

Micbee Care & Employment Limited

# Micbee Care & Employment Limited

## Inspection report

141 Morden Road  
Mitcham  
Surrey  
CR4 4DG

Date of inspection visit:  
23 September 2021  
18 October 2021

Date of publication:  
10 December 2021

### 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

Micbee Care & Employment Limited provides personal care to people in their own homes. There were 20 people using the service at the time of this inspection.

### People's experience of using this service

Relatives told us they felt their family member received safe care. Staff spoken with said people using the service were kept safe and were treated with dignity and respect.

People received support from a regular carer or group of care staff and these staff members were recruited safely. Where risks to people had been identified, assessments were completed to help keep them safe. People received their medicines safely when they needed them.

People's needs were assessed, and care plans put in place to support them safely and effectively. Staff were receiving appropriate training to assist them in their role. There were enough staff to support people's needs.

The provider had systems in place to monitor, assess and improve the quality and safety of the service being 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)

### Rating at the last inspection

The last overall rating for this service was good (published March 2019).

### Why we inspected

We received concerns in relation to how the service was provided and how people using the service were kept safe. 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 not changed. This is based on the findings at this inspection.

We found no evidence during this inspection that people were at risk of harm from this concern. 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 Micbee

Care & Employment Limited on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

#### Follow up

We will continue to monitor the service and information we receive about them. 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.

# Micbee Care & Employment Limited

## **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.

This was a focused inspection to check on specific concerns we had received about the service provided and how people using the service were kept safe.

#### Inspection team

This 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 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

The inspection was unannounced.

#### What we did before the inspection

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 reviewed the information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We used this information to help plan our inspection.

#### During the inspection

We spoke with 15 relatives of people using the service by telephone. We spoke with the registered manager and a care co-ordinator. We received feedback by email from three staff members.

In addition, we reviewed a range of records relating to the management of the service including staff rotas, eight care plans and 12 staff records.

#### After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found.

# 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

- Appropriate systems and processes were in place to help safeguard people from the risk of abuse. Relatives of people using the service told us that staff were respectful and helped keep people safe and well. One relative told us, "The Carers are very respectful towards [person] and I think they have become friends as they talk about (their) families, and I have heard them laughing together if I am visiting."
- Staff said they received training and knew how to recognise and report any safeguarding concerns. They told us they would speak to the registered manager if they had any concerns. A staff member commented, "I can assure you that the manager will deal with allegations of abuse or neglect that may come to their attention very well."

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- The service ensured that risks and safety were assessed and monitored. Both environmental and individual risks were assessed, monitored and reviewed as required. Measures were then put in place to help minimise any identified risks.
- Before providing support, the service completed assessments which looked at any risks to the person and the staff supporting them. These individual risk assessments were updated as required and changes to the support provided made where needed. A relative told us, "There was a full risk assessment done at the beginning and they went through everything thoroughly."

Staffing and recruitment

- There were enough staff employed to meet people's needs. The majority of relatives told us the person received support at the planned time and for the right length of time. One relative commented, "There is an occasional late call due to the buses, but the Carer calls us and we have certainly never had a missed call in all that time."
- Staff we spoke with felt there were good staffing levels and they were given sufficient time to complete visits effectively. A staff member told us, "My shifts are well coordinated by the office and manager, I have enough travel time."
- The service carried out recruitment checks on care staff to ensure they were suitable to work in people's homes. This included Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) and identity checks along with references to confirm they were of good character.

Using medicines safely

- Medicines were managed safely and there was an up to date policy and procedure in place.
- Staff completed appropriate training and we saw evidence of regular competence checks to ensure skills remained up to standard. A relative told us, "They (Carers) do give medication to [Person] and there has

never been a problem. Everything is written down." Another relative commented, "They (Carers) have never failed to give [person] their meds and they don't always want to take them, but they persevere."

- Medicine records were audited by senior staff to ensure they were completed accurately. A member of staff told us, "My manager checks the medicines charts weekly and makes sure there is no medication error."

#### Preventing and controlling infection

- The provider had managed risks effectively during the recent coronavirus pandemic. We were assured that people were protected by the prevention and control of infection.

- Staff had received training and were kept updated about government guidance to manage the risks of infection relating to the pandemic.

- Staff told us they had access to personal protective equipment (PPE) and used this effectively and safely. Relatives told us staff wore appropriate personal protective equipment when they visited. One relative said, "We didn't have any problems during (COVID) lockdown. It ran well and we felt that [person] was safe despite people coming into the home. They [staff] always wear their PPE and take it with them when they go." Another relative commented, "The PPE is still a fixture even though things have relaxed a bit."

- The service had policies, procedures and guidance in place relating to all aspects of infection prevention and control.

# 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; 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

- Most relatives told us they received good quality care from staff with the right knowledge and skills to perform their roles and responsibilities well. A relative commented, "I think the Carers are trained well enough to keep my [family member] safe. Staff were positive about the quality of support provided. One staff member told us, "I would recommend the agency to other people if they need care."
- The registered manager understood the requirements of the duty of candour, that is, their duty to be honest, open and apologise for any accident or incident that had caused or placed a person at risk of harm.

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

- Most relatives spoke positively about the way the service was managed. A relative told us, "We have always had a good relationship with the Manager and when we call, they have listened and done something if it is needed. We see it as a team effort, and I think they do too." Staff were positive about their line managers. One staff member said, "They are friendly and accommodating." Another staff member responded, "Yes, the managers are approachable, and are good listeners."
- Quality assurance systems were in place. The management team completed regular audits of important areas such as medicines administration, care plans and staff logs. Spot checks on staff and the support being provided were also undertaken. Written records were kept of these checks and a process in place to action any changes required to improve the quality of service.

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

- Relatives and people using the service had opportunities to provide feedback about the service through their care reviews and spot checks. One relative told us, "There has been a care plan review by phone when personal visits were not allowed or encouraged, and it has never been an issue. [Person's] care has always been paramount to them, and we would definitely recommend them to others." Another relative commented, "There is a regular request to see if everything is going well with the service and I would be happy to recommend them."
- Staff had regular contact with the registered manager and senior staff. One member of staff told us, "The office carries out regular spot checks and supervision."

#### Continuous learning and improving care

- Most relatives told us that they felt listened to and communication with the service was good. One relative told us, "I have only spoken to the manager twice, but she has taken comments on board." Another relative commented, ""There is a regular request to see if everything is going well with the service and I would be happy to recommend them."

#### Working in partnership with others

- We saw examples of the service working with local GP practices and other healthcare agencies to ensure that people had access to medicines and equipment as necessary.