

Agincare UK Limited

Agincare UK - Bristol Extra Care Scheme

Inspection report

The Bristol
Gainsborough Square
Bristol
Bristol
BS7 9XA

Tel: 07725217301
Website: www.agincare.com

Date of inspection visit:
11 February 2016

Date of publication:
26 September 2016

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 11 February 2016 and was announced. We gave the service 48 hour's notice of the inspection. This was to ensure that people who lived at the service were available to meet with us and also that the registered manager and staff could be there for us. The service was last inspected in July 2014 and met with legal requirements at that time.

Agincare UK - Bristol Extra Care Scheme is a sheltered housing service. Agincare UK are registered to provide a domiciliary care service to people who have a learning disability and or have mental health needs. People are tenants in their own flatlets and receive personal care according to their needs from staff.

There was a registered manager for the service. 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 provider had systems in place to minimise risks to people and to protect them from abuse. People felt safe at all times with the staff who supported them.

People told us that all of the staff who visited them were always kind and caring in manner. People who used the service interacted in a positive and warm way with the staff. We saw that staff provided people with effective support with personal care and other needs.

People were supported with their needs by staff who were monitored and supervised in their work. People also benefited because they were supported by staff who were properly trained to understand their needs.

People spoke highly about the care and support they received from the staff. Examples of comments we were told included, "They're adaptable, they're great" and "We are very happy, the carers are respectful that this is my home".

Care records were informative and clearly explained what to do to effectively assist people with their personal care needs.

People were properly supported to make complaints about the service the agency provided if they needed too.

There was a system in place to ensure that regular checks on the quality of care and service were carried out. When needed actions were put in place to improve the care and service people received.

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.

People received care and support from staff who understood how to protect them from abuse.

People were able to take their medicines when they needed them and they were helped to manage them safely.

The provider had a safe system in place to recruit safe staff.

People received safe care that met their needs because there was enough staff to support them.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

People felt the staff provided care that was of a high standard that met their needs.

People were supported by staff who understood the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

People were supported to eat and drink a healthy diet and to make their own choices around menu planning.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

People felt that staff who visited them were always caring kind and supportive.

Staff supported people with their range of needs in a respectful and caring way.

The staff team who visited people had worked with them for many years and understood them properly.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive

Care records clearly explained how to support people to meet their care needs.

People spoke highly of the service and the flexible way they were supported with their care.

Surveys were regularly carried out to seek the views of people who used the service. The results of these were used to improve the service.

Is the service well-led?

The service was well led

People were consulted as part of the process of checking the service and the feedback they gave had been very positive.

The staff team followed the visions and values in their work. They included providing personalised care that ensured people were treated as unique individuals.

Good ●

Agincare UK - Bristol Extra Care Scheme

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.

The inspection took place on 11 February 2016 and was announced. We gave the service 48 hours' notice of the inspection. This was to ensure that people who lived at the service were available to meet with us and also that the registered manager and staff could be there for us.

The service was last inspected in July 2014 and met with legal requirements at that time.

Agincare UK - Bristol Extra Care Scheme is a sheltered housing service. Agincare UK are registered to provide a domiciliary care service to people who have a learning disability and or have mental health needs. People are tenants in their own flatlets and receive personal care according to their needs from staff.

There was a registered manager for the service. 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 provider had systems in place to minimise risks to people and to protect them from abuse. People felt safe at all times with the staff who supported them.

People told us that all of the staff who visited them were always kind and caring in manner. People who used the service interacted in a positive and warm way with the staff. We saw that staff provided people with effective support with personal care and other needs.

People were supported with their needs by staff who were monitored and supervised in their work. People also benefited because they were supported by staff who were properly trained to understand their needs.

People spoke highly about the care and support they received from the staff. Examples of comments we were told included, "They're adaptable, they're great" and "We are very happy, the carers are respectful that this is my home".

Care records were informative and clearly explained what to do to effectively assist people with their personal care needs.

People were properly supported to make complaints about the service the agency provided if they needed too.

There was a system in place to ensure that regular checks on the quality of care and service were carried out. When it was needed actions were put in place to improve the care and service people received.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

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.

Before our inspection, we reviewed the information we held about the service this included statutory notifications. Notifications are information about specific important events the service is legally required to send to us.

