

Renew Care & Support Ltd

Renew Care

Inspection report

10 Boleyn Close
Hemel Hempstead
Tel: 01442244772
Website: www.renewcare.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 11/07/2017
Date of publication: 25/08/2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service safe?

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service effective?

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service caring?

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service responsive?

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service well-led?

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Overall summary

The inspection took place on 11 July 2017 and was undertaken by two inspectors. It was a follow up to the previous inspection completed on 28, 29 and 30 March 2017. The service was rated inadequate at the last inspection with seven breaches of regulation and was placed in special measures. At this inspection the service was supporting one person and therefore there was insufficient evidence to enable us to rate the service. The service rating will remain as inadequate and will therefore stay in special measures until we next inspect the service.

Renew Care and Support Ltd is a domiciliary care service which provides personal care and support to people in their own homes. The service was supporting one person at the time of our inspection.

There was a registered manager in place who was also the provider. 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 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

Summary of findings

We saw that a risk assessment had been completed however it was basic and contained conflicting information. We found that the recruitment process required improvement in particular in respect of obtaining references and exploring gaps in employment histories.

The provider was not able to show us any completed audits to ensure the service was operating effectively and

safely. There was a complaints policy and procedure in place. The registered manager told us they had not received any complaints since the last inspection. Feedback had been obtained via a questionnaire but the information had not been analysed at the time of our inspection, so we could not assess the effectiveness of the process.

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?

We were unable to assess this domain and therefore could not rate it.

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service effective?

We were unable to assess this domain and therefore could not rate it.

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service caring?

We were unable to assess this domain due to there only being one person being supported.

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service responsive?

We were unable to assess this domain due to there only being one person being supported.

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Is the service well-led?

We were unable to assess this domain and therefore could not rate it.

The registered manager had made some improvements since the last inspection. However further developments were required.

There were no quality assurance systems in place to monitor the overall quality and safety of the service.

Not sufficient evidence to rate



Renew Care

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 was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2014 and to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

We undertook a comprehensive inspection of Renew Care and Support Ltd on 28, 29 and 30 March 2017. The service was rated inadequate with seven breaches of the regulations. The current inspection was a follow up to check if the provider had made the required improvements and were now meeting the regulations. We gave the

provider 48 hours' notice of the inspection to ensure the provider would be available to support the inspection. Before our inspection we reviewed information we held about the service such as notifications which providers are required to send us

The inspection was undertaken by two inspectors. We inspected the office location on 11 July 2017.

During the inspection we spoke with one person who used the service. We spoke with the registered manager who was also the provider. We viewed one person's care records, four staff recruitment files. We looked at training and staff support arrangements. There was no quality monitoring systems in place in relation to the overall management of the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At the previous inspection we found there were four breaches of regulation in relation to regulation 12 safe management of medicines, regulation 13 protecting people from abuse, regulation 18 safe staffing levels and regulation 19 robust recruitment checks to ensure people employed were of good character.

The recruitment process was inadequate and pre-employment checks were not completed in accordance with the provider's recruitment process. There were insufficient trained and competent staff deployed to meet people's needs. Staff did not understand their responsibility to ensure people in their care were safeguarded from abuse.

Information provided to staff about risks to people was insufficient and did not provide specific guidance about how to keep people safe. Medicines were not managed safely. There were no medicine administration records in use and no audits had been completed to monitor the safe administration of medicines.

However at this inspection we were unable to fully assess and rate this domain as only one person was being supported at the time of our inspection and there was not enough evidence to properly assess the service.

Assessments for the person using the service did not contain sufficient information about the person's support needs and any potential risks. For example, information in the risk assessments was conflicting. At the time of our inspection all care was being provided by the provider, however were the provider to deploy any staff to provider care they would not have the relevant information to provide care safely and in a way that met people's needs and preferences.

We reviewed four staff files and although the staff were not currently working the provider told us these staff had been recruited and would be working at the service once they had work available. We found that the provider had not followed their own recruitment process. In all four files we found that the information was inconsistent and incomplete.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At the previous inspection we found a breach of regulation 11 obtaining consent. Staff had not always received training and support that was effective. At this inspection we found that consent had been obtained from the person they were supporting and this was recorded in their care plan.

We could not assess staff training and support arrangements as there were no active staff currently working at the service.

However at this inspection we were unable to assess and rate this domain as only one person was being supported at the time of our inspection and there was not enough evidence to properly assess the service.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At the previous inspection we found that people did not always receive care that respected their wishes and maintained their dignity. At this inspection the person who was being supported confirmed that they were treated with dignity and respect.

They had given positive feedback in response to a quality monitoring survey completed by the registered manager. The person provided positive feedback in relation their experience of the service. They told us “[name] is very good I could not ask for better”.

The care plan was basic and did not demonstrate that it was person centred. For example it contained only basic information to say the person required assistance with personal care but not how to support them.

However at this inspection we were unable to assess and rate this domain as only one person was being supported at the time of our inspection and there was not enough evidence to properly assess the service.



Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At the previous inspection we found that the service was not always responsive to people's changing needs. We found the provider was in breach of regulation 11. People's complaints and concerns were not recorded, investigated and outcomes were not recorded. However the provider had not recorded any of the concerns raised by people.

There was a complaints policy in place but the registered manager told us they had not received or recorded any

complaints so we could not assess if the complaints process had been followed or if any learning from feedback had been noted. No feedback had been received so we could assess if the provider acted on people's feedback.

However at this inspection we were unable to assess and rate this domain as only one person was being supported at the time of our inspection and there was not enough evidence to properly assess the service.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At the previous inspection we found that there was a breach of regulation 17. The provider did not have any quality monitoring systems or processes in place. Following our last inspection the provider submitted an action plan detailing how they would make the required improvements. However at this inspection we found that although some improvements had been made further developments and improvements were required. The provider told us they planned to introduce quality assurance systems, but this had not been done at the time of our inspection. The lack of quality monitoring meant that the provider had not identified and addressed areas of concern we identified during our inspection.

We found that records had been reviewed for example recruitment records. However the provider had not picked

up on some issues we identified as part of our inspection for example they had not explored gaps in employment or followed their recruitment process in relation to obtaining and validating references.

The provider had completed some quality monitoring forms with people. However the results had not been analysed so we could not see if the process was effective in rectifying any issues that were raised. Records were inconsistent and some historical information could have been archived such as training records up to twenty years old which would not demonstrate that staff had the necessary skills as they were very dated.

However at this inspection we were unable to assess and rate this domain as only one person was being supported at the time of our inspection and there was not enough evidence to properly assess the service.