

Knowles Home Care Limited

Knowles Home Care Limited

Inspection report

The Old School House
65A London Road, Oadby
Leicester
Leicestershire
LE2 5DN

Tel: 01162765568

Date of inspection visit:
05 September 2017

Date of publication:
18 October 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection of this service on 23 February 2017. A breach of legal requirements was found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breach.

We undertook this focused inspection to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for (location's name) on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Knowles Home Care Ltd provides personal care to people living in their own homes. On the day of the inspection the deputy manager informed us that 10 people were receiving a personal care service from the agency.

This inspection took place on 5 September 2017. The inspection was announced as we needed to be sure that someone was available to carry out the inspection with us.

At our last inspection in 23 February 2017 the service was not meeting regulations with regard to having systems in place to ensure quality services. We followed up these issues and found improvements had been made, though further improvements were needed to show that people did receive a quality service.

A registered manager was in place at the time of this inspection visit. 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.

People using the service and their relatives said they thought that staff provided a safe service.

People's risk assessments were in place to ensure people received safe personal care.

Essential policies and procedures to keep people safe and provide safe care were, in the main, in place.

People, their relatives and staff were satisfied with how the service was run by the deputy manager.

People and their relatives told us that staff were friendly and caring.

Management had carried out audits to try to ensure the service was meeting people's needs, however, the system needed strengthening to ensure that there was sufficient information to show that people using the service had been fully supported.

We could not improve the rating for Good Governance from Requires Improvement because to do so requires consistent good practice over time. We will check this during our next planned comprehensive inspection.

The service was no longer in breach of the regulations and remains rated as Requires Improvement.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service well-led?

We found that action had been taken to improve if the service was well-led.

Requires Improvement ●

Knowles Home Care Limited

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.

We undertook an announced focused inspection of Knowles Home Care Limited on 5 September 2017. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 23 February 2017 inspection had been made. This is because the service was not meeting the legal requirements of Regulation 17, Good Governance.

The inspection team consisted of one inspector and an expert by experience. An expert-by-experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service. Our expert for this inspection had experience of the care of older people.

We also reviewed the notifications we had been sent and the action plan from the provider to meet the breaches of regulations from the last inspection. Notifications are changes, events or incidents that providers must tell us about.

We also spoke with three people using the service, six relatives, the registered manager, the deputy manager, and two care staff. The registered manager told us that currently the deputy manager was the operational manager, responsible for day-to-day staff management and issues involving providing care to people using the service. When people and relatives referred to 'the manager', they were referring to the deputy manager.

We looked at records relating to aspects of the service including medicine administration, staffing and quality assurance. We also looked at three people's care records.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At last inspection, there was a breach of Regulation 17, Good Governance. The provider submitted an action plan which covered relevant issues such as keeping people safe by having more detailed risk assessments, ensuring staff were trained in providing medicines to people and that essential policies and procedures were in place. They also stated that systems would be put in place to ensure the quality of the service.

At this inspection we found improvements had been made. Risk assessments included more detail to eliminate risk. For example there were risk assessments in place which included mitigating risks around using equipment to help people to move and supporting people with catheter care.

We looked at policies on how to deal with people's medicines, the whistleblowing policy to direct staff to report poor care and the complaints procedure. We found essential details were in place to direct staff on how to deal with these issues. However, procedures did not always have the full contact details of relevant agencies. After the inspection, the registered manager provided more comprehensive procedures to assist staff to deal with these issues.

People told us they felt safe with care staff. One person said, "I feel very safe in the shower." A relative told us, "I feel [name of family member] is safe because the people [staff] are nice, and I have no concerns. There is a key safe and it is used by the staff appropriately." Another relative said "I feel [name of family member] is safe. They have a bath three or four times a week, and [name of family member] is never rushed."

Staff were able to describe to us how they would keep people safe whilst providing personal care. For example, by checking equipment before it was used to ensure it was safe. There was also detailed information in place how to assist people to have a shower safely so that they were protected from falling.

We saw that staff training was in place to assist people with their medicines. Dealing with medicines had not been included in staff spot checks to monitor how staff were carrying this out. After the inspection, the registered manager sent us an amended spot check form which included checking on how staff were helping people with their medicines, when needed.

Most people did not need staff to help them with their medicines. One person said, "If required the carer would help me with my medication, but my family member usually deals with it all."

A person told us that staff member had organised healthcare when they thought the person was not well. A person told us, "The carer [staff member] suspected I had a urine infection so it was GP, ambulance and A&E... the carer would always advise if they felt I should speak to a GP." This showed staff safely protecting people's health needs.

A person told us that they felt that staff had been trained because they were good at their job. A relative told us, "The carer is very helpful and I think they are very good to [name of person]. The carer is also nice to the family."

The majority of people and their relatives said that they would recommend the agency to friends and family, except one relative due to problems in the past. However, they did say they were currently satisfied with the care provided. One person told us, "I certainly would recommend this agency."

People and relatives told us that they felt the service was well led and well-managed. They said that if they had a concern they were listened to and action had been taken to resolve the issue.

People told us they were confident to speak to the manager or the office about any concerns they may have. A person said "I would complain but I have not had to complain... I feel I know the office well enough if I had a complaint."

A relative told us, "I have not met the manager but there have been lots of conversations. If I leave a message the manager always returns my call and gets back to me."

A relative said there had been an occasion when they thought the staff member was not very good. "I spoke to the manager about it and the person stopped coming here... I was satisfied with the way the situation was dealt with."

A relative told us, "The manager is a lovely person and is always on hand, all I have to do is phone. I feel they are a good manager... They have always been good to me." Another relative said, "I feel the manager is a good listener."

People told us that they were satisfied with the care provided. One person told us, "The carer is very kind, very much so." A relative said, "The regular carer is kind and so helpful and speaks with respect."

The registered manager told us that people had been provided with a satisfaction survey which asked their opinions of the service. We saw evidence that this had recently been provided to people.

Staff told us they could approach the deputy manager about any concerns they had, and they would get support. One staff member said, "I know I can get help whenever I need it. There has never been a problem with this."

Staff members we spoke with told us that the deputy manager expected people to be treated with friendliness, courtesy and respect. This showed that the manager was trying to ensure a quality service was provided by a motivated staff team.

These issues indicated important aspects of a well led service.

There was evidence that quality assurance systems were in place. These included audits looking at missed and late calls, equipment checks, medicines and health and safety issues. The outcome of the audits had been recorded but did not show in detail what issues had been checked. The registered manager stated that it was her intention to have a more comprehensive auditing process of the services supplied to people.

This meant there was no longer a breach of Regulation 17: Good Governance