

Care Connected Ltd

The Dragon Enterprise Centre

Inspection report

28 Stephenson Road
Leigh On Sea
Essex
SS9 5LY

Tel: 01702780011

Date of inspection visit:
10 April 2017

Date of publication:
12 May 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

The Inspection took place on the 10th April 2017.

Care Connected/ Dragon Enterprise is a domiciliary care agency which offers personal care, companionship and domestic help to support people living in their own home. They also provide an escort service to assist people to get to hospital and other appointments. The service provides approximately 550 hours of care per week to 37 people. The service has recently moved its base to new offices at Dragon Enterprises.

At our last inspection the service was rated as Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

The service was safe. Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that was intended to ensure people's safety and welfare. People were cared for safely by staff who had been recruited and employed after appropriate checks had been completed. There were sufficient staff to meet people's needs consistently. People were supported to take their medication by staff who had received training to do so.

The service was effective. People were cared for and supported by staff who had received training to support people to meet their needs. The registered manager had a good understanding of their responsibilities in relation to the Mental Capacity Act 2005. People were supported to eat and drink enough to ensure they maintained a balanced diet and referrals to other health professionals were made when required. In addition the service provided an escort service to transport people to appointments and stay with them if they required support.

The service was caring. Staff cared for people in an empathetic and kind manner. Staff had a good understanding of people's preferences of care. Staff always worked hard to promote people's independence through encouraging and supporting people.

The service was responsive. People and their relatives were involved in the planning and review of their care. Care plans were reviewed on a regular basis and also when there was a change in care needs. People were supported to follow their interests and participate in social activities. The registered manager responded to complaints received in a timely manner.

The service was well-led. Staff, people and their relatives spoke very highly of the registered manager. The service had systems in place to monitor and provide good care and these were reviewed on a regular basis.

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 remain Good

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good

The Dragon Enterprise Centre

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.

This inspection took place on the 10th April 2017 and was announced. The service was given 48 hours notice to ensure there would be someone present in the office. The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Before the inspection, we reviewed previous reports and notifications that are held on the CQC database. Notifications are important events that the service has to let the CQC know about by law. In addition we reviewed the 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. We also reviewed safeguarding alerts and information received from a local authority.

During our inspection we spoke with four people and two relatives, the registered manager, two team leaders and two care staff. We reviewed four care files, four staff recruitment files and their support records, audits and policies held at the service.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At this inspection we found the same level of protection from abuse, harm and risks as at the previous inspection and the rating continues to be Good.

People told us that they felt safe using the service, one person said, "I am very happy with the care, they come four times a day and do everything I need." A relative told us, "Staff are amazing, wonderful, I don't have to worry about anything." Staff told us that they always made sure people were safe one member of staff said, "I always make sure we lock up and shut windows, if people have care line pendants I check that they have them and that they are working. I always make sure the key safe is scrambled when I leave as well."

Staff received training in how to safeguard people from abuse. Staff were knowledgeable of the signs of potential abuse and what they should do to report this. One member of staff said, "I have had training on safeguarding, what to look out for, who to report to and how to 'whistle blow'." Another member of staff said, "I would report any concerns to the manager and make notes. If I needed to go further I would contact the CQC." The registered manager knew how to raise safeguarding concerns and had worked with the local authority to investigate these.

The registered manager made sure that they recruited staff of good character and ensured all staff completed enhanced disclosure and barring checks (DBS). The registered manager ensured staff did not have gaps in their employment history and obtained references of their previous work and character. People received care from a consistent staff team. The registered manager did not use any agency and any shortfalls of staff were covered by regular staff. People told us that they received support from the same staff consistently, and staff told us that they worked on set rounds. One person told us, "I have a letter with the staff names and I know them all really well."

Staff had the information they needed to support people. Staff undertook risk assessments to keep people safe. These assessments identified how people could be supported to maintain their independence and to ensure people were safe in their own homes. The risk assessments included making sure the environment was safe, for example, that there were not any loose rugs or carpets that people could trip over and that boilers were checked and carbon monoxide detectors were working. One member of staff said, "We work closely with families to ensure the environment is safe. One person who was prone to falls we worked with the family to make sure all sharp corners were covered with foam." Staff were trained in first aid, should there be a medical emergency and they knew to call a doctor or paramedic if required.

