

Priority Plus Limited

# Priority Plus Ltd Coventry

## Inspection report

Unit 2, Faraday House  
Electric Wharf  
Coventry  
West Midlands  
CV1 4JF

Date of inspection visit:  
30 January 2019

Date of publication:  
25 February 2019

Tel: 02477677135

Website: [www.priorityplusnursing.co.uk](http://www.priorityplusnursing.co.uk)

## 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

What life is like for people using this service:

A relative told us they felt confident in the registered manager and the way Priority Plus operated. They told us good staffing levels afforded people responsive and dignified support.

The management team had safe recruitment procedures to ensure staff were suitable to work with vulnerable adults. No new staff had been employed since their registration.

Staff responsible for assisting people with their medicines had received training to ensure they had the competency and skills required. One staff member said, "Yes we have had training you can only administer medicines if you have done appropriate courses."

Risk assessments had been developed to minimise the potential risk of harm to people during the delivery of their care. These had been kept under review and were relevant to the care provided.

Care plan information focused on a person-centred method of supporting people. Also, information contained what support was required. We discussed with the registered manager to ensure consent to care documentation was more prominent in care records. This had been implemented following the inspection visit and more detailed documentation around consent to care was now in place.

A relative of one person supported by the service told us they were treated with respect and by caring staff. The relative told us staff were kind caring and respectful when visiting their home.

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible. The policies and systems in the service supported this practice. We discussed the principles of the MCA and consent with staff and found they had a good awareness in accordance with domiciliary services.

We found Priority Plus had systems in place to ensure they could meet people's diverse and cultural needs. Care records we looked at evidenced people and where appropriate relatives were fully included in their support planning.

A relative we spoke with and staff told us there were enough staff on duty to ensure the person received support and enable them to care in a timely way. In addition, sufficient staff were deployed with specific skills so that the person was supported and cared for according to their needs. A relative said, "Very happy with the staffing arrangements."

The registered manager and organisation used a variety of methods to assess and monitor the quality of the service. These included staff meetings, spot checks, auditing of the service and surveys to seek people's

views about the service provided.

The service worked in partnership with other organisations to ensure they followed good practice and people in their care were safe.

There was a complaints procedure which was made available to people and their family when they commenced using the service.

More information is in Detailed Findings below.

Rating at last inspection:  
Not rated.

About the service:

This service is a domiciliary care agency. It provides personal care to people living in their own houses and flats in the community. It provides a service to adults and children. At the time of the inspection one person received 24-hour care from the service. The office is based in Coventry. The service provides care and support varying from short visits to 24 hours a day support.

Why we inspected:

This was a planned first inspection of the service since their registration with CQC.

Follow up:

We will continue to monitor intelligence we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-inspection programme or if any issues or concerns are identified.

## 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.  
Details are in our Safe findings below.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective  
Details are in our Effective findings below.

### Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring  
Details are in our Caring findings below.

### Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive  
Details are in our Responsive findings below

### Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led  
Details are in our Well-Led findings below.

# Priority Plus Ltd Coventry

## Detailed findings

### Background to this inspection

**The 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 team** • Consisted of an adult social care inspector.

**Service and service type** • This domiciliary service provides personal care to people living in their own homes and flats.

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

**Notice of inspection** • This comprehensive inspection visit took place on 30 January 2019 and was announced. The provider was given 48 hours' notice because the location provided a domiciliary care service to people who lived in the community. We needed to be sure that we could access the office premises and speak with people.

**What we did preparing for and carrying out this inspection** • Before our inspection we completed our planning; tool and reviewed the information we held on the service. This included notifications we had received from the provider, about incidents that affect the health, safety and welfare of people supported by the service and previous inspection reports.

We also checked to see if any information concerning the care and welfare of people supported by the service had been received. We contacted the local contracts commissioning departments. This helped us to gain a balanced overview of what people experienced accessing the service.

As part of the inspection we used information the provider sent us in the Provider Information Return. This is information we require providers to send us at least once annually to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make.

During the inspection visit we spoke with a range of people about Priority Plus, they included a relative of the person who received care, the registered manager and five staff members.

We looked at records relating to the management of the service. We did this to ensure the management team had oversight of the service and they could respond to any concerns highlighted or lead the agency in ongoing improvements. We also looked at staffing levels, training records and recruitment procedures for staff.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

Safe – this means people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm

People were safe and protected from avoidable harm. Legal requirements were met.

