

Barnardo's

Barnardo's The Triangle

Inspection report

2 Coxwell Road
Upper Norwood
London
SE19 3BG

Date of inspection visit:
26 January 2017

Date of publication:
23 March 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

This inspection took place on 26 January 2017. The visit was announced to make sure the registered manager and other senior staff were available to facilitate the inspection. This was the first inspection of the service since registration in December 2015. The service was previously registered at a different location as 'Sutton Short Breaks Service'.

Barnardo's The Triangle provides respite care and befriending services for children and young people with disabilities within their home and/or the community. This enables relatives and carers to have short breaks from their caring responsibilities.

The service had a registered manager in post. 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.

The service worked to match staff with children and young people looking carefully at areas such as the support needed, skills required and cultural background. Children and young people were supported by consistent staff members who knew them well and were trained and well supported in their job roles. Each staff member had been safely recruited, had access to regular training and supervision and felt well supported by the management team.

The service completed detailed assessments of children and young people's needs and these were used to inform their support plan. The service kept children and young people's needs under review and made changes as required. Staff were given the knowledge and support to manage specific health and behavioural needs.

Staff understood how to help protect children and young people from the risk of abuse. The service had procedures in place to report any safeguarding concerns to the local authority. Children, young people and staff were protected from potential risk of harm as the service identified and assessed any risks to them and reviewed these on a regular basis.

Relatives and carers felt able to raise any concerns or complaints. There was a procedure in place for people to follow if they wanted to raise any issues.

The service was well led. Managers monitored the quality of the service and made changes to improve the service provided when required. Relatives, carers and staff all told us that they found the management team approachable and responsive.

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.

Staff were trained and knowledgeable about procedures for safeguarding children and young people.

Any risks to the safety and welfare of children and young people were being identified and managed appropriately.

There were appropriate numbers of support staff allocated to meet the needs of children and young people who used the service. Robust recruitment procedures were in place to help keep them safe.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Training and supervision was provided to staff to help them carry out their role and provide effective care.

Communication was effective and children and young people's rights were protected.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

Staff worked to support children and young people's choice and independence.

Staff knew children and young people well. Relatives or carers we spoke with were happy with the support provided.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

Children and young people received care and support that met and responded to their individual needs.

Relatives and carers felt able to raise any complaints or issues of

concern with the staff or management of the service.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

There were experienced managers in post who were supportive and approachable.

Regular audits were carried out to monitor the quality of the service and drive improvement.

Barnardo's The Triangle

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.

Prior to our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service. This included any safeguarding alerts and outcomes, complaints, previous inspection reports and notifications that the provider had sent to CQC. Notifications are information about important events which the service is required to tell us about by law.

This inspection took place on 26 January 2017. Our visit was announced. We gave the service notice of the inspection because it is small and the manager is often out of the office supporting staff or attending meetings. We needed to be sure that they would be in.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector. We spoke with the registered manager, project manager and one member of staff. We also spent time looking at records. We checked care documents in relation to two young people who received care and support and two staff files. We reviewed records about staff training and support, as well as those related to the management and quality of the service.

Following our visit we spoke with one young person who used the service and five relatives or carers by telephone. We also received written feedback from one care professional and four staff members.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

One young person using the service told us they felt safe being supported by a consistent staff member who knew them well. A relative or carer told us, "We have found them to be very reliable." Another relative or carer commented, "Lovely, we have the same staff member. We have not had any problems."

There were sufficient numbers of staff allocated to keep children and young people safe and we saw that staffing levels were determined by their individual needs. For example, some children or young people received support from two staff members to keep them safe. The registered manager and project manager told us that the service was currently working at full capacity with a stable staff team which had not always been the case in past years. Staff reported positively about the recent improvements and the stability achieved within the service benefiting children and young people.

Relatives or carers told us that staff were punctual and stayed the correct length of time as allocated for the session. One example was given where the staff member had combined the allocated hours to plan a trip to London for one young person who told us they were really looking forward to this day out. Staff completed daily records which specified the time they arrived and left and detailed the care and support that had been provided at each session. Where possible the parent and carer signed each record to show their agreement with the support that had been provided.

Staff told us they received safeguarding training. Safeguarding was part of each staff member's induction training and there were policies available for staff to reference. One staff member told us, "I have just updated my online [Safeguarding] training." Other staff members confirmed they were up to date with this important training. Records kept by the service confirmed this.

