10 7LE

Tel: 01515211099

Date of inspection visit:
30 May 2017

Date of publication:
29 June 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 30 May 2017 and was announced.

24 Formosa Drive (formerly Radiant Care) is registered to provide personal care to people living in their own homes. The service is located in Fazakerley, Liverpool. The service is a domiciliary care service and people are provided with a range of hours of support per day or per week in line with their needs. At the time of our visit there was just one person receiving support from the agency.

The service is not required to have a registered manager because the Registered Provider manages the service on a day to day and on-going basis. 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.

People were protected from the risk of abuse or harm because staff knew people well and were vigilant in monitoring risk.

Staff knew what action to take if they suspected abuse or neglect.

The provider had a robust recruitment process to ensure staff were suitable to work with vulnerable adults.

The person received a regular service from familiar staff which met their needs.

Staff received appropriate training and support which allowed them to meet people's needs effectively.

Staff had a good understanding of the person's needs.

Staff demonstrated a genuine positive regard for the person they supported.

Care plans were completed to identify the person's assessed needs.

People who used the service had been provided with information on how to raise a concern or complaint.

There were systems in place to monitor the quality of the service provided. Reviews of the service provision and of the care plans were carried out on a regular basis.

Systems were in place to gather the views and opinions about the service from the people who received the service and their relatives.

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 protected from the risk of abuse or harm because staff knew people well and were vigilant in monitoring risk.

Staff knew what action to take if there was any evidence or suspicion of abuse.

The provider had a robust recruitment process to ensure staff were suitable to work with vulnerable adults.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

The person received a regular service from familiar staff which met their needs.

Staff received appropriate training and support which allowed them to meet people's needs effectively.

Staff had a good understanding of the person's needs.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

Staff demonstrated a genuine positive regard for the person they supported.

The care records demonstrated that people and their relatives had been involved in the planning of their care.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

Care plans were completed to identify the person's assessed needs and the support required.

People had been provided with information on how to raise a

concern or complaint.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well led.

There were systems in place to monitor the quality of the service provided.

The provider had systems in place to gather the views and opinions about the service from the people who received the service and their relatives.

24 Formosa Drive

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 on 30 May 2017 and was announced. We gave the service notice of the inspection because it is small and the registered provider is often out of the office supporting staff or providing care. We needed to be sure that they would be in.

The inspection team consisted of an adult social care inspector.

Before our inspection we viewed the information we held on 24 Formosa Drive. This included notifications we had received from the provider, about incidents that affect the health, safety and welfare of people who received a service. We also reviewed the Provider Information Record (PIR) we received prior to our inspection. This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and any improvements they plan to make. This provided us with information and numerical data about the operation of the service.

The agency was supporting one person at the time of our inspection. We were not able to speak directly to them on this occasion but we did speak with their relative. We also spoke with the service manager who directly provided care.

During the inspection we looked at the care records of the person who received a service, two staff files including staff training and recruitment records and records relating to the management of the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

We found that people were protected from the risk of abuse or harm because staff knew people well and were vigilant in monitoring risk. Risk assessments had been completed to monitor people's health. These assessments were reviewed regularly to help ensure any change in people's needs was reassessed so they received the appropriate care and support.

Staff had been trained in adult safeguarding and knew what action to take if there was any evidence or suspicion of abuse or neglect. Staff we spoke with were clear about their responsibilities to report concerns.

Staff were recruited safely as the provider had a robust recruitment process. We found copies of application forms and references. Staff had been subject to a Disclosure and Barring (DBS) check, to ensure they were entitled to work in the UK and police checks had been carried out. We found they had all received a clear DBS check. This meant that staff had been appropriately recruited to ensure they were suitable to work with vulnerable adults.

Arrangements were in place to ensure the person's needs were met as required. The service worked in conjunction with family members to meet the person's needs. The service manager told us they were able to work flexibly to meet the needs of family members to ensure the person received a regular and consistent service which met their needs.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

We found that the staff were trained and had a good understanding of the person's needs. Training was carried out in subjects such as first aid, infection control, hand hygiene, moving and handling, fire safety and safeguarding vulnerable adults.

The person was supported by the same people from the agency. This ensured the person was familiar with them and the staff were familiar with the person's needs. We spoke with the person's relative, who told us, "[staff] knows [family member]. We know when they are coming. [Name] always turns up on time."

Staff were not required to provide food or drinks to the person who received a service as this was carried out by a relative. The person's was also supported to access health services by their relatives.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

The service had supported the person for many years. A consistent service helped ensure the staff were familiar with the person's needs. Staff we spoke with demonstrated a genuine positive regard for the person they supported. They told us they provided care to the same person on a regular basis and for many years. This meant they had the opportunity to develop good relationships with the people they supported and their family.

The care records that we saw clearly demonstrated that people and their relatives had been involved in the planning of their care.

We were unable to speak with the person who received the service. However, we spoke with a family member on the telephone. They confirmed that a reliable and caring service was provided.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Care records we looked at showed people's needs were assessed before receiving a service. Care plans had been developed where possible with each person and their family, identifying the support they required.

Care plans were completed to identify the person's assessed needs and the support they required during each visit. A medical history including any known allergies were also recorded. Personal information and care plans were updated after each home review. These took place each month or when people's needs changed. Care plans we looked at confirmed this.

People who used the service had been provided with information on how to raise a concern or complaint. We found this was recorded in the service user's handbook. The relative we spoke with told us they had not had reason to raise a concern or complaint about the agency. We found that no other complaints had been made.

We saw that the commissioners of the service had recently reviewed the person's care provided by the agency. We saw that they were satisfied with the service provided.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

There were systems in place to monitor the quality of the service provided.

Records showed the provider had systems in place to gather the views and opinions about the service from the people who received the service and their relatives. People were asked if they were happy with their support and if it was meeting their needs. Questionnaires were sent out every three months. We saw that the feedback was consistently rated 'good' to 'excellent'.

The provider supported the person who received a service with another staff member. This enabled them to gather feedback in person regarding their service at each visit.