

Richmond Upon Thames Crossroads Care

Richmond Upon Thames Crossroads Caring for Carers

Inspection report

1 Beverley Court
26 Elmtree Road
Teddington
Middlesex
TW11 8ST

Tel: 02089439421

Date of inspection visit:
13 January 2017

Date of publication:
21 March 2017

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 was an announced inspection that took place on 13 January 2017.

Richmond Upon Thames Crossroads Caring for Carers is a domiciliary care service that provides personal care for vulnerable adults and young adults aged 13 to 18 in their own homes. This is primarily respite care for carers. It is located in the Teddington area.

There was a registered manager in post. 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 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

This is the first inspection under the new methodology. Using previous methodology in July 2014, our inspection found that the service was overall good and rated good for the five key questions of safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led.

People were satisfied with the agency and service it provided. They were given notice of any changes to staff and the timing of their care, unless it was unavoidable short notice. The agreed tasks were carried out to their satisfaction and the staff team were thoughtful and really cared. People thought the service provided was safe, effective, caring, responsive and well led.

People's records, those of staff and other records were kept up to date and covered all aspects of the care and support people received, their choices and identified that their needs were met. Information was clearly recorded, fully completed, and regularly reviewed enabling staff to perform their duties to a high standard.

Staff spoken with were knowledgeable about the people they gave support to and the way people liked to receive support. When required they also worked well as a team, in instances such as calls that may require two staff members. The care and support staff provided was delivered in a professional and friendly way that was focussed on the individual. Their attitude made them approachable and accessible to people using the service and their relatives and they had appropriate skills to achieve this.

People who use the service and parents of younger adults said the manager, management team and organisation were very accessible, supportive, responsive, encouraged feedback and selected and provided a high calibre of staff that were well trained and gave an excellent quality of service. Staff said that they received excellent support and training from the manager and organisation, the organisation was a great place to work and they got a lot of satisfaction from the job they did. They said the management team was approachable, receptive to their ideas and there were opportunities for career advancement. The organisation also provided a number of support services in the community for people with dementia, carers and children.

People using the service and parents were encouraged to discuss health and other needs with staff and had agreed information passed on to GP's and other community based health professionals, as appropriate. People were protected by staff from nutrition and hydration associated risks by them giving advice about healthy food options and balanced diets whilst still making sure people's meal likes, dislikes and preferences were met.

The agency staff were familiar with the Mental Capacity Act and their responsibilities regarding it.

The manager, management team, office staff and organisation frequently monitored and assessed the quality of the service provided.

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.

The agency had suitable staffing arrangements and staff had been disclosure and barring (DBS) cleared. There were effective safeguarding procedures that staff understood.

Appropriate risk assessments were carried out, recorded and reviewed.

People were supported to take medicine in a timely manner and records were completed and up to date. Medicine was regularly audited, safely stored and disposed of.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

People's needs were met by well trained staff.

People's care plans monitored their food and fluid intake to make sure they were nourished, hydrated and balanced diets were encouraged.

The agency was aware of the Mental Capacity Act and its responsibilities regarding it.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

People's opinions, preferences and choices were sought and acted upon and their privacy and dignity was respected and promoted by staff.

Staff provided support in a friendly, kind, caring and considerate way. They were patient, attentive and gave encouragement when supporting people.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

The agency re-acted appropriately to people's changing needs and reviewed care plans as required. Their care plans identified the individual support people needed and records confirmed that they received it.

People told us concerns raised with the agency were discussed and addressed as a matter of urgency.

Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

The agency had an enabling culture that was focussed on people as individuals.

The manager, management team and organisation enabled people to make decisions and supported staff to do so by encouraging an inclusive atmosphere.

The quality assurance, feedback and recording systems covered all aspects of the service constantly monitoring standards and driving improvement.

Good ●

Richmond Upon Thames Crossroads Caring for Carers

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 was an announced inspection and took place on 13 January 2016. 48 hours' notice of the inspection was given because the service is a domiciliary care agency and the manager is often out of the office supporting staff or providing care. We needed to be sure that they would be in.

Before the inspection, the provider completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. The PIR was complete and provided us with information about how the provider ensured the agency was safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led. We also checked notifications made to us by the provider, safeguarding alerts raised regarding people using the service and information we held on our database about the service and provider.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

There were 93 people using the registered service and 29 staff. During the inspection, we contacted 15 people using the service and parents of younger adults and 10 staff. We also spoke with the registered manager, office team and chair of the board of trustees.

During our visit to the office premises we looked at 10 copies of care plans for people who use the service.

