

C M Community Care Services Limited

CM Community Care Services Limited - 30 Waterloo Road

Inspection report

30 Waterloo Road
Wolverhampton
West Midlands
WV1 4BL

Tel: 01902 426364

Website: www.cmcommunitycareservicesltd.com

Date of inspection visit: 26 August 2015

Date of publication: 04/01/2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires improvement



Is the service safe?

Requires improvement



Is the service effective?

Requires improvement



Is the service caring?

Requires improvement



Is the service responsive?

Requires improvement



Is the service well-led?

Requires improvement



Overall summary

We inspected the service 26 August 2015. The inspection was unannounced. We inspected the service to make sure the requirements of the warning notices in relation to safe care and governance had been met. We found the provider had made improvements to their systems which check whether people received the calls they needed. Further improvements were needed in the way that medicines were managed.

CM Community Care Services Limited -30 Waterloo Road provides personal care for people in their own homes. At the time of our inspection there were approximately 350 people receiving the service.

A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like

Summary of findings

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 improved upon the length of time staff were spending with people, although some calls were still cut short and missed.

The provider had improved the system for supervising staff and making sure they were supported when they delivered care to people.

The provider had improved the checks they undertook as part of the quality monitoring of the service. Changes in the management of the service had taken place but improvements were still needed to make sure records were up to date, people were supported with their medicines appropriately and calls were delivered on time.

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?

The service was not consistently safe.

We found that action had been taken to improve safety as people were receiving calls care for the correct length of time more consistently, and improvements had been made to ensure people's medicines were managed safely. There was however still scope for further improvement.

Requires improvement



Is the service effective?

The service was not consistently effective.

We found that action had been taken to improve effectiveness as staff had received further training and new staff were introduced to people before they came into their homes to deliver their care and support. We will check the provider's continued improvement at our next inspection.

Requires improvement



Is the service caring?

We did not review this rating at this inspection.

Requires improvement



Is the service responsive?

We did not review this rating at this inspection.

Requires improvement



Is the service well-led?

The service was not consistently well led.

We found that action had been taken to improve how the service was led. We will check the provider's continued improvement at our next inspection.

Requires improvement



CM Community Care Services Limited - 30 Waterloo Road

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 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

We undertook an announced focused inspection of CM Community Care Services Limited 30 Waterloo Road on 26 August 2015. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements of the warning notices issued after our May 2015 inspection had been made.

The inspection was undertaken by three inspectors and three experts 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.

The team inspected the service against three of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe, is the service effective and is the service well led? This is because the service was not meeting some legal requirements at its previous inspection.

During our inspection we spoke with 25 people who used the service, the registered manager, commissioners for the service and the local authority.

We looked at eight people's care records, the provider's records of complaints, staff files and electronic call logs. We also looked at the provider's training records for staff.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of CM Community Care Service in May 2015 we found that people did not always receive the support they needed to keep them safe because staff were not spending the right length of time with them. People were not being given their medicines when they needed them.

This was a breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At this focused inspection we found the provider had followed their action plan to address the shortfalls in relation to meeting the requirements of the regulation and made some progress. The provider still needed to make further improvements to make sure the service was safe for people. Since the last inspection a new system had been introduced; people who needed assistance with their medicines now had a red folder in their homes and this was designed to alert staff to the fact they needed to support people with medicines. We also saw that checks had been completed on people's medicines administration records (MAR) to make sure they were an accurate reflection of the medicines people were taking. However, there were still some areas for improvement because information was not always correct in some people's records.

We spoke to people about the support staff gave them with their medicines. Two people told us they had never had any problems and staff always reminded to take their tablets. One person told us, "Medication is given correctly I have no concerns about that". However, another person told us that on one occasion staff had left their relative's medicines on the floor and the carer had not ensured that

it was taken. Staff we spoke with told us that since our last inspection they had undertaken further training with a pharmaceutical company to help them understand how to safely give people their medicines.

At our previous inspection in May 2015 we found that people were not being supported by staff for the length of time they should have. We found that staff were sometimes only staying with people for 12 minutes of their planned 30 minute call. People also experienced late calls and this placed them at risk. Following that inspection the provider told us they would immediately review the system they had in place to monitor call times and the responsiveness of staff. We saw that improvements had been made; the provider had agreed to meet with all people who used the service and agree call times with them. People we spoke with confirmed this, one person told us, "The office has recently telephoned to ask me how the care package is going and they've adjusted my calls now, its better". Another person told us, "They used to get me up at 6am but now its 7am it's much better".

We spoke with people about the time staff spent with them. One person told us, "The majority of carers arrive on time, if they get held up they let me know in advance." Another person told us, "I have three calls a day, they come on time but the carers are different each shift but I am getting to know them now." A relative we spoke with said, "I am concerned when they say they are going to put [person] to bed at 5 or 5.30pm I really think it's too early." We looked at the provider's records of call times and found that they had improved, staff were regularly recording the time they arrived to provide care and when they left. In some cases calls were still shorter than the expected time. The provider told us they were looking at the reasons behind this so they could make further improvements. We will check that these improvements have been sustained at our next inspection.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of CM Community Care Service in May 2015 we found that staff were not trained or effectively supported to carry out their duties.

This was a breach of the Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At this focused inspection we found the provider had followed their action plan to address the shortfalls in

relation to meeting the requirements of the regulation. Staff had taken part in refresher training in manual handling and medicines management. Staff we spoke with confirmed this and said they had found it helpful. The provider had recruited new staff since our last inspection. People we spoke with said that they had been introduced to the new staff before they came into their homes to deliver their care and support. We will check the provider's continued improvement at our next inspection.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

We did not review this rating at this inspection.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

We did not review this rating at this inspection.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of CM Community Care Service in May 2015 we found that the provider did not have effective governance systems in place and this was affecting the quality of service people received.

This was a breach of the Regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At our inspection in May 2015 we found the lack of governance within the service was placing people at risk of not having their care and support needs met. This was largely due to the lack of monitoring around late and/or missed calls people were experiencing. Following that inspection the provider told us they would review their management team and quality checks to make sure that people received the care they needed at the time they needed it.

We found that the senior management roles had been changed and one member of staff had been employed to specifically look at the issues caused by late and missed calls. The provider had an electronic system that monitored all calls but this was not working effectively at our previous inspection. We saw that there had been an improvement in the way calls were monitored. The system was now fully operational and the provider was now able to keep track of missed or late calls. One person told us, "The majority of carers arrive on time, if they get held up they let me know in advance." We checked records of the calls

people were having. We could see that on occasion there were still some calls that were shorter than expected and some people had missed their call. However the number of times this had happened was reduced from our previous inspection and people had told us they were informed when this was the case. The provider acknowledged that there was still further work to do in order to make this system completely effective. In addition to this more staff had been employed to complete 'spot checks' on care workers. This also formed part of the improved quality monitoring of the service provided and gave the provider an opportunity to see the quality of care being delivered.

People told us at our last inspection that they could not always access the out of hours call system and this had left them frustrated at times. The provider had taken steps to improve this since that inspection and had implemented the out of hours call line for people to access. At the time of our inspection none of the people we spoke with had used this service; we could not assess its effectiveness at that time.

The provider also needed to improve the way in which it checked people had had their medicines. At our last inspection there was a lack of information for staff when people were prescribed their medicines on an 'as required' basis. We saw in people's care records that this was still the case and more information was required to guide staff. The provider told us that they had reviewed each person's medicine forms and people's needs were in the process of being re assessed and updated. We will check these improvements at our next inspection of the service.