

Kids

# KIDS (Wakefield)

## Inspection report

Office Suite 7, Bizspace Business Park  
Denby Dale Road  
Wakefield  
West Yorkshire  
WF2 7AZ

Tel: 01924379015

Date of inspection visit:  
12 October 2017

Date of publication:  
21 November 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

The inspection took place on 12 October 2017 and was announced, so the provider knew 48 hours in advance we would be visiting. The last inspection was in August 2016 and was rated 'requires improvement' because we found a breach in regulation 17 good governance. At this inspection we found the provider had taken all necessary action to ensure the regulations were met.

KIDS Wakefield is a specialist childcare service which provides personal care and support for children and young people aged from birth to 25 years within their own home. Care is provided around children's needs, often before and after school. At the time of the inspection there were seven children and young people using the service, aged from seven to 17 years.

There was 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 inspection took place on 12 October 2017 and was announced. The service was last inspected in August 2016 and was rated 'requires improvement' overall, with a breach in regulation 17, good governance. This was because there were limited systems to assess, monitor and improve the quality and safety of the service provided and the registered provider did not sufficiently maintain accurate, complete and contemporaneous records. At this inspection we found all necessary measures had been taken to address the breach in regulation.

KIDS (Wakefield) is a registered charity which provides personal care for children and young people with complex needs. At the time of the inspection, care was provided for seven children and young people.

The service had a registered manager in post at the time of our inspection. 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.

Staff clearly understood how to keep children and young people safe. Robust recruitment, induction and staff support was in place and there were consistent staff in place to support each individual.

Staff were trained and their practise was monitored through regular drop-in visits to observe and assess their skills. Staff said they felt highly supported and valued.

Staff demonstrated enthusiasm and motivation for their work, with a clear focus on meeting children and young people's needs. Staff knew each individual they supported and they were respectful of children and young people's rights.

Care was provided in line with children's individual needs, preferences and routines. There was evidence of staff working closely with parents to provide responsive care. There were systems in place to obtain feedback on the service and comments received were positive and complimentary. The complaints procedure was made available and systems were in place to record and respond if complaints were received.

The registered provider responded promptly to the issues raised at the last inspection. The service had an open and transparent culture in which staff felt motivated, appreciated and trusted to do their work. Quality assurance processes were more robust and the registered manager was continually seeking ways for the service to evolve and improve.

## 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.

Systems were in place to ensure the safety of children and young people and staff understood how to manage individual risks to their care and support.

Staff were confident in their understanding of safeguarding children and young people.

Safe recruitment procedures and staffing levels were in place to meet the needs of the children and young people.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Staff were supported through training and supervision.

Staff's knowledge and skills were matched to the needs of individual children and young people.

Communication in the service was effective.

### Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

Parents told us staff were very caring. Staff were enthusiastic and committed to providing good care.

Children and young people's privacy, dignity and rights were respected.

### Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

The service was flexible to meet children and young people's needs.

Care plans were shared with parents and reviewed regularly.

Parents knew how to raise a concern or a complaint and they were confident this would be dealt with.

**Is the service well-led?**

**Good** ●

- The service was well-led.
- There was a clear system for assessing and monitoring the quality of the service.
- Parents and staff were confident the service was well-led.
- There was an open and transparent culture and staff felt valued and motivated.

# KIDS (Wakefield)

## **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.

This inspection took place on 12 October 2017 and was announced. The provider was given 48 hours' notice because the location provides a personal care service to children in their own home and we needed to be sure that someone would be available in the office.

There was one inspector who spent time at the office and an expert-by-experience who made telephone calls. An expert-by-experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

We reviewed information before the inspection from notifications and from liaising with the local authority.

Due to the complex needs of the children and young people who used the service, we spoke with six parents by telephone. We spoke with the registered manager and one member of staff face to face and two staff over the telephone. We reviewed four records of children's care, and documentation to show how the service was run.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

All the relatives we spoke with said they felt confident leaving their children with the support staff. They told us they had regular staff, who knew their child's needs. Where regular staff may be on leave, then the new staff were introduced and they shadowed regular staff before they worked with their children. One parent said "If the regular support worker is going to be on leave, then the agency gives us two weeks' notice in advance and introduces the new support worker before they are allowed to work with my [child]."

One parent said, "Support staff know that my [child] is a central part of their job, they know how to deal with challenging situations. They don't make drama of any situation. They are very competent, capable and build confidence with the child and the family. Since using the service for nearly seven years, my [child] is much more settled and has a very good rapport with the support staff."

Parents reported visits were not missed. One parent said "If on the odd occasion the support worker is running late, I always receive a call or text to inform me how late they will be." Another parent said, "If my support worker says [they are] going to be three minutes late, then it will be three minutes and not five minutes. They are very reliable and punctual." Another parent said, "My support workers never 'time watch' on occasions I've got stuck in traffic coming back from work so I come home late. They never rush out the door; they make sure they give me a proper handover before they leave."