Copies of the care plans were kept in the office as well as in people's homes. Information recorded included needs assessments, risk assessments, feedback from people using the service, relatives, staff training, supervision and appraisal systems and quality assurance. We also looked at three staff files.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People using the service including younger adults and their parents thought there was sufficient staff to meet their needs and they felt safe using the service. One parent told us, "This agency is the only one that can look after my children that I feel safe with as their needs are so complex." Another parent said, "Always feel safe in their hands." One person told us, "They recruit the right individuals, each one has been fantastic." A member of staff told us, "I am comfortable working alone as assistance can be obtained at all times when necessary."

Staff had received adult and children safeguarding induction and refresher training. This included how to recognise and prevent abuse and possible harm to people. Staff understood what abuse was and what to do if they encountered it. They had access to the organisation's policies and procedures in relation to protecting people from abuse, harm and followed them. Staff said they would tell the office to raise a safeguarding alert if they had concerns. The safeguarding, disciplinary and whistle-blowing policies and procedures were contained in the staff handbook. Previous safeguarding alerts had been suitably reported, investigated and recorded. There was no current safeguarding activity.

The recruitment procedure included advertising the post, providing a job description, person specification and short-listing of prospective staff for interview. The interview was conducted by a panel that included a former carer and included scenario based questions to identify people's philosophy towards providing care and their skills and knowledge of the care field. References were taken up, work history checked and disclosure and barring (DBS) security checks carried out. There was a four month probationary period before care workers were confirmed in post. The staff deployment rota confirmed that there were enough staff to meet people's needs without being over stretched or when travelling between calls.

The agency performed risk assessments that enabled people to take acceptable risks as safely as possible and also protect staff. The risks assessments included identifying risk and measures to take to reduce that risk. The risk assessments included both environmental risks and those related to people. They were monitored throughout the period people received the service and identified the level of support and when it required change. People said that staff asked them to identify any risks that staff may not be aware of. Staff told us the information they received, enabled them to identify situations where people may be at risk and take action to minimise the risk. Staff had been trained to identify and assess risk to people and themselves. One member of staff said, "I feel comfortable and safe working alone and with travelling from client to client."

The service monitored, logged and reviewed any accidents, incidents and events as they happened. Staff shared information regarding risks to people with the office and this was added to the accident and incident records. They also shared information with other members of the team, as required. Any immediate concerns were escalated to the senior management team and board of trustees.

Staff were trained to safely prompt people to take medicine or administer it as required. This training was updated annually. They also had access to a medicine policy and procedure and updated guidance. The

medicine records of people were monitored and risk assessed by the service.

There was adequate protective equipment and clothing provided to keep people and staff safe.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People and parents said that the agency involved them in decision making about the care and support they received, who would provide it and when it would take place. People said they did not have issues about the timing of calls, length of stay and that their needs were well met. People told us that staff knew their needs and provided care and support that was appropriate to them in a way they liked. They thought the staff were well trained and this enabled them to do their jobs to a high standard. One person said, "They are superb, delivering the service you really need." A parent said, "Carers know what to say, what to do and my boys ask for the carers to come in."

Staff received induction and regularly refreshed mandatory training. The induction training was in-depth, comprehensive and based on the 15 standards of the 'Care Certificate'. There was an expectation that staff would work towards the 'Care Certificate'. As part of induction new members of staff shadowed more experienced staff. This was until they felt sufficiently confident to provide support by themselves and the agency was confident they were equipped to do so. Training included areas such as moving and handling, safeguarding, infection control, medicine, general behaviour management including challenging behaviour, escort and transport and health and safety. More specialist training was also provided for areas such as autism, Gastrostomy feeding, Makaton, resuscitation, pressure area care and strokes. A staff member told us, "The training is the best I have had."

There were regular staff and one to one supervision meetings and annual appraisals. These provided staff with opportunities to identify group and individual training needs. This was in addition to the informal day-to-day supervision and contact with the office and management team. There were staff training and development plans in place.

People's care plans included people's health, nutrition and diet. As appropriate staff monitored what and how much people had to eat and drink with them. People were advised and supported by staff to prepare meals and make healthy meal choices. Staff said any concerns were raised and discussed with the person's relatives and GP as appropriate. The records demonstrated that referrals were made and the agency regularly liaised with relevant health services. The agency worked closely with community based health services, such as district nurses.

People's care plans recorded consent to the service provided and they had service contracts with the agency. Staff said they regularly checked with people that the care and support provided was what they wanted and delivered in the way they wished. The agency had an equality and diversity policy that staff were aware of and understood.

