

Prestige Nursing Limited

Prestige Nursing - Leeds

Inspection report

Suite G2 Oakwood House
Oakwood Lane
Leeds
West Yorkshire
LS8 3LG

Tel: 01132752555

Date of inspection visit:
20 September 2018
10 October 2018

Date of publication:
26 October 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

This inspection took place on 20 September 2018 and 10 October 2018 and was unannounced. At our last inspection in February 2016, we rated the service good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good and 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.

Prestige Nursing Leeds is a domiciliary care agency which is run by a national provider Prestige Nursing Limited. The agency provides personal care and support to people living in their own homes, including specialist care to people with physical or learning disabilities, dementia or people who require end of life care. The agency also provides nursing and care staff to hospitals, care homes and other providers of health and social care. Not everyone using Prestige Nursing Leeds 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. Where they do we also take into account any wider social care provided.

The provider did not have a policy in place regarding the Accessible Information Standard. We have made a recommendation about this.

People continued to remain safe as staff knew how to recognise and respond to concerns of ill-treatment and abuse. The provider followed safe recruitment procedures when employing new staff members. When people needed it, they were safely supported with their medicines by trained and competent staff members.

The provider followed effective infection prevention and control guidance when supporting people in their own homes. The equipment that people used was maintained and kept in safe working order and the provider undertook safety checks with people at their home addresses.

People continued to receive care that was effective and personalised to their individual needs and preferences. People were supported by staff members who arrived when expected and who knew them well. They were assisted by a staff team who were well supported and had the skills and training to effectively assist people.

People were supported to have choice and control over their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible. Staff members were aware of current guidance which informed their practice and people's rights were protected by the staff who supported them.

People and their relatives, continued to be involved in developing their own care and support plans. When changes occurred in people's personal and medical circumstances, these plans were reviewed to reflect these changes. People and their relatives were encouraged to raise any concerns or complaints. The provider had systems in place to address any issues raised with them.

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.

Prestige Nursing - Leeds

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 checked 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.

This inspection took place on 20 September 2018 and 10 October 2018 and was unannounced.

Inspection site visit activity started on 20 September 2018 and ended on that date. We visited the office location to see the manager and office staff; and to review care records and policies and procedures. We also spoke with staff who provided care and support to people. We contacted people's relatives by telephone on 10 October 2018.

The inspection was carried out by one adult social care inspector.

Before the inspection we reviewed information we held about the service. This included notifications the provider had sent us about events or incidents that occurred and which affected their service or the people who used it. We contacted the local authority adult safeguarding and quality monitoring team as well as Healthwatch, the consumer champion for health and social care, to ask if they had any information to share. We used this information to plan our inspection.

We used information the provider sent us in the Provider Information Return. This is information we require providers to send us at least once annually to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. This included feedback to questionnaires that we had sent out to people who used the service, staff, relatives and friends and community professionals.

During the inspection we spoke with three people's relatives for their feedback. We spoke with the registered manager and six members of staff. We looked at three people's care plans, risk assessments, daily notes and medication administration records. We reviewed two staff's recruitment records, as well as training, supervision and appraisal records for the staff team, and meeting minutes, audits and a selection of other records relating to the management of the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At this inspection, we found people continued to receive care and support to protect them from risks to their safety, harm and abuse as at the previous inspection in February 2016, and the rating continues to be Good.

We sent out questionnaires to people who used the service before our inspection. Their feedback was 100% positive in relation to the following questions; 'I feel safe from any abuse or harm, my care workers arrive on time, stay for the required length of time and complete all tasks they are required to complete.'

Relatives spoken with told us they had confidence in the staff and felt their relative was safe using the service. They told us that staff were respectful of people's homes when they visited and that they never felt uncomfortable with staff. Comments included, "The staff are excellent, I trust them in my home 100%"; "The staff are great. They are very respectful and I have peace of mind because of the care they deliver" and "I know my relative is safe with them. The staff are very professional and I am confident they do a great job and my relative is definitely safe with the staff."

The provider had a safeguarding policy and staff were trained to identify and respond to any safeguarding concerns. They assessed people's needs to identify risks and created risk assessments to outline how those risks should be managed to prevent avoidable harm.