The service completed assessments to help make sure children and young people were kept safe. General risk assessment documents seen for children and young people were up to date and addressed areas such as nutrition, personal care, sleep, communication and sensory needs. We saw detailed information was recorded in one assessment about behaviour that required a response and how to reduce the possible risks to the child or young person and the staff supporting them.

Any incidents or accidents were documented and learnt from in order to reduce the risk of the event happening again. Records showed that any untoward events were being reported and evidenced that, where necessary, further action was taken. We saw one example where staffing levels had been increased in response to an incident to help make sure the child or young person and others were kept safe when support was being provided. Behaviour management protocols were also put in place to help people stay safe. One relative or carer told us how the service had talked through any incidents with them and said, "They've helped us to learn."

Relatives or carers retained responsibility for administering medicines. Protocols were in place if support was required with administration of medicines with staff receiving appropriate training as required. For example, where children or young people had complex health needs, we saw specific training was provided

from a healthcare professional in relation to the specific interventions required.

Safe recruitment practices were in place to help protect people from the employment of unsuitable staff. We looked at the personnel files for two members of staff. Completed application forms included references to their previous health and social care experience and documented their employment history. Each file contained evidence that criminal record checks had been carried out along with employment references, right to work checks where applicable and proof of identity.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Relatives or carers told us that they thought the staff who provided the care and support were trained and competent. One relative or carer said, "Very good at what they do."

The service worked to match staff with children's and young people looking at, for example, their availability, skills and cultural background. Senior staff would visit the child or young person and their relative or carer first to complete their own assessment in order to inform this process. An initial session would then take place with the staff member supported by one of the two senior project workers employed by the service depending on the child or young person's needs. Records showed the service worked alongside relatives or carers throughout this process listening to their views and own requirements from the service. Relatives or carers confirmed this through their feedback including, "They have been great in matching a staff member, they have been very patient and taken the time to listen."

Staff received the training and support they needed to help them do their jobs effectively. One staff member told us, "I am always interested in further training that will enable me to carry out my role more efficiently and training has been offered to me. I have regular supervision sessions with my line manager." Another staff member commented, "We receive regular emails offering different training and courses". A third staff member said, "Our supervisors will also let us know which courses will be beneficial according to the children we do sessions with." A third staff member told us, "Additional training is always offered and discussed in regular supervision sessions."

The service was able to access local authority training and e-learning modules. Some staff had National Vocation Qualifications (NVQ) and we saw evidence of staff being able to access training to meet specific needs. For example, one staff member had attended bereavement training to meet one young person's needs.

Staff told us, and records confirmed that they had regular one to one sessions with their line manager. One staff member commented, "We have supervision every couple of months, in this time we are able to talk about any concerns, update our supervisor how our sessions are going, how we are feeling and retrieve any new information."

Consent to receive support was obtained from relatives or carers and documented by the service. One staff member gave us examples of how they always raised any issues around restraint and consent with their line manager and commissioners as appropriate. Staff used different ways to help children and young people make choices. For example, using pictures and other visual aids. Relatives or carers felt their views were listened to and the service communicated very well with them.

Staff were supported to meet the healthcare needs of children and young people through training and guidance. Records showed that the advice of health care professionals was obtained and documented with training provided as appropriate. An example was seen where a seizure management plan was in place for one child or young person. This gave staff the warning signs to look out for, what to expect and the action to

take.

Children and young people had their nutritional needs met by relatives and carers. Support plans contained information about likes and dislikes, any allergies and specialised diets in the event that support was required during a session.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

One young people we spoke with told us they got on very well with the staff member who supported them. They said, "We get along quite well and they are another person I can talk to." A relative or carer told us, "[child's name] always tells me what they did, they are very happy after the session."

Relatives or carers gave positive feedback about the service and the caring attitude of the staff. One relative or carer said, "It really feels like they care." Another relative or carer commented, "The staff are very polite and very nice." A third relative or carer gave us an example where a staff member had gone 'the extra mile' to speak with them and make sure they were aware of what was happening.

Feedback obtained from relatives or carers by the service in 2016 included, "It gives me a chance to spend time with my other children" and "If I say to my relative that someone from Barnardo's is coming, they know they will be a good person, they have built up trust."

We noted that the project manager and staff knew the children and young people well and were able to talk about their individual support needs. Support plans and other care documentation contained detailed information about each child or young person's needs and how staff should meet these. One staff member told us that support plans had been improved to provide more holistic information about the child or young person. Care documentation seen included the likes and dislikes of children and young people.