The inspection team consisted of two inspectors. During the inspection we spoke with 16 people who used the service. We also spoke with eight members of staff, the registered manager, and two managers who have day-to-day management responsibility for parts of the service.

We saw how care and support was provided to people in their homes. We looked at the care records of six people, the recruitment and personnel records of five staff, training records, staff schedules and other records relating to the management of the service. We also looked at a range of policies and procedures including, safeguarding, whistleblowing, mental capacity, recruitment, confidentiality and complaints.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The people we spoke with said that when they had moved into their flatlets and started using the services of the agency, the manager had met with them. This was to work out with them what sort of care they would like to receive.

People were supported with their personal care by staff who understood how to provide them with effective support. The staff we spoke with had an understanding of how to effectively support the people they visited in their own flatlets. The staff told us they looked at each person's care records before they first visited them. They also said they were told by the manager and senior staff when it had been updated if a person's needs had changed.

Staff we spoke with were knowledgeable about people and how they preferred to be cared for. The staff told us about individual preferences and daily routines such as certain people who liked to get up late and other people who preferred to be supported by staff of the same gender. We saw staff provide care to the people they had told us about in the ways described. Staff told us they supported a regular group of people with their particular needs. Staff said this helped them get to know people well and what sort of care and assistance they wanted.

People were effectively supported to meet their physical healthcare needs. Each person had a health action plan. People told us they were able to see their GP if they were concerned about their health. The action plans contained information that explained how people were to be supported with their physical health needs. People said they had access to medical services when needed.

The registered manager and the staff told us that everyone they currently supported had mental capacity. The staff demonstrated they understood about the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. They explained how people had the right to make decisions in their lives. They also understood that mental capacity must be assumed unless someone was assessed otherwise.

People were supported to eat nutritious food and drink that they enjoyed. Some people we spoke with said the staff helped them to prepare and cook their own food. Staff told us they sometimes helped people who required special diets by going shopping for them for the food they needed available.

Information in care records explained how to support people with their nutritional needs. The staff team had been on a training course to help them support people effectively nutrition. .

The staff told us that regular spot checks were carried out on them while they were supporting people. These were carried out to observe how they supported people with their care. The manager and a senior care worker told us the aim of a spot check was to ensure people were supported with their needs in a professional and suitable way.

The staff told us there was always someone they could contact if they needed guidance and support. They

told us there was an out of hours telephone number they could use. This was to be able to speak to someone for support and advice.

Staff spoke positively about the training opportunities they were able to go on to help them to support people effectively. They told us they had been on training in subjects relevant to people's needs. The training records confirmed staff had attended training in a range of relevant subjects. These included a course about care of learning disability, health and safety matters, food hygiene, first aid, infection control and medicines management.

New staff were provided with proper training and supported when they began working for the organisation. The staff went on an induction-training programme for all new employees. The staff induction programme included areas such as how to support people with complex learning disabilities and safeguarding adults. Completed records explained that the registered manager had ensured staff had received proper training before they began work with people at the home.

Supervision records explained that staff were supported and guided in their work. The staff confirmed that they met with their supervisor regularly to talk about work matters and review their performance. Training needs and performance related issues were also discussed at each meeting.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People were very positive about the caring attitude of the staff throughout the inspection. All the people spoke of how they got on well with the staff and said they were treated as individuals. One person said, "You can't fault them at all." Another person said "The team have been marvellous."

People felt they were treated respectfully by the staff and their comments reflected the good relationships they had built with the staff who supported them. One person said, "I am treated with respect. If they have to do a bit more for me, they just do it" another person told us, "My dignity is always respected." Another person described how staff assisted them when providing intimate care whilst ensuring they maintained their privacy.

People felt involved in decisions about their care and their independence was maintained. People said they had been involved in deciding their care packages and they were pleased with the care they received. We saw that people had signed and agreed their care packages. One person who was unable to sign, usually had their relative present at any care planning meetings, however the care package had not been signed by either of them. The service could have got the relative to sign the care package on the person's behalf. One person told us "The staff discuss the delivery of my care and always talk any changes which need to be made with me and my relative."

People told us that the service communicated well with them. One person said "the staff always say what they are going to do for me." People's records contained personalised information within them. One person told us "The staff always read my file then they still ask me what I want." All of the people we spoke with told us the care they received met their needs and reflected their preferences. We noted that the personal care which one person told us they received from the staff was the same as it was written in the care plan.

