

Mrs Kathleen Ann Dawson







F D Domestic Services

Inspection report

16 Firthland Way,
Parr,
St Helens,
Merseyside.
WA9 3RQ
Tel:01744 733692

Date of inspection visit: 09 December 2015
Date of publication: 08/02/2016

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

The inspection of FD Domestic services was announced and took place on 09 Decemebr 2015.

FD Domestic services is a small family run domiciliary care agency that provides personal care and support to people in their own homes in the St Helens area.

During our inspection the registered manager was present. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage 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.

The registered provider of the service is also the manager of the service.

Effective recruitment processes were in place and followed by the service, and staff received on-going training and support to ensure they carried out their role effectively.

Summary of findings

There were effective systems in place to assess and monitor the quality of the service. This included gathering the views and opinions of people who used the service and monitoring the quality of service provided.

People's care needs were assessed and care plans were put into place to meet those needs. People's wishes and preferences were recorded in their care plans. Risks to people's health and well-being were identified and risk assessments were in place to manage those risks.

People had been supported to access healthcare professionals, when needed.

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.

We found the registered provider had satisfactory safeguarding procedures in place, with staff having received appropriate training.

The registered provider had the necessary recruitment and selection processes in place which meant only staff suitable to work with people using the service were employed. This helped to ensure that people would be protected.

Good



Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

People's consent to care had been appropriately obtained and recorded.

Staff had the skills and experience to meet the needs of the people they were supporting.

Good



Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

People were treated with dignity and respect, with staff providing support and care in a dignified manner.

People had their needs appropriately assessed and care records gave clear guidance to staff of how people needed to be cared for and supported.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

People were encouraged to make their views known about the service and raise any concerns they had. These were appropriately responded to.

Staff had a good understanding of people's individual needs and provided care and support in a way that respected their individual wishes and preferences.

Good



Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

The registered provider also managed the service.

There were quality assurance systems in place to monitor the service provision.

We saw that when any issues had been raised they had been appropriately addressed.

Good



F D Domestic Services

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 the 09 December 2015 and was announced. We informed the registered provider of the inspection four days prior to our visit. This was to ensure that the registered provider / manager was available for the inspection.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector. Before our inspection we reviewed all the information we held about the agency. The local authority did not commission any care packages from the agency.

We spoke with a relative by phone, the commissioning organisation and an external organisation that was involved in the recruitment of potential employees. They carry out the required employment checks on behalf of the agency. We looked at care files, the staff training records and the policies and Procedures for the agency.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

We spoke with a relative of a person who used the service, they commented, “(Name) is safe, I am really happy, have no worries at all”.

A safeguarding flowchart was displayed in the agency’s office. This flowchart gave clear guidance of how to raise a safeguarding alert to the local authority, if a potential or alleged abuse incident had occurred. The registered manager was fully aware of how to raise a safeguarding alert and had in the past raised a safeguarding alert with the local authority. We saw that staff received safeguarding training as part of their initial induction to employment.

The registered provider had the necessary recruitment and selection processes in place.

We looked at the staff files and we found that appropriate checks had been carried out, including pre-employment checks such as written references and satisfactory Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. DBS checks are carried out to check people’s criminal record and to check if they have been placed on a list for people who are

barred from working with vulnerable adults. The agency resources a company to recruit staff and they also obtain the DBS checks. A robust recruitment system helps to ensure that only suitably recruited staff are employed.

There was a policy in place regarding accidents and incidents, although no accidents had been recorded, there was a relevant and appropriate procedure in place to ensure they were correctly managed.

The medication policy and procedure was up to date and satisfactory, giving guidance about the administration of medication. At the time of our inspection the agency was not administering medication to anyone using the service.

We saw that environment assessments were carried out in the homes of people who used the service, these assessments included, adaptations within the home, for example, bath seat used, Zimmer frame and key safe in place. Only the staff and relatives would know the key safe number.

