

## Care Services Thirsk Limited

# Care Services Thirsk Limited

### Inspection report

Office 4, Silver House  
Thirsk Industrial Park, York Road  
Thirsk  
North Yorkshire  
YO7 3BX

Tel: 07587091422

Date of inspection visit:  
23 May 2019  
30 May 2019

Date of publication:  
29 July 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

Care Services Thirsk Limited is a domiciliary care service providing care and support to older people and younger adults, as well as people who may be living with a learning disabilities or autistic spectrum disorder, dementia, mental health needs, a physical disability or sensory impairment.

Not everyone using the service receives regulated activity; the Care Quality Commission (CQC) only inspects the service being received by people provided with 'personal care'; help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating. Where they do we also take into account any wider social care provided.

### People's experience of using this service

People received reliable and person-centred care from kind and caring staff.

Management focussed on assessing staff's values through the recruitment process to make sure they were caring. New staff completed comprehensive shadowing and were introduced to the people they supported to learn how best to meet their needs. Staff understood people's needs and provided person-centred care according to people's likes, dislikes and personal preferences. People's privacy and dignity were maintained.

People told us staff were on time, never missed a visit and they were supported by regular and familiar staff. People enjoyed staff's company and had developed positive caring relationships with them.

People were kept safe by staff who were trained to identify and respond to any safeguarding concerns. People received safe support to take prescribed medicines and to make sure they ate and drank enough.

People were supported to seek medical attention if they were unwell or an accident or incident had occurred.

Staff listened to people, offered them choices and followed their instructions. People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

Management were 'hands on' and closely monitored the quality and safety of the service. They were proactive in supporting staff. Staff told us management were approachable and very supportive. Supervisions and appraisals provided an opportunity for staff to reflect on their performance and identify goals for the future.

Management listened and responded to any complaints and were committed to continually learning, developing and improving the service. We recommended they review and develop record keeping in relation to accidents and incidents and to provide clearer evidence of how new staff had been assessed as

competent.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC's website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

#### Rating at last inspection

At the last inspection service was rated Good (report published 6 December 2016).

#### Why we inspected

This was a planned inspection based on the previous rating.

#### 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.

## 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.

# Care Services Thirsk Limited

## 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 was carried out by one inspector.

#### Service and service type

This service is a domiciliary care agency. It provides personal care to people living in their own homes.

The service had a manager registered with the CQC. 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

We gave 24 hours' notice of the inspection. This was because it is a small service and we needed to be sure the provider or registered manager would be in the office to support the inspection.

#### What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return (PIR). This is information providers are required to send us with key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. This information helps support our inspections. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

#### During the inspection

We spoke with three people who used the service, and two people's relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with the registered manager, director, deputy manager and four members of staff.

We looked at two people's care records in full and two people's care records in part. This included medication administration records and people's daily notes. We looked at three staff's recruitment, induction, training and supervision records as well as other records relating to the management of the service.

After the inspection

A second inspector spoke with another two people who used the service, and three people's relatives for their feedback about the care and support provided.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

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

At the last inspection this key question was rated as Good. At this inspection this key question remained the same. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Staff reported any accidents or incidents that occurred and supported people to seek medical attention if needed; management monitored falls and admissions to hospital to identify any patterns or trends.
- Records of accidents and incidents were brief and could be developed to provide more detailed information about what had happened.

We recommend the provider reviews how information about accident and incidents is recorded.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People were protected from abuse and avoidable harm; staff had been trained to recognise and respond to any safeguarding concerns.
- The registered manager worked closely with the local authority and other professionals to respond to safeguarding concerns and to help keep people safe.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- People felt safe with the care that staff provided; they had confidence in staff's skills and the reliable and safe support they provided.
- Staff showed a very good understanding of people's needs, risks to their safety and how these could be reduced or managed.
- People's needs were assessed and risks regularly reviewed, but we spoke with the registered manager about recording more information about how risks with medical conditions could be managed.

Using medicines safely

- People received safe support to take their prescribed medicines; staff had completed training and had their competency checked to make sure they knew how to safely administer medicines.
- The provider was in the process of introducing more detailed medication competency checks.
- Accurate records and regular audits helped management monitor and make sure people received their medicines safely.

Staffing and recruitment

- Staff had been safely recruited; the provider focussed on assessing staff's values and attitude to help make sure suitable caring staff were employed.
- People were supported by reliable staff; staff arrived when expected, had not missed visits and stayed as long as they were needed.
- Robust systems helped management monitor and make sure staff were in the right place at the right time

to meet people's needs.

#### Preventing and controlling infection

- Staff followed good infection prevention and control practices; they used personal protective equipment, such as gloves, to help prevent the spread of healthcare related infections.



# 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.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as Good. At this inspection this key question remained the same. This meant people's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People praised the effective care staff provided; staff understood people's needs and how best to support them.
- Staff completed training courses and a comprehensive period of shadowing to learn how best to meet people's individual and specific needs.
- Staff felt supported; the registered manager was approachable and supportive of the staff team. They used formal supervisions and annual appraisals to monitor staff's performance and wellbeing.
- Induction records did not always provide good evidence of how new staff had been assessed as competent.