### Systems and processes

- The service had safe, effective safeguarding systems in place and all staff spoken with had a good understanding of what to do to make sure people were protected from harm.
- A relative told us they felt safe in the knowledge that staff provided a safe service for their relative. One comment received, "Yes we are safe the staff are very good and give me peace of mind they are doing a safe job looking after [relative]."

### Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Staff understood where people required support to reduce the risk of avoidable harm. Care plans we looked at contained explanations of the control measures for staff to follow to keep people safe and reduce risk of accidents and incidents.
- We found care records looked at included risk assessments that covered, health and safety, the environment, falls and medication. Information contained details comprised of the person's level of independence and action to support them.

### Staffing levels

- We looked at how the service was staffed and found appropriate arrangements were in place.
- Staffing levels matched people's requirements. Sickness and staff leave was managed between the team to maintain continuity of care. When we discussed this with a relative they confirmed they had the right support and staff who understood their needs.
- Staff had been recruited safely. All pre-employment checks had been carried out including Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. No staff had been recruited since the registration of the new location.

### Using medicines safely

- We looked at medication records and found medicines to be managed safely. Staff who administered medication did so at the correct time they should and had received appropriate training. One staff member said, "We have all received good training and competency testing with medication."
- Medicines were managed in line with The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) national guidance. This showed the service had systems to protect people from unsafe storage and administration of medicines.
- The registered manager regularly completed medication audits to check their procedures and processes were safe.

### Preventing and controlling infection

- If required staff told us there was sufficient personal protective equipment, such as disposable gloves and

aprons to maintain good standards of infection control. This helped prevent the spread of infections.

- The registered manager ensured infection control procedures were maintained with effective staff training.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Accidents and incidents were recorded and analysed so any trends or patterns could be highlighted and action taken.



# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

Effective – this means people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promotes a good quality of life based on best available evidence.

People's outcomes were consistently good and people's feedback confirmed this.

Staff skills, knowledge and experience.

- Staff records showed personnel received training that was relevant to their role and enhanced their skills. This was confirmed by records we looked at and discussions with staff. A staff member said, "We are only small at the moment but the training is second to none. It is really good."
- Staff also told us they were supported to improve their learning by undertaking professional qualifications. The registered manager had a system in place to monitor training to help ensure this was regularly refreshed. In addition, training was updated so staff were kept up to date with best practice and current legislation. Training methods included online computer training and the organisations training department.
- The management team strengthened staff experience and support through supervision and individual informal meetings. Supervision was a one-to-one support meeting between individual staff and a member of the management team to review their role and responsibilities. Meetings were provided regularly and covered, for example, professional and personal progress, and training needs. Staff we spoke with confirmed they had regular formal supervision sessions.

Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law.

- Care plans we looked at showed expected outcomes and details of support required with an emphasis on promoting independence.
- Care plans detailed times and tasks required when visiting a person's home.

Supporting people to eat and drink enough with choice in a balanced diet

- Care plans seen confirmed people's dietary needs had been assessed and support and guidance recorded as required.
- A relative told us staff supported them with their meal preparation and they were happy with support they received.
- Staff informed us they had completed food and hygiene training to ensure they were confident with meal preparation.

Staff providing consistent, effective, timely care

- We found evidence the registered manager was referencing current legislation, standards and evidence based on guidance to achieve effective outcomes.
- People received effective support from staff at Priority Plus because they were supported by trained staff who had a good understanding of their needs.

Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance

- We looked at how the service gained people's consent to care and treatment in line with the Mental

Capacity Act (MCA). Processes were in place for people to give their consent to care and support. A relative of a person supported by the agency confirmed this.

- The Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) do not currently apply in settings such as domiciliary care where people are resident in their own homes. However, the management team were aware of (DoLS). Staff demonstrated a good awareness of related procedures We found staff had MCA and DoLS training to underpin their knowledge and skills.

Adapting service, design, decoration to meet people's needs

- The agency had systems to identify record and meet communication and support needs of people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss. This was so they could adapt the service to ensure they received the best care and support. This was a domiciliary agency so people received care in their own homes.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

Caring – this means that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

People were supported and treated with dignity and respect and involved as partners in their care.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported

- A relative we spoke with confirmed staff were kind, respectful and sensitive to their relative's needs.
- Care records we looked at contained information in relation to each person's dignity and privacy. It was evident care records and the attitude of staff was to ensure support planning was personalised and focused on retaining and promoting people's independence as much as possible.