We saw that care staff had been provided with protective clothing, such as gloves and aprons. This was in order to help with the management of infection control.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

A relative informed us, “The carer always turns up at the correct time. (name) thinks the carer is marvellous”.

We saw consent forms had been signed and dated by people who used the service to show that they had given their consent to receive the support that was provided.

The care records were clear about people’s decisions. They identified their preferences and choices regarding their care provision and staff understood the importance of gaining people’s consent wherever possible.

Records demonstrated that people had received health care services, such as a GP visit and district nurse services, which had been either accessed by support staff on

people’s behalf or people had been supported to contact health professionals themselves. A welfare officer from the commissioning organisation told us, “They always inform us of any changes to people’s care and have in the past phoned the person’s GP or for an ambulance”.

We saw that staff had received up to date and relevant training including, dignity and respect, safeguarding, infection control, nutrition and health and safety.

Staff received appropriate support and supervision. The registered manager had provided staff with regular supervision, in order to assess and monitor their performance. Supervision sessions

provided staff with an opportunity to reflect on their work and plan any future training and development needs.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

A relative told us, “The carer is very nice, well presented and well mannered” and “the carer has always been very good. The carer calls (name) by her first name, she was asked what she wanted to be called”.

Staff member said, “A person’s dignity and privacy should be maintained, as well as their safety and independence”.

An external care professional told us, “They (staff) seem quite compassionate about what they do”.

We saw that people had their needs appropriately assessed and care records gave clear guidance to staff of how people

needed to be cared for and supported. People who used the service had been involved in decisions about their care and support. We found they had been involved in the assessments of their needs when they first began to use the service and that these had been incorporated into care plans.

There were policies and procedures in place to ensure people’s privacy, dignity and human rights were respected and records showed that staff had received training in these areas.

Feedback received from relatives demonstrated that people who used the service were treated compassionately, in a dignified and respectful way.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

A relative told us the agency was responsive to the needs of their relative and that staff and the registered manager communicated with them regularly.

Comments from external organisations included, “The agency is brilliant , welcoming and always happy to talk to you” and “ We have been dealing with the agency for a long time, they are excellent to work with”.

Care plans were individualised and person centred. The plans provided staff with clear guidance in how to meet a person’s needs. People’s likes and dislikes were recorded,

spiritual, cultural and diverse needs, and preferences were recorded. Staff had a good understanding of people’s individual needs and provided care and support in a way that respected their individual wishes and preferences.

The registered manager and staff had consulted and liaised with different health and social care professionals to make sure people were provided with the care and support they needed to promote their health and wellbeing.

People were encouraged to make their views known about the service and raise any concerns they had. These were appropriately responded to. Staff had a good understanding of people’s individual needs and provided care and support in a way that respected their individual wishes and preferences.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

A relative told us, “The manager has always been helpful, if you ask her for anything, it’s done straight away”. External professionals said, “The manager and the staff seem concerned about the clients and the staff” and “ Never had any problems with the agency. The manager goes the extra mile”.

The registered provider had implemented a quality assurance system to ensure the risks to people were being assessed, monitored and responded to. These included reviews of people’s care plans, risk assessments, audits of staff training, regular supervisions, and regular observations of staff practice, which included competency checks, observations of staff interactions with people and checks of how they were carrying out the care and support in people’s homes.

This helped to ensure that people who used the service were appropriately supported and cared for by staff that were trained and supported by the service.

We saw that people who used the service had been encouraged to share their views in regular reviews of their care, through the use of a survey and during on-going communication. We saw written feedback from people including, “Don’t like the carer to wear a uniform” and “When the carer goes on holiday, I don’t want anyone else”. Feed back received was complimentary and positive about the registered manager.

We found that people’s views, comments and concerns had been appropriately considered and responded to by the registered manager. This demonstrated that the service had implemented a system to review how it was run in order to monitor and improve the quality of service that had been provided.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Enforcement actions

The table below shows where legal requirements were not being met and we have taken enforcement action.