

Accord Housing Association Limited

Skills Development Team

Inspection report

Orchard Place, Wrekin Drive
Donnington
Telford
Shropshire
TF2 8DP

Tel: 07730988782

Website: www.accordgroup.org.uk

Date of inspection visit:
20 March 2019

Date of publication:
15 May 2019

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

About the service: Skills Development Team provided personal care to people living in their own homes both in the community and within a supported living complex. When we inspected they were providing the regulated activity of personal care, to two people.

People's experience of using this service:

- People felt safe and well supported.
- People were satisfied with the quality of the service provided.
- People received their medicines as and when they needed them.
- Risks to people were monitored and procedures were in place to help keep people safe.
- People were protected from the risks associated with the control and spread of infection.
- Staff understood the importance of ensuring people's rights were understood and protected.
- People's health care needs were monitored and understood by staff.
- There were sufficient staff to meet people's needs flexibly.
- Support was personalised to meet individual needs
- People told us staff understood their needs and were kind and caring.
- People were confident that complaints would be addressed.
- Quality checks and audits enabled the provider to ensure improvements were made and good quality was maintained.

Rating at last inspection: This was the first inspection of this service.

Why we inspected: This was a planned inspection.

Follow up: We will continue to monitor intelligence we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-inspection programme. If any concerning information is received we may inspect sooner.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

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.

Skills Development Team

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection: We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

Inspection team: The inspection team consisted of one inspector.

Service and service type: The service is a domiciliary care agency/ supported living service. People receive a personal care service in their own home. CQC regulates only the care provided. 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: Inspection site visit activity was announced and started on 20 March 2019 and ended on 20 March 2019. We gave 48 hours short notice of the inspection site visit because we wanted to be sure the management were available.

What we did: At the time of our inspection only two people were receiving a regulated activity. We reviewed information we had received about the service since the time of their registration. This included details about incidents the provider must notify us about, such as abuse. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. We used all this information to plan and inform our inspection.

During the inspection, we spoke with one person who used the service to ask about their experience of the care provided.

We spoke with four members of staff including the registered manager, a senior support worker, a support worker and a senior manager.

We reviewed a range of records. These included two people's care records. We looked at records relating to the general management of the agency.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm

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

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People told us they received safe support. Staff had received training to understand abuse and were confident to recognise and report it.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- People had complex needs and risks were clearly identified and actions in place to reduce them.
- People had been involved in deciding actions to keep them safe. Risks were managed effectively.

Staffing and recruitment

- There were enough staff to support people to receive the support they required. People said they knew the staff team well, meaning they had consistency.
- Staff confirmed they had been through a thorough recruitment process prior to starting work and records demonstrated that all required checks had been made.

Using medicines safely

- People required support to manage their medicines to keep them safe. One person told us their medicines were stored in a locked cupboard and they understood why this was necessary.
- One person told us staff arrived on time to administer medicines and staff always checked to ensure they were the 'right ones'.
- Staff were knowledgeable of their roles and responsibilities when administering and recording medicines and training had been delivered as well as ongoing competency checks.
- Senior staff audited records and did this with the person who used the service. The audit we saw identified positive responses and this was confirmed in conversations with the person.

Preventing and controlling infection

- Staff told us they received training in relation to infection control. One staff member told us, "There are gloves and aprons to use in all of the flats and we also have a supply in the office."
- People told us that staff wore gloves when supporting them.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- The registered manager told us how they liaised with other managers to discuss incidents and learn from them as a team.
- Accidents and incidents were reported and monitored by the registered manager and senior managers to identify trends.
- Incidents were shared with staff and support plans were reviewed to reduce likelihood of reoccurrence

where possible.

- The provider completed group learning logs in order to record issues and learn from them. Issues were initially shared within teams and then training identified to address the learning need when appropriate.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence

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

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

- People's needs were assessed prior to them receiving a service. People told us they had been involved in this process and the registered manager confirmed it.
- Assessments informed care plans and were person centred containing details of people's diverse needs and aspects of their life that were important to them. Plans were being further developed to enable people to have the opportunity to assess their own needs on a regular basis.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People told us they were confident in the skills and knowledge of the staff. Staff said they received good training opportunities and training was relevant to their role. One staff member told us, "We are always able to come back and put what we have learnt into practice."
- New staff were supported in their roles with opportunities to work with existing staff and undertake a detailed induction programme.
- Staff received support from seniors and colleagues to ensure they were performing as required. One staff member said, "I've never worked anywhere where the team is so supportive. There is always someone there for advice and support."

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet

- Although staff did not support people with eating and drinking they were aware of people's dietary needs to ensure they could manage any issues that may affect the person's wellbeing.

Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care

- Staff told us they worked very closely with outside agencies to ensure people's needs and changing circumstances were shared when appropriate.
- Social care professionals spoke very positively about the impact the staff team made on people's lives.

Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- People received only minimal support and were largely independent. However, staff worked closely with people and ensured that when their health needs changed that they were signposted to the appropriate support. This joint working meant that people could live as independently as possible.

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

- 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. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA and found they were.

- One person told us they felt involved in decision making and that their decisions were respected. Staff told us that everyone they supported had capacity to make decisions about their care and support.
- Information was provided in formats that suited people's needs.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect

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

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; respecting equality and diversity

- One person told us, "Staff are very caring. They always have a chat with me."
- All staff undertook equalities training and worked with professionals to support people express their individuality. Support was personalised to those needs and one person told us staff knew their needs well.

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

- One person told us they were fully involved in making decisions about their care. They had detailed plans in place for safe support and said they had agreed to them.
- The registered manager told us how they adapted situations to ensure people felt comfortable being involved. For example, one person only attended part of any meeting to reduce their anxiety.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- One person told us staff respected their privacy and they always knocked on their door and waited to be invited in. They said that staff promoted their independence by being available for support but not doing things for them. They told us their independence was very important and they were happy with minimal support as required.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the service met people's needs

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

Planning personalised care to meet people's needs, preferences, interests and give them choice and control

- People told us they were involved in the development of their support plans and in developing their risk assessments.
- One person told us, "I know why I need support and I was involved in deciding how my support was to be given. The staff understand me and this helps."
- The registered manager told us plans and reviews were becoming even more person centred and we saw how people's involvement was central to this.
- Staff told us that it was important to understand people's life histories to enable them to fully understand their current situations. Plans we saw were very detailed.
- People's needs and preferences about how they wished to be supported with their medicines were clearly recorded and staff knew how to offer support safely and why it was important.
- A social care professional told us the service was "Responsive to how a person was feeling."

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- There was a complaints procedure in place that was easy to follow and readily available to people. People were confident they would be listened to if they had a concern or a complaint.
- One person told us they were aware of the procedure. They told us "All staff are approachable. If there's a problem I go and speak to them." They went on to say "There is nothing they could do better. I'm happy."
- We also saw compliments from social care professionals saying how supportive the staff team had been and what a positive impact it had had on people who used the service.
- There had been no complaints made about the service provided.

End of life care and support

- There was no one using the service who required end of life support. If required the registered manager would liaise with the person's social worker.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

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

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

Planning and promoting person-centred, high-quality care and support with openness; and how the provider understands and acts on their duty of candour responsibility

- The registered manager worked flexibly with their team to ensure the service was delivered based around the needs of individuals.
- One person told us, "I think they all do a good job. I am happy with the support I receive."
- The registered manager was aware of their responsibility to be open and transparent with addressing issues and investigating complaints. This was in accordance with the Duty of Candour. The Duty of Candour is a regulation that all providers must adhere to. Under the Duty of Candour, providers must be open and transparent and it sets out specific guidelines providers must follow if things go wrong with care and treatment.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- The registered manager understood the responsibilities of their role and acted in accordance with them.
- Notifications of incidents, events or changes that happen to the service were sent to us within a reasonable timescale and as required by law. These included safeguarding referrals and notifications of accidents and incidents.
- The provider had audits and quality monitoring systems in place that identified any concerns relating to the safety and quality of the service.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- People who used the service and staff told us how they felt fully involved and consulted in relation to how their support was delivered. Staff had opportunities, both informal and formally to discuss issues and make suggestions for improvements and changes.
- People's views and opinions were valued.
- People found the management team and the staff to be approachable. One person told us, "I feel at ease, everyone is approachable."
- One person told us they received surveys to complete in relation to the quality of the service they received. They told us, "I always complete them. I am full of praise."
- The annual survey for 2018 identified a 'high level of customer satisfaction'.

Continuous learning and improving care

- Staff told us they were encouraged to, "Bring ideas to the team." They said that staff voice was important and there were numerous ways they were encouraged to share views.
- The registered manager told us how incidents were reviewed and discussed in staff teams. Staff confirmed this.
- Action plans were developed following consultations to drive improvement.
- A social care professional told us, "They are continually learning." They told us how they developed effective strategies to offer appropriate support.
- Staff excellence was rewarded and we saw how individuals had received awards for their input into delivering a high-quality service.

Working in partnership with others

- The manager worked in partnership with health and social care professionals to achieve good outcomes for the people who received a service. These included the local authority safeguarding team, GP's and community nurses.
- A social care professional spoke positively about the drive and commitment of the staff at the service to improve and develop.