Procedures were in place for the safe management of people's medicines. Where people required support with their medicines, information relating to what support was needed was recorded in their care plan. Staff told us that they felt competent in managing people's medicines.

People had personalised emergency plans in place which detailed the assistance that they would need in an emergency. For example, what type of mobility equipment they used. Staff described the importance of infection control management within the service and stated they had all received training. Staff had access to personal protective (PPE) and this included disposable gloves and aprons used when undertaking personal care tasks.

The provider continued to follow safe recruitment practices. They used application forms, interviews and references to assess the suitability of new staff. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks helped to make sure new staff were not barred from working with adults who may be vulnerable.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At this inspection, staff continued to be supported in receiving ongoing training to develop their knowledge, skills and experiences to enable them to meet people's needs as effectively as we found at the previous inspection in February 2016. The rating continues to be Good.

We sent out questionnaires to people who used the service before our inspection. Their feedback was 100% positive in relation to the following questions; 'My care and support workers have the skills and knowledge to give me the care and support I need, The information I receive from the service is clear and easy to understand and would recommend this service to another person.'

Relatives spoke positively about staff skills and competence. Their comments included, "Sometimes I don't know how the staff do what they get done with my relative but they are amazing, and very highly skilled" and "I have every confidence in the staff. It's clear they have all been well trained, they definitely know what they are doing."

Staff were positive about their induction and training opportunities and felt able to approach the registered manager should they wish to undertake additional training. Staff told us they regularly met with the registered manager. They found these meetings beneficial as they were able to discuss any concerns they had as well as receiving feedback on their practice. Supervision and appraisals were also completed in line with the provider's policy.

People's needs were assessed prior to their service starting to ensure their specific needs and requirements could be met. For example, assessments identified people's preferred methods of communication and staff were provided with guidance on how to effectively communicate with people. Assessments also covered people's individual needs relating to their physical and health needs.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The act requires that as far as possible people make their own decisions or are helped to do so when required. When they lack mental capacity to take decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA. We found evidence in care plans that people had consented to care and our discussions with the registered manager and staff showed they understood the requirements of the MCA.

People can only be deprived of their liberty so that they can receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. For people living in their own home, this would be authorised via an application to the Court of Protection. At the time of our inspection the registered manager had not needed to make any applications to the Court of Protection.

Staff assisted people to eat and drink whenever this was required. Each person's care plan detailed any particular likes or dislikes and these were respected by staff who also understood the importance of offering

people choice in what they had to eat and drink. Relative's spoke positively about people's food and drink needs being met. One relative told us the service accommodated their family member wanting to eat their main meal at 10pm at night. They told us, "This has been facilitated by the service for years and I can't thank them enough for ensuring my relative has a good meal."

Records showed that staff had completed an induction at the start of their employment and had undertaken shadow shifts until they felt competent in their role. The induction met the requirements of the care certificate which is a nationally recognised qualification based on a minimum set of standards, that social care and health workers follow in their daily working life

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection, people's relatives expressed they were as happy with their care as they had been during our previous inspection in February 2016. They told us they felt the registered manager and staff genuinely cared about their relatives. The rating continues to be Good.

We sent out questionnaires to people who used the service before our inspection. Their feedback was 100% positive in relation to the following questions; 'I am always introduced to my care and support workers before they provide care or support, I am happy with the care and support I receive from this service and I am involved in decision-making about my care and support needs.'

Staff had formed positive caring relationships with people who used the service and relatives. Relatives told us their family member received care from staff they were familiar with and had the opportunity to build relationships with because they saw them regularly. One person's relative described being supported by staff as, "Like having family around to see us." They said staff knew them well and were very friendly and caring.

One staff member told us the registered manager always had an initial meeting with people to discuss how they wanted their care provided. Staff spoke about the importance of involving people in what they were doing. One staff member said, "As a service I think we have got it right when it comes to providing person centred care. Care that is based on people's choices and preferences is what we aim for. I think the team has a values based approach to care. This comes from the manager, she is dedicated to providing a high standard of care to people."

Relatives told us staff respected their family member's dignity and privacy. They gave examples of staff always shutting the doors in their homes and being covered by towels when personal care was being delivered. One relative told us, "Staff are respectful when they communicate with my relative. They give time and show a great deal of patience and understanding with my relative."