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA and that applications must be made to the Court of Protection if appropriate. No applications had been made to the Court of Protection as this was not appropriate and the provider was not complying with any Court Order as there were none in place. Staff were aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA), 'Best Interests' decision making process, when people were unable to make decisions themselves and staff had received appropriate training. The

parents of people who were under 18 gave consent to the care provided, although the provider made sure that young people between the ages of 16 and 18 were involved and had their views heard. Consent documentation was recorded on file and regularly reviewed and updated. There were clear internal and external guidelines led by consent from parents and legal guardians.

The manager was aware that they were required to identify if people using the service were subject to any aspect of the MCA, for example, requiring someone to act for them under the Court of Protection and their child protection responsibilities.

The agency carried out regular spot checks in people's homes that included areas such as staff conduct, courtesy and respect towards people, maintaining time schedules, ensuring people's dignity was maintained, competence in the tasks undertaken and in using any equipment. The spot checks were incorporated as part of the supervision and appraisal system.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People felt relaxed with the company that staff provided and thought that staff treated them with dignity and respect. Staff took time to listen to them and valued their opinions. They also said that staff provided them with support in a friendly, thoughtful and compassionate way. This reflected a strong person focussed culture. People were also encouraged to socialise and participate in community life. An example of this was the 'Men who care project' where male carers were encouraged to participate in social activities such as gardening and attending music and sports events and health awareness sessions, whilst respite care was being provided. One person said, "I'm delighted, (Staff) is a star, not too intrusive and it's the little touches that make such a difference." Another person told us, "I'm amazed at the standard of care, they (Staff) are not just doing it for a job, they like to do it." A parent said, "Polite, kind and a very good service."

People told us the agency provided thorough, easy to understand information about what was provided to enable them to decide if they wished to use it. The information outlined what people could expect, the way support would be provided and the agency expectations of them.

Staff received training in treating people with dignity and respecting them and their privacy during induction and refresher training. The importance of social engagement and interaction for people was emphasised, particularly as the visit by staff may be the only interaction people received. The service operated a matching staff to people policy, particularly for sensitive areas such as same gender personal care. This also included staff skills that helped to meet peoples' needs and enable them to establish or maintain the skills required to live as independently as possible. The service strove to provide staff continuity to support people better to achieve that independence.

People said they were fully consulted and involved in all aspects of the care and support they received. This was by staff that were patient, compassionate and friendly. People thought staff were prepared to make an extra effort to ensure their needs were properly met. Staff told us about the importance of listening to peoples' views so that the support was focussed on the individual's needs. The service confirmed that tasks were identified in the care plans with people to make sure they were correct and met the person's needs. People also felt fairly treated and any ethnicity or diversity needs were acknowledged and met.

If providing end of life care, the service liaised with the appropriate community based health teams. The service took into account that relatives could be involved in the care as much or as little as they wished during a distressing and sensitive period for them.

The agency had a confidentiality policy and procedure that staff said they understood, were made aware of and followed. Confidentiality was included in induction, on-going training and contained in the staff handbook.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People using the service and parents said that they were involved in the decision-making process before and during the time the agency provided a service. The agency actively sought their views and they were frequently consulted about the service they received and its quality. One person said, "Tremendous staff, from the moment they walked into the house, they had an insight into what was needed." Another person told us, "I think they are brilliant, I really do, they send the same person who is excellent, very experienced and treats my husband wonderfully." People said that they received personalised care that was responsive to their needs and staff enabled them to decide things for themselves, listened to them and if required action was taken. They also said that staff were always looking for ways to improve the care and support provided. Staff told us how important it was to get the views of people using the service and their relatives so that the support could be focused on the individual's needs. A health care professional stated that the agency provided high quality respite support for carers.

Once the agency had received an enquiry, an assessment visit was carried out by a member of the management team. During this visit they checked the tasks identified and required by people. They also agreed the tasks with people, to make sure they met the person's needs. This was to prevent any inconsistencies in the service to be provided. The visit also included assessing risks.

We saw office copies of people's support plans that were individualised, person focused and the manager and team told us that people were encouraged to contribute to them and agreed tasks with the agency. People had support plans that detailed the agreed tasks and gave information that would help staff familiarise themselves with people and their routines. This included how they would like to be addressed, outcomes they wanted from the support plan, religious, cultural and personal preferences, communication, social activities and personal interests, important relationships and medical history. People's needs were regularly reviewed, re-assessed with them and their relatives and support plans changed to meet their needs. The changes were recorded and updated in people's files that were regularly monitored. The support plans were reviewed a minimum of annually or if required.

There was a robust system for logging, recording and investigating complaints. Complaints made were acted upon and learnt from with care and support being adjusted accordingly. Staff were also aware of their duty to enable people using the service to make complaints or raise concerns. The agency had an equality and diversity policy and staff had received training. People told us they were aware of the complaints procedure and how to use it. The procedure was included in the information provided for them. One person said, "I have absolutely no complaints."