Generally people who used the service were responsible for their own medication. Staff did support some people with medication these were usually provided in a monitored dosage system. The system supported people to manage their medicines more easily because each dose of medicine was pre-dispensed by the pharmacist in a sealed tray and medication administration charts (MARS) were used. Staff told us that they had received training to support people with taking medication and records confirmed this. From medication administration records we reviewed we saw that these were all completed correctly.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At this inspection, we found staff had the same level of skill, experience and support to enable them to meet people's needs effectively, as we found at our previous inspection. People continued to have freedom of choice and were supported with their dietary and health needs. The rating continues to be Good.

The registered manager was very keen for staff to develop and attend training courses. Staff told us that they were supported to achieve nationally recognised qualification, one member of staff said, "I am up to date with all my mandatory training and I am currently doing an NVQ level 3. I recently did a course with the district nurse on pressure area care which was very interesting." Other staff we spoke with also confirmed how training was helping them to perform their role. Staff felt supported at the service. New staff had a full induction which included shadowing more experienced staff and completed a skills assessment by the registered manager so they could measure the level of support and training that they required to do their job. In addition staff said that they had regular opportunities to reflect on their practice and to discuss the running of the service during staff meetings, supervision sessions and spot checks. Since moving to their new office space the registered manager was also developing regular monthly drop in sessions for staff. The two team leaders also on occasion held team meetings for a catch up with staff in the community at local café.

People who used the service had capacity to make their own decisions and choices about their care. Staff were aware that people had to give their consent to care and had the right to make their own decisions. The registered manager was aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and was aware of how to apply for capacity assessments and how to protect people's rights.

Where required people were supported with their dietary needs. Staff assisted people with their meals by preparing food for them. People told us that they chose their meals and staff would prepare the meals for them. Staff would cook full meals for people or make light snacks such as sandwiches. Staff told us that they would bring in fresh vegetables to put with people's microwave meals and would pick up items of shopping if needed, such as milk. Staff told us that they always leave drinks and snacks to hand for people when leaving them. One member of staff told us how they assisted people to cook for themselves helping them to open tins and peel vegetables.

People were supported to access healthcare as required. The service had good links with other healthcare professionals, such as, community nurses, occupational therapists and GPs. The registered manager made referrals where appropriate for assessments from the district nurses and occupational therapists if people required support or equipment for them to continue living at home independently. In addition to this the service also escorted people to hospital and doctors appointments even if these appointments were out of area at specialist hospitals in London. One person said, "They come and collect us for our hospital appointments in their car, it always works well for us."

Is the service caring?

Our findings

At this inspection people remained happy using the service, they continued to be very complimentary of the staff and felt cared for. The rating continues to be Good.

People were very complimentary of the support they received from staff and how caring the staff were. One person told us, "The staff are very good, all very friendly." A relative told us, "My husband always cheers up when they come in, they [staff] are a pleasure." We saw a relative commented, "Best care company anyone could want, lovely staff and great management, I would recommend anytime."

Staff knew people well, including their life histories and their preferences for care. People told us that they had their own regular carers and staff confirmed that they had a regular round of people they supported. This meant people were cared for consistently. A member of staff told us, "I have my ladies who lunch and go into them everyday." The registered manager told us that they kept people's care plans up to date with their likes and dislikes and tended to review these every six weeks.

People were actively involved in decisions about their care and treatment and their views were taken into account. The registered manager discussed people's care needs with them so that they could develop a care plan that was tailored to their needs. This care plan would then be reviewed regularly. One person told us, "[manager's name] discussed everything with me and what support I needed." When appropriate, staff supported people to have other professionals involved in their care who could act as advocates, such as social workers and relatives.