Staff completed equality and diversity training and understood the importance of making sure people were not discriminated against. The registered manager understood the role of advocacy services and told us people could be supported to access advocates when necessary. An advocate is someone who supports people to make sure their wishes and views are heard on matters that are important to them.

Procedures were in place to ensure that personal information and records relating to people using the service and staff were stored appropriately. Lockable filing cabinets were available for the safe storage of paper records. Electronic records were password protected which ensured that they were only accessible to staff requiring the information.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At this inspection, we found the service continued to be responsive to people's care and support needs as they were during the previous inspection in February 2016. The rating continues to be Good.

The registered provider did not have a policy in place to provide staff with guidance on the Accessible Information Standard. The Accessible Information Standard (AIS) was introduced by the government in 2016 to make sure that people with a disability or sensory loss are given information in a way they can understand. It is now the law for the NHS and adult social care services to comply with this standard.

We recommend the provider implements guidance for staff to follow regarding the Accessible Information Standard and also incorporate this into relevant documents within the service.

Staff were aware of people's individual needs and preferences which enabled them to provide support which was centred around the person. One staff member described to us the care they provided to one person who they regularly visited. They knew the little details about the person's needs, such as how people liked to receive support with their personal care. In addition, they had built up a good relationship with the relatives of the person and were able to talk to the person about their family which they found comforting.

Staff demonstrated a clear understanding of the needs and wishes of the people they supported and it was evident that positive working relationships had been formed. Staff were able to give examples of how they responded to people's changing needs. For example, when one person's condition changed and their needs increased, the service responded by changing the times of their visits. They also included more social elements of care for the person as they were no longer able to leave their house.

Care plans contained detailed information about what support was required and how that support should be provided taking into account people's individual personal preferences. People and their relatives were involved wherever possible in reviews to make sure the support was person-centred and continued meet people's needs. Following each visit to people, staff recorded what care and support had been delivered at that time. These records, along with medication records were checked as part of the care plan reviews.

We sent out questionnaires to people who used the service before our inspection. Their feedback was 100% positive in relation to the following question, 'I know how to make a complaint about the service.' People and their relatives had received information which explained how they could make a complaint. The document included information about how quickly the registered person aimed to address any issues brought to their attention. Relatives we spoke with all told us they found the office staff and the registered manager very responsive to any issues or concerns they raised.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At this inspection, staff told us they continued to be well supported by the provider and the registered manager of the service as at our previous inspection in February 2016. The rating continues to be Good.

Relatives we spoke with were positive about the service they received and told us they considered the service to be well-led. One relative said, "The manager is wonderful. She knows my relative well and always keeps in touch to see if we are happy with things. The standard of communication is very high." Another relative said, "I would recommend Prestige Nursing - Leeds to anyone needing care. We are so lucky to have them, they have been a god send to us."

The service had a 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 continued to oversee the service provided to people. Throughout discussion the registered manager demonstrated a thorough knowledge of people using the service and the staff team. The registered manager was supported by a team of office based staff and the registered provider.

We sent out questionnaires to people who used the service before our inspection. Their feedback was 100% positive in relation to the following question, 'The service has asked what I think about the service they provide.'

The registered manager told us they encouraged people, their relatives and staff to share their concerns and opinions to help them improve the quality of the service. Relatives of people and staff told us the registered manager often conducted regular reviews of care and was very knowledgeable about people's care and support needs. In addition, we saw many positive comments on the quality of the service in the most recent satisfaction surveys returned to the provider.

Staff we spoke with clearly explained how they saw the overall culture and aims of the service, explaining that the support provided for people was their priority. Staff told us the registered manager always provided support and expected staff to be friendly, approachable and treat people with dignity and respect.

The registered manager had systems in place to monitor the quality of the care provided and make improvements to the quality and safety of the service. These included audits on areas covering care records, medication and staff training records. When issues had been identified, plans had been put in place to make sure appropriate action was taken. For example, we saw checks on staff training meant staff were prompted when they required refresher training, so staffs skills were kept up to date.

The rating from the previous inspection were displayed in the office.