Supporting people to express their views and be involved in making decisions about their care

- Care records we looked at contained evidence the person who received care or a family member had been involved with and were at the centre of developing their support plans. Also, what support was required to maintain and promote their independence within their own home.
- Records contained information about people's current needs and choices.
- There was information available about access to advocacy services around the office base should people require their guidance and support. This ensured their interests would be represented and they could access appropriate services outside of the service to act on their behalf if needed.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- Discussion with staff and a relative about how people should be treated with respect and dignity confirmed they showed a good awareness of the importance of respecting people and maintaining their dignity. A staff member said, "We are in people's homes and have to acknowledge and respect that at all times."
- Staff spoken with had a good understanding of protecting and respecting people's human rights. They talked with us about the importance of supporting people's different and diverse needs. Care records seen had documented people's preferences and information about their backgrounds. Additionally, the service had carefully considered people's human rights and support to maintain their individuality. Documents for future service users included information of protected characteristics as defined under the Equality Act 2010, such as their religion, disability, cultural background and sexual orientation. The registered manager told us they had systems in place to ensure people's human rights were upheld.

# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

Responsive – this means that services met people's needs.

People's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

### Personalised care

- Priority Plus staff provided care and support that was focused on individual needs, choices and routines of people they cared for. This was confirmed by discussion with staff and a relative of a person who received 24-hour care from the agency. They said, "[Relative] needs specialised care and the staff know what they are about."
- Care was personalised and centred on the individual. For example, details in care records highlighted how they were to be supported and their daily routines. For future when people used the agency the registered manager had documentation in place that highlighted how they wanted to spend their time. In addition, what their interests were and choices they preferred. A staff member said, "We have the paper work in place for when we expand."
- A relative told us they were supported by staff to express their views and wishes. This enabled people to make informed choices and decisions about how their relative was to be supported.

### End of life care and support

- The service is a domiciliary care agency. The aim of the service is to make independent living a reality by working with the people to overcome the obstacles of day-to-day life. The registered manager told us the service at present does not support people with end of life care. The service had provision for staff training in 'end of life care'.

### Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- We saw information was made available to people that described how to make a complaint if they wished and relevant steps to follow. The procedure was clear in explaining how a complaint should be made and reassured people these would be responded to appropriately. Contact details for external organisations including social services and the Care Quality Commission (CQC) had been provided should people wish to refer their concerns to those organisations

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

Well-Led – this means that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

The service was consistently managed well led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person centred care.

Provider plans and promotes person-centred, high-quality care and support, and understands and acts on duty of candour responsibility when things go wrong

- The relative of the person supported by the agency was complimentary about the registered manager and the way the service operated. They said they were approachable and available when they needed to speak with senior staff.
- The registered manager demonstrated a commitment to provide person-centred, high-quality care by engaging with everyone using the service. In addition, they had good communication links with outside agencies who had involvement with Priority Plus.

Managers and staff are clear about their roles, and understand quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- This was the first inspection for Priority Plus Ltd since their registration. We had received notifications of incidents and events that required attention. This showed the registered manager was aware of their responsibilities and knew their regulatory requirements.
- We found the service had clear lines of responsibility and accountability. The registered manager and staff were experienced, knowledgeable and familiar with the needs of people they supported.
- Discussion with the registered manager and staff on duty confirmed they were clear about their role and between them provided a well run and consistent service. For example, a staff member commented, "We have a good manager and the service is well organised."

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff

- The service had systems and procedures in place to monitor and assess the quality of their service since their registration. These included views of people who used the service by way of surveys and telephone discussions. Comments from surveys were positive and included, 'great staff who really help me a lot.' Also, 'the service is well organised and never let us down we are grateful we get good support from Priority Plus. The registered manager informed us all would be examined and where any negative comments were made, they would be analysed and acted upon.
- Staff meetings were held regularly. Staff told us they were useful and well attended and gave them opportunities to suggest ideas or voice opinions on how the service operated.

Continuous learning and improving care

- The management team completed a range of quality audits to ensure they provided an efficient service and constantly monitored Priority Plus performance. These for example included, care records, environmental issues and spot checks. This meant improvements could be made to continue to evolve and

provide a good service for people.