We recommend the provider review what induction and training records are completed with new members of staff.

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

- People received effective care; staff assessed people's needs and recorded detailed information about how those needs should be met.
- Staff worked closely with people and their families to regularly review the support provided to make sure it met their needs.

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 MCA 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.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA.

- People were involved in decisions about their care; staff sought people's consent before providing support.
- Staff understood how people communicated and supported them to have choice and control over how they were supported.

Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support; Staff working with other

agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care

- People received effective support to meet all of their assessed needs; this helped promote and maintain people's health and wellbeing.
- Staff monitored people's needs and supported people to seek appropriate and timely medical attention if needed.

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

- People received effective support to make sure they had enough to eat and drink; staff assessed people's needs and monitored what people ate and drank when necessary.

# 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.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as Good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant 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

- People received kind and caring support; a person said, "It's a very good service. They staff are very nice, they are always pleasant and polite."
- People were supported by familiar staff and had developed positive caring relationships with them; a relative explained, "The staff are caring, they take time and chat with [Name] have a joke and make them laugh."
- Information about people's life history helped staff to get to know people, spark conversation and build a rapport.
- Staff showed genuine concern for people's wellbeing and were keen to ensure their rights were protected and they were not discriminated against.

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

- People felt in control of their care and support; staff listened and responded to people's requests. A relative told us, "The staff are so caring. Whatever you need, it is done."
- Staff supported people to make decisions; they used verbal and non-verbal communication to help people express their wishes and views.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People were treated with kindness, dignity and respect; staff spoke with people in a respectful way and were mindful of the importance of maintaining people's privacy and dignity when supporting with personal care. A relative told us, "The staff treat people with real dignity, they are lovely."
- Staff used equipment and adaptations to help people maintain their independence; care plans reinforced the importance of supporting people to complete tasks independently and providing support only where needed.
- Staff recognised and met people's individual and diverse needs; they provided attentive care and support to ensure people were not unduly restricted and to promote their independence.

# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

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

At the last inspection this key question was rated as Good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to ensure people have choice and control and to meet their needs and preferences

- People received care and support which was responsive to their needs; a person told us, "If you ask staff for anything they are willing to do it, they look after me very well."
- People's needs had been assessed and detailed care plans provided very clear person-centred guidance on how staff should support them to meet their needs. A person explained, "They get a list together of all the little things you like, and they always remember them, which makes you feel more cherished."
- People's needs were regularly reviewed to make sure they were happy with the support provided.

Meeting people's communication needs

Since 2016 onwards all organisations that provide publicly funded adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). The standard was introduced to make sure people are given information in a way they can understand. The standard applies to all people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss and in some circumstances to their carers.

- Staff had a good understanding of people's communication needs and provided information in accessible ways to help people make decisions and be involved in all aspects of their care and support.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- People felt comfortable speaking with staff or management if they were unhappy about the service or needed to complain; they were confident management would take their concerns seriously and resolve any issues.
- Management listened to complaints and had been quick to respond to concerns to improve the service.

End of life care and support

- Staff asked if people had any preferences for care and support approaching the end of their life, but limited information was recorded. People did not have end of life care plans.
- Although people did not need support with end of life care at the time of our inspection, staff had received positive feedback from relatives of two people praising the compassionate care they provided.
- The registered manager had completed training with the local hospice and had a good understanding of best practice guidance. They described their person-centred approach to supporting people and their families approaching end of life.

# 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.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as Good. At this inspection this key question has remained the same. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements; Continuous learning and improving care

- Management led by example and had a strong commitment to providing good care; they assessed all new clients, introduced new staff to people and provided detailed guidance on how best to meet their needs.
- Staff praised the communication and told us management provided the information they needed to support people safely.
- Management worked to continually improve the service; they completed regular training and sought advice and guidance from other professionals.
- People received consistently good care; management used spot checks and audits to monitor and make sure staff provided safe and effective care to meet people's needs. A person told us, "[Registered manager's name] and [directors name] are always willing to answer questions and explain things as necessary. They do call in when they can to make sure everything is alright."
- Management monitored information about the time staff arrived and how long they spent with people to make sure they received their agreed care and support.

How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong

- The provider was open and transparent in dealing with issues and concerns; they understood their responsibility to apologise and give feedback to people if things went wrong.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- People received a person-centred service, management promoted a positive and caring culture in the way the assessed, planned and delivered care.
- Management listened and responded to people's requests and were flexible in their approach to supporting and meeting their needs. A relative said, "They give me peace of mind; I would recommend them to anyone - I have nothing but praise."

Working in partnership with others; Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- People were actively involved in discussions about their care; people, their relatives and other professionals were involved in regular reviews.
- People, relatives and staff were asked to complete surveys to help monitor the quality of the service and

gather feedback about how the service could improve.

- Management were approachable and supportive of the staff team; a member of staff told us, "I feel valued, they [management] respect you. If there is anything I want, or if I have any concerns, they address them and guide me. They ask for my opinion about what people would like or need."
- The registered manager worked closely with the local authority and responded to their feedback to improve the service.