

Miss Katija Strizak

Fast 24

Inspection report

63 Judge Street
Watford
Hertfordshire
WD24 5AN

Tel: 07985187781

Date of inspection visit:
08 November 2018
12 November 2018

Date of publication:
07 December 2018

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

Fast 24 is a domiciliary care agency. It provides personal care to people living in their own houses and flats in the community. It provides a service to older adults. At the time of the inspection 31 people were supported by Fast 24.

Not everyone using Fast 24 receives regulated activity; CQC only inspects the service being received by people provided with 'personal care'; help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating. There was only one person who received personal care at the time of the inspection.

At our last inspection we rated the service good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns.

This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

The registered manager is also the provider for this location.

The service was safe. Staff received training about safeguarding and were competent to report any concerns. There were enough staff to ensure people received support at a time they wanted. Safe recruitment practices were in place to employ suitable staff. Staff understood the importance of good infection control and wore appropriate equipment provided to keep people safe. Staff received training in medicines. However, at the time of the inspection people managed their own medicines. □

The service was effective. Staff completed induction and training to meet people's needs effectively. Staff received regular supervision and meetings. The registered manager and staff worked in line with the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) principles, staff understood the importance of promoting people's choice. Care needs were assessed and reviewed. Staff supported people with their nutritional and hydration requirements.

The service was caring. Staff were introduced to people and delivered care in a compassionate way. Staff respected people's privacy and dignity and supported people to maintain relationships. Staff delivered care that was supportive, kind and caring. People were involved in the planning and reviews of their care and support.

The service was very responsive. People`s needs were assessed to ensure people received the support they required. People were involved with their care reviews and received support that promoted their independence. People knew how to raise concerns and complaints if required and received their calls at the appropriate time for them.

The service was well-led. Staff understood their roles and responsibilities. The registered manager was clear about their vision and values for the service and what they wanted to achieve. The registered manager had an overview of the service, identified issues were actioned. Regular surveys and visits were completed to ensure people's views were sought. Staff felt there was strong leadership and could contact the registered manager at any time.

Further information is in the detailed findings below.

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 remains Good

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good

Fast 24

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 8 November 2018. On the 16 November 2018 we contacted people to get feedback about their experience of the service. We gave the provider 48 hours' notice of our intended inspection to make sure that appropriate staff were available to assist us with the inspection.

Before our inspection we reviewed information, we held about the service including statutory notifications relating to the service. This included the Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that requires them to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make.

During the inspection We spoke with one relative, two staff members and the registered manager. We looked at one care plan, three employment files, quality monitoring records and other relevant documents relating to how the service operated.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At the time of the inspection one person was receiving personal care. They were unable to talk with us over the telephone, but their relative spoke to us about their care and support. They confirmed that the care their relative received was safe, they commented, "[Staff] are very good at what they do."

Staff received training about safeguarding people from harm. Staff demonstrated their knowledge with identifying and reporting abuse. Staff knew how to raise concerns, both internally and externally. One staff member said, "I have raised a safeguarding in the past." Another said, "I would always report any concerns."

Identified risks to people's health, welfare or safety were appropriately managed to keep people safe. People's care plans contained risk assessments for people and the environment. The registered manager was aware of people's risks.

Safe and effective recruitment practices were followed to make sure that all staff were of good character and suitable for the roles they performed. All the necessary pre-employment and identity checks were completed to ensure best practice.

Staff confirmed they received enough travel time and attended calls at the required times. One relative said, "They turn up on time but if they do run late, [staff] will let us know." The registered manager commented, "Clients are asked to contact us if staff do not turn up on time."

Staff received training for safe administration of medicines. However, at the time of the inspection, people receiving support from Fast 24 did not required support from staff to take their medicines. Staff had access to appropriate equipment when providing personal care to ensure infection control was managed safely.

The registered manager monitored the service to ensure improvements were made and lessons were learnt. At the time of the inspection there had been no incidents. The registered manager commented, "All our clients are independent, we haven't had any incidents." However, the registered manager still monitored the service to ensure people received appropriate care and support. They had identified that due to the service expanding that there was a need to invest in an electronic monitoring system and to relocate the service. This was part of the registered manager's improvement plan.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

A relative felt positive about the staff that provided care and support. They commented, "The care is really good."

Staff completed an induction programme during which they received training relevant to their roles. One staff member said, "I have completed the care certificate." The Care Certificate identifies a set of care standards and introductory skills that health and social care workers should consistently adhere to and includes assessments of competence. The registered manager confirmed they completed spot checks to ensure staff were working in line with best practice.

