

Aevitus Care Services Ltd

Home Instead Warminster and Gillingham

Inspection report

Roman Way
Crusader Park
Warminster
Wiltshire
BA12 8SP

Date of inspection visit:
09 June 2021

Date of publication:
14 July 2021

Tel: 01985988282

Website: www.homeinstead.co.uk/warminster

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

Home Instead Warminster & Gillingham is a domiciliary care service providing personal care for people in their own home. The service offered support to people who require help with day to day routines, including meal preparation, shopping and housework. At the time of our inspection 22 people were receiving a regulated activity (personal care).

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 told us they felt safe with staff and staff were able to evidence how and when to report a safeguarding concern.

Safe recruitment processes were in place to ensure staff were suitable for their roles.

Staff received induction, training and supervision to carry out their role effectively and safely. Risks to people had been identified and as such, this helped staff keep people safe and free from harm.

People received the medicines they required and people told us staff wore the appropriate PPE during the pandemic.

The registered manager and provider had good oversight of the service. Quality assurance systems had been developed to monitor the service.

Feedback from people, relatives and staff demonstrated they were happy with all aspects of the service.

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.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection

The last rating for this service was good (published 15 January 2019).

Why we inspected

We received concerns in relation to people's personal care needs not being met and not being recorded. As a result, we undertook a focused inspection to review the key questions of safe and well-led only.

We reviewed the information we held about the service. No areas of concern were identified in the other key questions. We therefore did not inspect them. Ratings from previous comprehensive inspections for those key questions were used in calculating the overall rating at this inspection.

The overall rating for the service has remained as good. This is based on the findings at this inspection.

We found no evidence during this inspection that people were at risk of harm from these concerns. Please see the safe and well-led sections of this full report.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Home Instead Warminster and Gillingham on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

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.

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.

Home Instead Warminster and Gillingham

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 two inspectors and an Expert 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.

Service and service type

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

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. 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 the service 24 hours' notice of the inspection. This was because it is a small service and we needed to be sure that the provider or registered manager would be in the office to support the inspection.

Inspection activity started on 23 March 2021 and ended on 6 April 2021. We visited the office location on 23 March 2021.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since its registration. 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.

During the inspection

We spoke with three people who used the service and 12 relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with 11 members of staff including the registered manager and nominated individual. The nominated individual is responsible for supervising the management of the service on behalf of the provider.

We reviewed a range of records. This included three people's care records and multiple medication records. We looked at three staff files in relation to recruitment. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including policies and procedures were reviewed.

After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the registered manager to validate evidence found. We looked at training data and quality assurance records. We spoke with five professionals who have been involved with the service.

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 told us they were happy with the service and felt safe with the care workers who supported them. One relative told us, "I'm quite confident that my [family member] is safe in their care, he gets on well with the care givers" and another stated, "My [family member] is definitely well looked after. They've [provider] never let us down."
- Staff had received safeguarding training and understood their responsibilities to identify signs and knew how to report appropriately. One staff member told us about whistleblowing, "If I think someone is being mistreated or at risk, I would tell my manager." Whistleblowing is where a member of staff can report concerns they have seen at work, to a senior manager in the organisation, or directly to external organisations.
- When the provider had safeguarding concerns, these had been alerted to the appropriate authorities. The registered manager had worked with the local authorities to investigate these and had provided all information required.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Staff had a good understanding of people's risks.
- Risk assessments and management plans described how staff should support people to minimise any risk associated with their health and well-being. People were involved in how they liked to be supported.
- The registered manager had a system in place to ensure risk assessments were reviewed and were updated to remain accurate.

Staffing and recruitment

- People told us they received their visits on time, and if their care worker was running late, they were informed of this. One person told us, "They've never missed an appointment. They might be a few minutes early or late but I can rely on them" and another said, "They always let me know if they're running late."
- Pre-recruitment processes were in place to ensure that suitable staff were employed. This included a values-based interview structure to employ care workers with the same values as the provider.
- The registered manager ensured people were regularly supported by the same care workers. This meant staff knew the needs of the people they supported. One person told us; "We've had the same two ladies since the beginning. [Relative] has a really good relationship with [names of staff]."