The manager and the staff told us how they were taught about the idea of person-centred care when they completed their induction programme. Person centred care means that people should always be respected as a unique individual. Staff gave us examples of how they supported people to take part in different activities and interested based on what they wanted to do. Some people had employment. Some people stayed close to friends and family and other people liked to go out for coffee in a nearby coffee shop. Staff told us the importance of person centred care was discussed at team meetings and during their one to one supervision meetings.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People's care needs were being met. People told us the service delivered the care they needed and all spoke positively about the care provided. One visitor told us that the person receiving the care "Was happy with the service." One person said how the staff met their care needs and would change things if he asked them to. The person said "If I ask them to do something for me a bit later, they will." Another person said "They always give me choice and they know how I like things done."

Care records were personalised for people and clearly demonstrated their agreed package of care. People and their relatives were involved in the planning of their care and told us their care plans were discussed with them. Most of the care plans we viewed had been signed by the person. Records contained information for staff that showed each person's individual needs and how they liked to be supported. We saw one care plan where the care to be provided was broken down into 22 stages to ensure the care was just right for that person.

People's written care packages were all different and showed the service saw them as individuals. For example, they showed what different tasks were required by staff on each visit they attended. Staff visited people several times during the day to provide care based around the person's care needs.

People told us they were always involved in their reviews and discussed and signed any changes in their care plan. People's care needs were reviewed annually or earlier if required, for example, a person's relative went into hospital so staff took over the activities the relative did. The person said "we had to increase the care I needed and staff just seemed to fit in and I got the extra care."

The service was responsive when staff highlighted matters that may have an impact on the delivery of people's care needs. The service always provided a member of staff people could contact in an emergency, even at night. This was confirmed by one of the people using the service, who said "if I need help at night I know who to contact although it might take a while for them to get to me." People also told us how easy it was to contact 'the office' if they needed to talk about something.

We asked staff if they felt they were given sufficient time at appointments to provide the care that people needed. The staff all said that visits were well planned and if they did need more time to support someone they would go to the manager who would address this

Everyone we spoke with said they felt confident they could make a complaint to the manager or any of the staff. People told us they were given their own copy of provider's complaints procedure when they first started using the services of the agency. The complaints procedure included the provider's contact details so that people could contact the right people to make a complaint. The procedure was available in an easy to look at format. People told us they had been given a folder that contained information about the services the agency provided. This was to help them decide if they felt it was suitable for their needs. The information people were given was clear and it fully explained in detail the services the agency offered. This information meant people were able to make an informed choice about whether the agency was suitable for their needs.

We saw that surveys were sent to people regularly. People were asked in the survey if they had any complaints about the service. Where people had raised concerns in the survey form we saw detailed actions were taken by the manager to address them. The latest responses from people was positive about the service.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

People told us that the registered manager and the deputy manager came to see them on a regular basis. People told us that both managers were helpful and good at their jobs. People said they were asked to say what they thought of the service the staff provided, as well as what they felt about the way their needs were met. They told us the manager and other staff based in the office listened to them and took their views seriously.

The service had an online system used to track the times staff arrived at people's flatlets and how long they spent with each person. The manager told us that they found the monitoring system very useful as it meant they were able to track if people's visits were completed in the allocated time.

People approached the registered manager and the deputy manager throughout our visit. Every time someone wanted to speak with them, they made plenty of time to be available for them. Both managers were warm and accommodating in their approach.

The registered manager told us they kept themselves up to date with current matters that related to care for learning disability by going to meetings with other professionals who also worked in social care. They told us they shared information and learning from these meetings with the staff team. They also told us they looked at online articles and journals about health and social care matters.

Health and safety audits and quality checks on the care people received were carried out regularly in their flatlets. Actions were put in place where risks and improvements were needed. For example an assessment of people's bathroom and kitchens were carried out to ensure they were safe. The kitchenette in each flatlet had recently been refurbished and people told us they liked them.

The staff had a good understanding of the provider's visions and values. They explained to us that the values they included being person centred in their approach with people, supporting their independence and respecting diversity. The staff told us they made sure they followed these values when they supported people they visited.

All staff were asked to complete a staff survey which asked for their views about the organisation and about working at the home. They were also asked if they had suggestions for improving the service. Staff told us they felt listened to by the organisation they worked for and by the registered manager.