Staff we spoke with understood how to safeguard children and young people from abuse and avoidable harm. One member of staff said, "The children we support are so vulnerable and they can't always communicate their needs. We have to be especially aware of safeguarding." Staff said they would be able to identify the signs of possible abuse and would always report this to their line manager without delay. Staff told us, and records confirmed, they had undertaken regular safeguarding training. We saw there were safeguarding questionnaires being devised for staff to consider their knowledge as part of a forthcoming awareness and training day.

We saw staff had access to 'Working together to safeguard children' documentation and this included information about who to contact in the event of a concern. Staff were very confident in the whistleblowing procedures and said they would always challenge and report poor practice if they witnessed this.

Staff told us the risks to individuals were assessed and managed according to each child's particular needs and abilities. We saw details of risk assessments in the care and support records. For example, specialist childcare support plan and safety checklists along with risk assessments and care management plans, gave guidance for staff about how to meet children's needs safely.

Systems were in place for managing children's medicines safely. Staff told us they had received training to support children with medicines and the training records confirmed this. We saw sample documentation which showed how children preferred to receive their medicines and how this was recorded. Staff told us they knew where children's medicine was kept securely and they were aware of the individual support plans for this.

Staff told us they felt safe in their work and thought their safety was given due regard. We spoke with the specialist childcare practitioner who told us they made sure staff had support to keep them safe in their work with children and young people.

Recruitment procedures ensured suitability checks were carried out before staff could work with children and young people. Staffing was organised according to each child's individual needs and the planning of the staff rota was based upon staff skills matching with specialist childcare support plans. It was clear from staff rotas when new staff were shadowing other staff and not counted as part of the staffing ratio.

Accidents and incidents were recorded and reported and staff were encouraged to engage in reflective practice to evaluate any lessons learned. Staff knew they could always contact their line manager for support or in the event of an emergency.



# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

At the last inspection we found regular staff supervision could not be evidenced and there was no system to show how quality assurance and spot checks of care staff practice were carried out. At this inspection, documentation was in place to show how managers maintained an overview of the quality of care delivered, including regular supervision and drop-in visits to staff whilst they supported children. Staff we spoke with said they felt very well supported in their role.

Parents we spoke with said they felt staff were well trained and briefed about their children's care needs. All parents told us they were satisfied their children had very good support workers because their children were happy to see the support workers. Parents told us staff engaged and interacted with their children the way they wanted them to. One parent said "My [child's] personality and condition has changed over the last four years and because they have had consistent staff my [child] is much calmer now because [staff] understand [them]."

Parents told us communication was effective and they felt staff were professional in their approach. One parent said, "Once there was a miscommunication: I informed the agency that the support worker was not required for a particular week because the family were on holiday but the support worker still came. This was dealt with very professionally and there were no issues or concerns about it. Therefore, I've never had or I don't think I will have any reason to complain.

One parent said "If, given the chance [my child] would be on the [electronic tablet] 24hours a day, so I told the support worker that I didn't want [my child] to over use the [electronic tablet]. Support staff listened and engaged with [my child] by reading books or interacting/playing games instead."

Staff training records showed staff had regular access to relevant training to support the needs of the children and young people. The registered manager told us they had changed the training provider. Where children needed staff to have specialist skills and knowledge, additional training was carried out, such as for epilepsy, autism and asthma. The staff training record showed which children staff supported and their skills match. The registered manager and the specialist childcare practitioner told us they were planning a team day for staff to focus on particular skills and enhance their knowledge. We saw resources were being prepared for this.

We saw supervision records, which showed these were done on an individual basis and in groups. Staff we spoke with said they valued supervision meetings and in between times they were confident to approach the registered manager or senior staff if they needed support. There was an on-call system for staff to obtain support if they needed this at any time. The registered manager told us they made sure support systems were reliable should staff need to call upon them.

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.

The service provides care and support to children and young people. For those children under the age of 16 their parents had authority to make decisions on their behalf. The MCA applies to people aged 16 and over so mental capacity assessments would be required if staff were making decisions on behalf of a person aged 16 or over, where they may lack capacity. The registered manager and staff were aware to consider young people's capacity and empowered them to make their own choices.

We saw consent had been appropriately sought, and contractual agreements had been signed, both in terms of the care and support provided and in relation to information being shared.

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

All parents we spoke with said they felt the support staff and office staff were very caring, kind, confident and responsive.

Staff we spoke with were animated in their approach to caring for children and young people and it was clear from discussion they put children at the centre of their work. Staff confidently talked about the children and young people they supported and they knew their personalities and abilities very well, describing care that was personal to each child's needs.

We were unable to observe care directly due to the nature of the service, although in preparation for the inspection, staff had written some positive stories to illustrate their practice in this domain. For example, staff described how they had flexibly supported children based upon their wishes and preferences, even if this was outside the planned times of care. The registered manager gave us examples of how staff had 'gone the extra mile' in addition to the requirements of their role. For example, staff had accompanied a family to hospital and stayed to support, and another time had purchased some groceries for the child's tea even though their duties did not extend to this. One member of staff we spoke with said they knew a parent needed to be in work earlier than planned and so they agreed to arrive early to care for the child.