Using medicines safely

- People's medicines were managed safely. The provider used an electronic medicines administration system. This did not allow staff to end a care visit without having recorded an outcome for all prescribed medicines. The system could be checked remotely, which enabled the provider to maintain oversight and complete monthly audits.
- Staff received training to administer medicines safely. The manager conducted a competency check of staff skills and knowledge of medication administration to be assured of safe practice.
- There were up to date policies and procedures in place to support staff and to ensure that medicines were managed in accordance with current regulations and guidance.

Preventing and controlling infection

- People received protection from the risk of infections. Staff had received training in infection control procedures and followed the latest guidance with personal protective equipment (PPE). Staff were tested for COVID-19 weekly and lateral flow test (LFT) kits had been acquired to increase frequency of staff testing. One person told us, "The [care workers] all wear full PPE and dispose of it safely when they go."
- Staff we spoke with told us they felt confident with their infection control knowledge and were updated regularly by the office when guidelines changed.
- We were assured that the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Staff were aware of the processes for responding to and recording any incidents or accidents. The provider had an on-call system to support staff and ensure that immediate action was taken to keep people safe.
- The registered manager monitored how incidents and accidents had been investigated to ensure that lessons had been learned.
- People knew who to contact when things went wrong and confident the provider would respond to their concerns. One person told us, "It's very easy to get hold of them. They're very quick to fix issues if they arise."

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 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

- The provider supported people with person centred care that was inclusive and achieved positive outcomes.
- People and relatives told us they found the registered manager to be friendly and professional. A relative said, "My impressions are that they're great, nice people, caring and they don't mind sorting things out." Another relative said, "They seem really interested in [family member] as a person."
- Staff felt proud to work for Home Instead Warminster and Gillingham. They spoke positively about their colleagues and management team. Some of their comments included, "They're [management team] approachable, fair and friendly. During COVID they kept the team morale up", "It's all about the client. I feel this is what makes it different to others [care providers] as it's very personalised care", "They definitely have an expectation of the standard that should be met by each care giver" and "I've found them really friendly as someone new to working in care."

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 registered manager had a clear understanding about the duty of candour and told us they encouraged staff to be open and honest in their feedback.
- The registered manager knew about their duty to send notifications to external agencies such as the local authority safeguarding team and CQC where required. This is a legal requirement to allow other professionals to monitor care and keep people safe.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- Staff told us they felt very supported by the management team. One member of staff said, "I feel valued within the company. I don't feel like I am being taken for granted. We receive little tokens of appreciation. It could be a simple thank you, a little card, a box of chocolate or our carer of the quarter award."
- We saw from records staff received regular support in the form of spot checks and supervision to discuss any issues they may have or training needs.
- The registered manager regularly completed a range of audits which enabled them to have oversight of the service and identify areas where improvements were needed.

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

- People and their relatives gave positive feedback about the service and how it operated. One relative said, "They're very friendly and approachable. I feel that they listen to me." Another relative said "I've got absolute trust in them, I can sleep at night."
- The registered manager gathered regular feedback about the quality of the service provided from people and their relatives.
- The provider held regular staff meetings which had been done virtually during the pandemic. Staff told us communication within the service was good., One staff member said, "I can go to anyone in the management team if I had any concerns. They all answer the phone."
- The registered manager provided training and access to relatives on the electronic system they use. Relatives were able to see what activity their family members were doing. One relative said; "My sister has the application on her phone so she can access all the reports. For example if I ask [relative] what she had for lunch she'd say 'egg sandwich' but I knew she'd had a proper lunch which she'd eaten and enjoyed."

Continuous learning and improving care; Working in partnership with others

- Staff were supported with training which was up to date. The registered manager ensured staff received training that matched the changing needs of the people they supported, such as how to support people with diabetes.
- The registered manager improved people's experience of care through learning from incidents and quality assurance audits.
- We saw evidence of the service working with health and social care professionals to meet people's needs. One professional told us, "I had a really positive experience of working with Home Instead Warminster and Gillingham. We were working together on a very challenging and contentious case and they went above and beyond to support [person]."