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

People were very comfortable speaking to the manager, office team and staff and were happy to discuss any concerns they may have and always felt responded to. They told us there was frequent telephone communication with the office and they liked the fact that the agency made the service a personal one and being treated as an individual. When we checked a sample of care plans, office staff were able to give us information about each individual and the service they received without having to refer to the care plans. People said that if there was a problem with staff or the timing of the support provided, that it was always quickly resolved. One person said, "The organisation provides a superb service, very reliable, a real life saver". Another person said, "The manager and team make a real effort to continually improve the service setting up groups where we can meet other carers." A parent told us, "Very thorough, a lot of communication from the first assessment visit right through. The office is very helpful, flexible and never let me down."

The agency's positive culture was open, inclusive and empowering. This was mirrored, sustained and further developed by the management team who displayed open, supportive and clear leadership with staff enabled to take responsibility for their designated tasks. They described the agency's vision of the service, how it was provided and their philosophy of providing care to a standard that would be acceptable for themselves and their relatives. The vision, values and structure from the board of trustees downwards was clearly set out, staff understood them and said they were explained during induction training and regularly revisited. Over the last ten years new service innovations have been introduced or developed. The organisation had set up and run a community café for people with dementia that was well used and a Saturday club, for children with support needs that included karate sessions and a football team. The impact of the cafe was to give people with dementia a destination they could enjoy in a supportive, calming environment. The impact of the Saturday Club was to provide children and younger adults, who may not otherwise have had the opportunity, to play as part of a team and develop the skills that teamwork offers. A health care professional stated that the Saturday Club provided a unique opportunity for vulnerable children with a wide variety of needs to come together in a safe and happy environment, to be stimulated by a range of activities and to relax and have fun with their peers. Since the last inspection there has been the development of the 'Men that care' project and carers' drop in sessions that were run at the agency offices on the last Friday of each month with refreshments provided. The impact of this was to provide support for carers and give them an opportunity to meet staff, other carers and have a chat, ask questions and get information. Support was also provided for people who may struggle to use technology with an introduction to tablets workshop to enhance their opportunities to communicate with the agency and generally enrich their quality of life experiences. The activities were developed from suggestions made by people who use the service, relatives and staff. This showed that the board members were very active in providing support for the management team, open to new ideas, innovation and involvement in the local community.

The manager and management team provided staff with excellent role models. Staff told us they were not expected to carry out roles that the manager and team would not be prepared to undertake themselves. They always received the support they needed when they needed it and that the organisation valued their contributions. The manager and team was in frequent contact with staff to provide support and this enabled staff to provide the service that people needed, when it was required. Staff also told us that there was an

open door style of management that enabled them to voice their opinions and exchange knowledge and information. This was in group settings such as staff meetings or one to one meetings. They felt that the suggestions they made to improve the service were listened to and given serious consideration by the manager and organisation. There was also a whistle-blowing procedure that staff felt confident in. They said they really enjoyed working for the agency. One staff member commented, "I am really enjoying my work with Crossroads and feel a valued member of the team where I get full support with any training requirements and supervision and my Line Manger is very supportive as is the office team." Another staff member told us, "I am confident that the work I do is of a high standard and is supported excellently in all ways by the organisation in training and manager support." A further staff member said, "I have an excellent relationship with my management team and have no problems with access to the office staff. I feel very privileged to be part of such an admirable organisation."

The records demonstrated that regular telephone monitoring and office based, observational and appraisal staff supervisions took place. They included input from people who use the service about staff performance and helped to identify if staff were person centred in their approach to their work. There were also regular spot checks, weekly record sheets and visit communication sheets that were audited.

There was a policy and procedure in place to inform other services of relevant information should they be required. The records showed that safeguarding alerts, accidents and incidents were fully investigated, documented and procedures followed correctly. Our records told us that appropriate notifications were made to the Care Quality Commission in a timely manner.

The agency carried out regular reviews with people regarding their care. They noted what worked for people, what did not and any compliments and comments to identify what people considered were the most important aspects of the service for them. The approach to monitoring the quality of care and support provided was individualised with quality checks focussed on what the person using the service and their carers thought. These included spot check visits; phone contact with people and their relatives, questionnaires and an annual review and newsletter. Audits took place of peoples' files, staff files, support plans, risk assessments, infection control and medicine recording. The agency used this information to identify how it was performing, areas that required improvement and areas where the agency performed well.

The manager was registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and the requirements of registration were met.

We saw that records were kept securely and confidentially and these included electronic and paper records.