We saw evidence of the service working to meet the changing needs of children and young people through discussion with relatives, carers and other healthcare professionals. One relative or carer told us, "They take a genuine interest." A care professional told us that the service was good to work with and focused on positive outcomes for the children and parents they worked with.

The service had a confidentiality policy and procedure that helped protect people's privacy. Expected conduct from staff around their position of trust and the sharing of confidential information was included in the staff handbook.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

The needs of children and young people were assessed before they could start using the service. Support plans were then developed based on the assessments completed by the service and those provided by local authority commissioners.

We saw the service responded well to changes in care and support needs. We looked at care documentation kept electronically for children and young people. Support plans were detailed and contained up to date information about children or young people's needs. For example, how they liked staff to support them and the possible risks that they needed to be aware of. Areas covered included communication, sleep, play and leisure and personal care. Individual plans were completed around particular support needs such as epilepsy and behaviour that could require a response from staff.

Staff told us that the service always gave them information about the child or young person before they first started working with them. One staff member told us, "Before working with a new child, I receive a copy of their care-plan and, if I have queries, I contact the team at the Triangle. Usually one of the team will call me to let me know of any changes in circumstances regarding the child I am working with that may impact their behaviour." Another staff member commented, "I get all the information I need via secure email and can always speak to my line manager on the phone if I have any queries." A third staff member said, "I received a full care plan and additional meetings with line manager to discuss any issues that may arise including any identified risks."

There was documented evidence that relatives and carers were involved in the planning and review of the support provided. For example, records showed where the project manager had met with the relatives or carers of one child and discussed changes to the support being provided. The support plan was then amended to reflect the agreed changes with this information supplied to the involved support workers. We saw the project workers and manager participated in review meetings as required by commissioners. The project manager gave us an example where they had initiated a review for one child or young person in order to make sure their needs were being met.

Regular meetings and staff supervision sessions were used to discuss the children and young people using the service and respond to any changes in their support needs. We saw electronic records were kept to document these discussions and log any actions required.

Relatives or carer said that they felt able to raise any issues with the project manager or workers if they had any concerns or complaints. One relative or carer said, "We have not had any problems." Another relative or carer commented, "I do speak to the office and they always sort things out."

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

One young person using the service said they were happy with the service provided to them. Relatives or carers told us the service was well organised and communication with the staff team was good. One relative or carer said, "They are always easy to get hold of. They have really helped us to move forward."

A care professional gave us positive feedback about the service saying the service was quick to respond to requests and worked well on identifying any improvements required. They told us the service attended provider forums to discuss any issues with other providers in the sector.

Staff knew their roles and responsibilities with a clear management structure in place. There was a registered manager in post overseeing a project manager and two project workers who took responsibility for the day to day running of the service.

Support staff spoke positively about the project manager and staff and expressed confidence in the quality of support provided. One staff member described the managers as "accessible and approachable." Another staff member commented, "I believe Barnardo's provide an excellent service to children, families and their staff. I feel Barnardo's goes above and beyond to ensure they offer as much support needed to those who use the service by offering excellent confidentiality, advice and flexibility." A third staff member spoke about how the service had improved under the current project manager saying, "The service has massively improved. The project manager is really supportive and happy to help us resolve any issues."

The project manager and two project workers maintained the ongoing contact with the relatives or carers of children and young people. Relatives or carers told us they had regular contact with the service and this was confirmed by records seen during our inspection. The service sent out a regular newsletter to relatives and carers giving them local information about the service, any upcoming events and wider news from the national organisation.

The session records kept by staff were based on outcomes within the local authority framework. These were checked by the project workers, logged for each child or young person and monitored by the commissioners. The organisation had its own quality framework tool to measure their effectiveness in working with the children or young people. We saw the service monitored the effectiveness of the support they were providing and to identify any improvements necessary.

The organisation carried out checks of the service to monitor the quality of the service provided. There were regular audits of support plans, reported incidents, any safeguarding concerns and supervision and training. We saw action was taken when any shortfalls were identified. The service also gathered information from children, young people, relatives and carers directly during group sessions to get their views of the support they received. Feedback from relatives or carers during a provider forum held in July 2016 was very positive.

A commissioning local authority carried out quality checks of the service in September 2016 and found the service to be fully meeting the standards they assessed.