We saw photographs of the children engaged in a variety of situations with staff and saw the children and young people were happy, smiling and engaging with staff supporting them.

The registered manager told us the service was committed to making a positive difference to the lives of children and their families and as such, caring was not just about the care of the child being supported, but their family as well.

The service had devised ways to inform parents their child had been safely met from school by the staff, by sending a text message. This gave parents extra reassurance their child was cared for.

Staff we spoke with understood the need to maintain confidentiality of information and they told us this was an expected aspect of their role. Staff told us they ensured children's privacy and dignity and we saw the policies in the service gave due regard to children's rights.

It was evident from care records children and young people had been involved in the decision making around how their support was given. Children's 'all about me' records were written in the first person and included individual ways personal to each child, such as 'how I want to be supported' as well as 'what makes me happy'. The documentation was completed with a theme to illustrate each child's special interests, such as their favourite activity or television character.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

All parents told us they had been involved in their children's care and support plans, and signed agreements for care. They said copies of care and support plans were in a file at their homes, which staff referred to and wrote in exactly what support had been provided on their visit. Any issues or concerns were also recorded.

One parent, who started using the service in September 2017, said "It was such a smooth process, I went to the office discussed my [child's] support needs and within two weeks we had support workers who understand [our child]. It's early days but the service provided so far is really great." Another parent said "It's a great service, in fact a life saver, we would struggle otherwise. Support workers are very caring and take pride in what they do. Office workers are very responsive, they listen too."

One parent told us, "There was an incident with [my child], where the support worker struggled with [their] behaviour. So I discussed it with the support worker and told [them] how I would deal with this situation. The support worker spoke to their manager and this was then implemented. I feel I am listened to and the service responded accordingly to my concern. I also, showed the support worker how I administer [my child's] medication and [they] followed these instructions without any problems."

Another parent said, "My child has complex needs, I'm really happy, it's a great service, they talk about different ways on how the behaviour could be managed. They handle all risk really well and keep my [child] safe; they distract [them] with bubbles which [they] love and accommodate [their] needs really well. They have great relationship with my [child] and the family."

We saw there were reviews of children and young people's care and support needs. Documentation in support of children's care was in place and up to date, although we found the occasional missing signature. We spoke with the registered manager who said duplicate information was held in each child's home and it was likely the signed document was there instead of held in the office. The registered manager said they were confident all agreements were signed by parents on their children's behalf, but acknowledged this was an area that needed to be improved.

Parents said their children had regular care reviews and on occasions parents received text messages asking how the support workers are doing especially when they are new. Some parents recalled doing feedback/evaluations when they used holiday clubs. Parents felt their views were valued by the service.

Most parents said they had been using the service for many years and they had never needed to complain because any concerns were dealt with appropriately. They felt they were very well listened to. All parents reported that if they had any concerns they could speak to staff comfortably without any worries. They all said they ring the office and the things are dealt with swiftly. The registered manager told us where compliments were received these were always shared with staff. Recorded compliments showed parents had been highly satisfied with the service.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

At the last inspection, we found daily communication records were not routinely kept and this had not been actioned through any auditing. Audits had not been robust enough to identify areas of weakness in the systems. At this inspection we saw audits were much improved and there were communication records maintained regularly to illustrate the care each child had received. The registered manager told us daily notes were difficult to maintain and so they were trialling a technology based system which they planned to fully implement in January 2018 and which it was hoped would ensure continued improvements.

Following the last inspection there were letters sent to parents to inform them of the outcome and assurance of the action plan. This demonstrated an open culture of communication.

There was 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 registered manager told us they had found the previous inspection findings helpful in enabling them to make improvements to the internal audits. We saw the service improvement plan with dates of actions and regular reviews. Audits of staff and young people's files were carried out. Where audits had been completed there were action plans with timescales if improvements were needed. The registered manager told us the service was continuing to evolve in response to people's needs and they were striving to ensure care was responsive and relevant. The registered manager had completed a business analysis to review the service in August 2017.

There were clearly defined organisational priorities with an emphasis on improving the quality of the service. The values of the organisation; responsive; caring; trusted; collaborative; passionate and quality were known by staff and they were clear about their roles and responsibilities.

Staff we spoke with were motivated and focused on providing the specialist childcare service in line with the aims and objectives of the organisation. All staff said they would be happy for a relative of theirs to use the service. One member of staff said, "The children are our first priority. I feel highly motivated." Another member of staff said, "I love this job, it's so rewarding and we do make a real difference."

Parents we spoke with thought the service was well run. One parent who recently started to use the service said, "The service is much better than I thought it would be."

We saw evidence of partnership working where children attended other services. The provider was also registered with Ofsted on the voluntary childcare register.