People were always treated with dignity and respect. The registered manager ensured staff were trained properly and knew how to show dignity and respect to people. Before staff began working with people they would be introduced to the person to ensure that they knew how they wished to be supported. The service was sensitive to people diverse needs and were sensitive in the language they used to ensure for example this matched people's gender identity. The service also supported people's individual religious needs, one member of staff said, "I will support [person's name] to church, and remind them to have a shave if needed."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

At this inspection we found staff were as responsive to people's needs and concerns as they were during the previous inspection. The rating remains Good.

People continued to receive care that was individual and personalised to their needs. The registered manager and team leaders ensured people had a thorough assessment before they agreed to deliver their care. People's care needs continued to be reviewed regularly and adjustments made where required. This meant people received up to date and consistent care.

The service continued to be responsive to people's changing needs. People's care needs were kept under constant review and adjusted as required. For example if people support needs increased or decreased support was adjusted to match this. The team leader told us how they worked very hard with one person to get them back into their own home following episodes of falls and time spent in respite. The team leader arranged to spend time with the person and had their needs assessed so that the correct equipment could be supplied to assist them in resuming their independence back at home. The team leader spent time with the person in respite reassuring them and going through all their support requirements. When the person was able to return home the team leader ensured they had all the correct medication and spent most of the first day with them to help them gain their confidence. The team leader told us that now the person had adjusted to being back at home they would be reducing the level of support required with the person's consent. This demonstrated the service was responsive to people's changing needs.

Staff supported people to follow their hobbies and social interests. Staff supported people as companions, this included going out on trips with them to places of interests or to the shops and local clubs. One member of staff said, "I take some people out for a drive to the seafront or wherever they want to go." Staff told us that they also escorted people to church or to clubs and out for lunches. Staff also supported people with hobbies in their own homes such as playing cards or gardening. The service also provided companionship which meant they may just spend time talking with people and keeping them company in their own home in addition to community activities.

The registered manager had a robust complaints process in place that was accessible and all complaints were dealt with effectively. People and relatives said if they had any concerns or complaints they would raise these with the registered manager. However people told us they generally did not have any complaints. The service also received a number of compliments, one said, "Mum is very happy, gets on and loves all the boys and girls, everything works well."

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

At this inspection we found the service was as well led as at the previous inspection. The rating remains Good.

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. □

People told us that they were happy with the quality of the service, one person said, "I am very happy with the service I receive." Another person said, "I have no complaints, regular carers who come on time and do everything I ask." A relative commented, 'Mum and myself have been very satisfied, Care Connected have been very supportive and understanding.' □

The registered manager and staff were very passionate and enthusiastic about the service and staff shared the manager's vision and values. The registered manager was keen to run a bespoke service that was person centred to meet people's individual needs to help them maintain their independence at home. All the staff we spoke with were enthusiastic about the service, one member of staff said, "We want people to be happy, healthy and safe, to be able to stay in their own home, whilst looking after their well-being and social needs."

Staff felt supported and valued by the management team. Staff told us that the registered manager and team leaders were always available to give them support. In addition to this they had regular staff meetings to talk about the running of the service and to receive any updates on training or other relevant information. Staff told us that they were in regular phone contact with the management team and received information through email. Staff told us that they were happy working for the service one member of staff said, "It's a good company to work for, you get to build relationships with people because we have long call times."

The registered manager and team leaders visited people at home to receive their feedback and review their care. They also kept regular contact with people and relatives by telephone and email. The registered manager also used questionnaires to canvas people's feedback so that they could look at ways of improving the service. From survey's we reviewed they were all very complimentary of the service. Team leaders and senior carers also carried out spot checks to ensure people were receiving the correct support from staff in a professional way. This showed that the management listened to people's views and responded accordingly, to improve their experience of the service.

The registered manager had a number of quality monitoring systems in place to continually review and improve the quality of the service provided to people. They carried out regular audits, for example, on people's care plans and medication management. This information was used as appropriate to continually improve the care people received. In addition the service was working on keeping their website up to date to share people's experience and improve their well-being whilst using the service. We saw the website

contained profiles of people receiving support along with other useful information for people.