

Ace Care Professionals Limited

# Ace Care Professionals Ltd

## Inspection report

Suite A1, Wharton Park House  
Nat Lane  
Winsford  
Cheshire  
CW7 3BS

Tel: 01606597070

Date of inspection visit:  
29 September 2020  
30 September 2020  
05 October 2020

Date of publication:  
03 November 2020

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

### About the service

Ace Care Professionals is a domiciliary care agency providing personal care to 12 people at the time of the inspection. Not everyone who used the service received personal care. CQC only inspects where people receive personal care. This is help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating. Where they do, we also consider any wider social care provided.

### People's experience of using this service and what we found

People felt safe with the staff team and felt that positive working relationships had been fostered. Staff were aware of types of abuse that could occur, had received training in safeguarding and were familiar with processes to raise these. Swift action was taken by the registered manager to address any issues and learn lessons.

Staffing levels met the needs of people. The staff team had been given additional training in Covid 19 awareness to reflect the pandemic to minimise the risk of infection spreading.

Effective systems were in place to support people with their medicines, which were documented, audited in real time with training and staff competencies carried out. The risks faced by people when being supported were assessed, up to date and reviewed.

People told us that the service was well run and well organised with their views being regularly sought as to the quality of the support they received.

Supervision and spot-checks were carried out on staff performance and regular audits were carried out to further check on the quality of the service provided.

The registered manager had the experience and skills to manage the service and was aware of the requirements to notify CQC of any adverse events.

Support plans provided a person-centred approach to care and the service had sought to liaise with other agencies as part of the support they provided.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)  
The last rating for this service was Good (published 19 October 2018).

### Why we inspected

Due to the Covid 19 pandemic, we undertook a focused inspection to review the key questions of Safe and Well-led only. This was to follow up on a safeguarding referral that had been received by us as well the opportunity to assess how the agency had kept people safe in light of the pandemic.

## Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Ace Care Professionals on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

## 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 well-led?

Good ●

The service was well led.

Details are in our well led findings below.

# Ace Care Professionals Ltd

## 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. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided 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 who was registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means they will be legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

#### Notice of inspection

We gave the service 72 hours' notice of the inspection. This was due to issues around COVID-19, we needed the service to prepare in advance for the inspection.

Inspection activity started on 29th September 2020 and ended on 5th October 2020. We visited the office location on 29th September 2020.

#### 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. The provider was not asked to complete a provider information return prior to this inspection. This is information we require providers to send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We took this into account when we inspected the service and made the judgements in this report.

We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

#### During the inspection

We had contact with two people who used the service and a relative. This was to ask them about their experiences of the support they received. All contact with those who used the service was done remotely in light of the current Covid 19 pandemic. We spoke to managerial staff on-site which included the registered manager, human resources manager and care manager.

We reviewed a range of records. This included five people's care records, risk assessments, medication records and other care-related documents. We looked at two staff files in relation to recruitment and staff supervision. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including policies and procedures were also reviewed.

#### After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found. We had subsequent contact with four staff members who outlined their experiences. We spoke with one professional who had responsibility for commissioning local services.

# 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 has remained the same.

This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People and relatives told us that they felt safe with the staff; comments included, "I do feel safe with them", "I trust them to look after my relative" and "Yes I do, absolutely".
- Staff understood how to protect the people they supported from potential harm.
- Staff confirmed that they received training in safeguarding and that they had information available to them to raise concerns.
- The registered provider had assisted in safeguarding investigations undertaken by other agencies.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Assessments were in place to ensure that any risks faced by people during their support were identified and mitigated.
- Assessments included reference to any hazards that may be present in people's own homes that could adversely affect the support they received.
- All assessments were up to date, regularly reviewed and included the views of people who used the service.

Staffing and recruitment

- People told us "Yes, staff always turn up", "They never miss a call" and "99% percent of the time it is the same carer who comes and they know my relation so well".
- Staffing rotas outlined the number of staff required on each care call.
- Staff told us there were sufficient staff to support people's needs. People told us they felt there were sufficient staffing levels. People said, "Staff always turn up" and "They [staff] never miss a call,"
- New staff had been appropriately recruited with checks in place to confirm their suitability to support vulnerable people.

Using medicines safely

- People told us "They help with medicines and are very good with this", "I always get my medication" and "I manage my own tablets and they let me do this independently".
- Systems were in place to monitor in real time that support with medicines had been provided effectively.
- Staff had received training in medication awareness and had their competency to assist with medication assessed regularly.
- Information was available in care plans about the level of support people required in taking prescribed

medicines.

#### Preventing and controlling infection

- People told us, "They always wear face masks and gloves; especially with this virus around" and "Yes, staff have a separate area in the house to put on their gloves, masks and aprons and they do this every time they visit".
- Staff had received training in line with infection control and considerations they needed to make in light of the Covid 19 pandemic.
- Personal protective equipment (PPE) was available to staff and supplies were currently sufficient to ensure the safety of people who used the service.

#### Learning lessons when things go wrong

- A procedure was in place to enable the registered provider to reflect on any adverse events and how best to prevent future re-occurrence.
- Swift action was taken by the registered provider in response to safeguarding concerns since our last visit.



# 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.

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

- People told us that they were very happy with the support they received and were complimentary about how the service was run "It is a very organised; they are local and because they are small, they have that personal touch". They felt involved in the support they received and were able to influence it.
- Support plans were person-centred and detailed the level of support required.
- There was a clear emphasis within the culture of the support on people being as independent as possible during their support.
- Staff indicated that the registered manager had been supportive and approachable.

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

- During the inspection the registered manager was open and transparent. This included providing evidence to us in a timely manner prior to the site visit.
- Our contact with service users and staff were facilitated by the management team.
- The registered manager had been swift to take action following safeguarding investigations.

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

- Effective quality assurance systems were in place. Audits involved real time information on the quality of support provided as well as meetings with people who used the service and their relatives.
- Staff received regular supervision and checks were undertaken on the quality of support they provided.
- The registered manager had the skills and experience to undertake their role.
- The registered manager was fully conversant in their responsibilities of running a registered service and had the skills and experience to do this
- The registered manager understood the requirements of Statutory notifications to be sent in a timely manner.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- People told us they were involved in reviews of care plans and risk assessments, they told us, "Yes they meet with me to discuss my support" and "They are in touch every three months".

- People told us that they had the opportunity to regularly comment on the support they received. All comments were analysed and acted upon.
- Staff meetings had been restricted in light of the pandemic yet other means to ensure information was shared with staff were in place; such as telephone calls.
- A real-time monitoring system enabled staff to raise issues affecting individuals instantly so that appropriate action could be taken.
- People told us that they were always kept informed about the support they received.

#### Working in partnership with others

- The service had a close working relationship with other agencies; in particular with commissioners for continuing health care funding.
- The service had liaised with other agencies for advice during the Covid 19 pandemic.
- The service co-operated with social workers and local Authorities when appropriate.