Staff had 'one to one' supervisions where they had the opportunity to review and discuss their performance. One staff member told us, "We have supervisions, [Registered manager] asks us if we are happy, if we need any support. We discuss training, they are very supportive." Staff told us that the registered manager was approachable. They confirmed they had the opportunity to attend meetings and staff we spoke with felt they had a voice and that the registered manager listened to them.

Staff had received training in areas such as safeguarding, health and safety and medicines. Staff were able to verbally demonstrate their knowledge and confirmed they received regular training.

People's care needs were assessed and reviewed regularly to ensure people received the care and support they wanted. One relative said, "The communication is good, the [registered] manager discusses with us about their care."

We found that the registered manager and staff were working within the principles of the MCA where necessary and appropriate to the needs of the people they supported. Staff confirmed they obtained people's consent before they offered any support. One staff member said, "I assume people have the capacity to make their own decisions." Another staff member said, "Choice is very important, we all want different things."

Staff confirmed they supported and encouraged people to eat a healthy balanced diet. One staff member said, "I always make sure people have had a drink."

Is the service caring?

Our findings

One relative told us that support and care was provided by staff in a kind, respectful way. The relative commented, "Staff are kind and caring and respectful to [name], they speak to [them] really nicely."

Staff promoted people's independence and treated them with respect. One relative said, "Staff stay for the allotted time, they are always communicating what they are doing." One staff member commented, "We stay for the allotted time, I don't stop talking. I believe people are really happy with the support they receive." Another staff member said, "I encourage people to do what they can, I always give options."

Staff developed relationships with people they supported. People received care and support from the same staff and staff were introduced to people to ensure people knew who was coming to deliver their care. The registered manager commented, "All staff are introduced to clients to make sure they are suitable." A relative confirmed the communication was good and that staff always had time to sit and chat. The relative said, "Staff are respectful of [names] cultural needs." The registered manager commented, "Part of good care is that staff ensure they make time to sit down and chat with people."

People were involved in the planning and reviews of their care and support. The registered manager commented, "I see all our clients weekly and review care plans every six months, we sit down with [people] and their relatives to discuss their care."

Records were stored securely, staff understood the importance of respecting confidential information. They only disclosed it to people such as health and social care professionals on a need to know basis.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

The registered manager reviewed and documented people's care regularly to ensure they received appropriate support. One relative said, "Staff have the skills."

People received an initial assessment to ensure their support needs could be met. The registered manager said, "We meet the [person] and chat with them about the care they want, we ask what their preferences are and look at any risks they might have."

People received regular six-monthly reviews of their care and support. We saw people were involved with and contributed to their assessments. The provider ensured people received their calls on time.

The registered manager confirmed that no one was receiving end of life care at the time of the inspection. However, they confirmed they would discuss people's preferences to ensure people wishes were met. Staff understood their roles and responsibilities.

There was a complaints procedure in place. People were aware of how to make a complaint should they need to. People told us they were very happy with the care and support they received. One relative said, "If we have any problems we know who to contact." We noted complaints received, were responded to in line with the Registered Manager's complaints policy.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

A relative felt the service was well led and they felt listened to. The relative commented, "[staff] always keep us informed."

The provider was also the registered manager. 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 ensured people's views were sought. This was achieved by regularly visiting people to ask if everything was alright with the care and support. The registered manager said, "I contact each client each week and ask if they are happy with the care. Staff confirmed they checked daily that people were happy with the care they received. We saw annual surveys completed by people, these were very positive in the responses to the care and support they received."

The registered manager had clear visions and values on how the care and support was delivered, they ensured that staff spent time talking with people to develop relationships. The registered manager believed this was an important part of care, especially if this was the only contact the person had with people during the day. The registered manager said, "What is special about [Fast 24] for me, the most important thing is [people] have the chance to chat about how they feel. We must take the time to support people. Give [people] time to express themselves. It's about them and how they feel at that moment."

The registered manager had an overview of the service and was aware of people's needs. There were systems in place to monitor the quality of the service. For example, the registered manager identified one staff member who had regularly attended calls late. They spoke with the staff and implemented an action plan to resolve the problem. The registered manager confirmed this had worked.

Staff were positive about the registered manager and felt there was strong leadership. One staff member said, "[Registered manager] is very supportive." Staff confirmed they could contact the registered manager at any time.

Although at the time of the inspection there had been no safeguarding's the registered manager demonstrated they understood the importance of raising concerns to keep people safe. There were policies and procedures in place should this be required.