

Westgarth Enterprises Limited

# Home Instead Senior Care: Maidenhead, Henley & Wallingford

## Inspection report

Unit 5  
Castle End, Ruscombe  
Reading  
Berkshire  
RG10 9XQ

Date of inspection visit:  
30 April 2018  
01 May 2018

Date of publication:  
22 May 2018

Website: [www.homeinstead.co.uk/maidenhead](http://www.homeinstead.co.uk/maidenhead)

## 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 30 April and 1 May 2018. It was announced and was carried out by one inspector. We gave the service 48 hours' notice because they provide a domiciliary care service and we needed to make sure someone would be in the office.

Home Instead Senior Care: Maidenhead, Henley & Wallingford is a domiciliary care agency. It provides personal care to people living in their own homes in the community. It provides a service to older and younger people, some of whom may be living with physical disabilities and/or dementia. At the time of our inspection there were 41 people receiving a service.

At our last inspection we rated the service good. Following that inspection the provider moved their office location and the service now has a new manager. The new manager is currently in the process of registering with the Care Quality Commission. 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.

At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

Why the service is rated Good.

People were protected from the risks of abuse. Risks were identified and managed effectively to protect people from avoidable harm. Recruitment processes were in place to make sure, as far as possible, that people were protected from staff being employed who were not suitable. Medicines were handled correctly and safely.

People received effective care and support from staff who knew them well and were well trained and supervised. People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice. People's right to make their own decisions were protected.

People were treated with care and kindness and their right to confidentiality was protected. People were treated with respect and their dignity was upheld. People's diversity needs were identified and incorporated into their care plans where applicable.

People received care and support which was personalised to meet their individual needs. People knew how to complain and staff knew the process to follow if they had concerns.

People benefitted from a service which had an open and inclusive culture. Staff were happy working for the service and people benefitted from being supported by staff who felt well managed and supported.

Further information is in the detailed findings of the full report.

## 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.

# Home Instead Senior Care: Maidenhead, Henley & Wallingford

## **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 30 April and 1 May 2018. It was announced and was carried out by one inspector. We gave the service 48 hours' notice because they provide a domiciliary care service and we needed to make sure someone would be in the office.

We used information the provider sent us in the Provider Information Return (PIR). 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. Prior to the inspection we looked at the PIR and all the information we had collected about the service. This included previous inspection reports, information received and notifications the service had sent us. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to tell us about by law.

We spoke with the manager and both of the provider company's directors, one of whom is also the nominated individual. We also spoke with members of the office staff team. As part of the inspection we sought feedback from 18 people who use the service and received responses from eight as well as feedback from one of their relatives. We requested feedback from two community professionals and received responses from both. We also requested feedback from 42 members of staff and received 18 responses.

We looked at four people's care plans, daily notes, monitoring records and medicine administration sheets.

We saw staff recruitment files for six staff members who had been employed since our last inspection. We reviewed a number of other documents relating to the management of the service. For example, staff training records, staff supervision and appraisal log, audits, policies, incident forms, staff meeting minutes, compliments, online reviews and concerns records.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

The service continued to provide safe care and support to people who use the service.

People were protected from the risks of abuse. Staff knew what actions to take if they felt people were at risk. They were confident they would be taken seriously if they raised concerns with the management. People told us they felt safe from harm or abuse from their care workers. A relative said they felt their family member was kept safe by the service. Community professionals thought the service and risks to individuals were managed so that people were protected.

People were protected from risks associated with their health and care provision. Staff assessed such risks, and care plans incorporated measures to reduce or prevent potential risks to individuals and staff. For example, risks associated with moving and handling. Risk assessments of people's homes were carried out and staff were aware of the lone working policy in place to keep them safe in their work. One member of staff said, "Home Instead is a fantastic company to work for and I feel safe and encouraged in my work."

People could be confident that staff were checked for suitability before being allowed to work with them. Staff files included all required recruitment information. For example, a full employment history, proof of identity, evidence of conduct in previous employment and criminal record checks.

Staff were provided in line with the hours of people's individual care packages. In the service's 2017 survey 100% of clients who responded said staff arrived on time. People said staff stayed the correct length of time. Staff said they had enough time to provide the care people needed within the time allocated to them. Community professionals thought the service made sure that there were sufficient numbers of suitable staff to keep people safe and meet their needs. One added, "With [Name] the carers are on the ball. They are really good."

People confirmed staff did all they could to prevent and control infections, such as using hand gels and wearing gloves. Staff training records showed staff were up to date with their infection control training.

Emergency plans were in place, such as plans for extreme weather conditions. Accidents and incidents were recorded, together with details of actions taken at the time. The log showed appropriate action was taken promptly to deal with any incidents. Care plans were updated with actions staff needed to take to reduce the risk of a recurrence of incidents where applicable.

People's medicines were handled safely. Staff had received training and their competence had been checked by a manager observing them administering medicines. Only staff trained and assessed as competent were allowed to administer medicines. Medicines administration record sheets were up to date and had been completed by the staff administering the medicines.

We saw an online review from a relative who stated, "Home Instead do exactly what we wanted them to do – provide support and ensure all is well on days when I do not visit. The carer has established a very good

personal relationship with my father and I have peace of mind. All in all a very good, reliable service."

## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

The service continued to provide effective care and support to people who use the service.

People received effective care and support from staff who were aware of people's preferences and abilities. The provider had a number of mandatory training topics updated on a regular basis. For example, training in fire, moving and handling and food safety. Other mandatory training included first aid, medicines and infection control. From the training records we saw staff training was mostly up to date. Where staff were due refresher training, dates had been booked. Community professionals thought the service provided effective care to their client and that staff had the knowledge and skills they needed to carry out their roles and responsibilities.

We noted the mandatory training provided to staff at the service was not in line with the current best practice guidelines for ongoing social care staff training. For example, the provider's practice was to update staff training in first aid every three years. However, Skills for Care "Ongoing learning and development guide" sets out that staff training in first aid and basic life support should be at least every three years but recommends that staff skills are refreshed at a minimum of once a year in both topics. Other topics recommended for social care staff were not included in the provider's training curriculum, such as recording and reporting.

We recommend that the provider bring the staff training provision in line with the current best practice guidance on ongoing training for social care staff.

New staff were provided with induction training which followed the care certificate developed by Skills for Care. The care certificate is a set of 15 standards that new health and social care workers need to complete during their induction period. Staff said they had completed an induction which had prepared them fully for their role before they worked unsupervised. One member of staff commented, "I feel secure in this job with having supportive management who make sure we are trained and give us any information we require before visiting clients. I can call them at any time if I'm unsure or have a problem. I am treated with respect, consideration and understanding... I hope to remain with Home Instead for many years to come."

People benefitted from the care provided by staff who were well supervised. The service aimed to provide staff with one to one meetings (supervision) twice a year and an annual appraisal of their work. Observational spot checks were carried out twice a year where a manager assessed staff as they work with people who use the service. Records showed staff were up to date with their formal supervision meetings, spot checks and annual appraisals. Staff told us they had regular supervision which they felt enhanced their skills and learning. People told us staff had the skills and knowledge they needed to give them the care and support they needed.

People's rights to make their own decisions, where possible, were protected. Staff and managers received training in the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and understood their responsibilities. The 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 and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible.

People received effective care and support from staff who knew how they liked things done. Each care plan was based on a full assessment and demonstrated the person had been involved in drawing up their plan. The care plans were kept under review and amended when changes occurred or if new information came to light.

Where providing meals was part of the package of care and/or where there was a concern, daily records included how much people had eaten. Where people were not eating well staff would highlight that to the person's relative, the manager or a senior and advice would be sought from a health professional if necessary.

Community professionals thought the service "most definitely" supported people to maintain good health, have access to healthcare services and receive ongoing healthcare support. One professional went on to emphasise that staff contacted them if anything was out of the ordinary with a person's health and sought advice promptly and appropriately. Comments received from staff included, "Office staff and management are always very helpful even when ringing for support." and "Caregivers are supported well by the office. Clients are well respected and valued." One relative left a review stating, "Great people/service/organisation. Cannot fault anything. They allow me not to worry about my mum and are always flexible if needed."

## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

Home Instead Senior Care: Maidenhead, Henley & Wallingford continued to provide a caring service.

People and a relative told us the care workers were caring and kind and they were happy with the care they received from the service. One person left a review saying, "I could not hope for better care. My carers are so friendly and not pushy!" Community professionals said the service was successful in developing positive, caring relationships with people using the service. One added that their client was, "very relaxed, comfortable and happy with the carers."

Staff knew the people who use the service and how they liked things done. Staff said the time allowed in the care packages meant they were able to complete all the care and support required by the people's care plans. People told us they received care and support from familiar, consistent staff. Staff were respectful of people's cultural and spiritual needs. Any equality and diversity needs were identified and set out in people's care plans.

People and a relative said staff treated them with respect and dignity. This was confirmed by community professionals, who told us the service promoted and respected people's privacy and dignity. People said the support and care they received helped them to be as independent as they could be. The care plans set out instructions to staff in how to provide care in a way that maintained the person's level of independence. The care plans gave details of things people could do for themselves and where they needed support. One member of staff told us, "The company is well managed and showing real respect and care for their clients and employees. I am very happy to be part of the team."

People's right to confidentiality was protected. Staff were made aware of the provider's policy on data protection and confidentiality as part of their induction training. In the office, any personal records were kept in a lockable cabinet and on the service's computer system, only accessible by authorised staff. In people's homes, the care records were kept in a place agreed with the person using the service.

We saw a compliment sent by a person to the service about one care worker. The person reported that the care worker went above and beyond and no job was too much trouble. He said the care worker was always helpful and smiling when with him. Other compliments seen included, "I have always found carers who have come to help us helpful, caring and very pleasant.", "As far as I'm concerned the service can't be improved. The carers are great and cannot do enough for me. I am very happy with Home Instead" and "We have been nothing but impressed with your initial response to my desperate call in January and the thoroughly amazing team you have put together to look after Mum. I would especially like to thank [staff name] who has been fantastic."

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

The service continued to provide responsive care and support to people who use the service.

People received support that was individualised to their personal needs. People said they received the care and support they needed, when they needed it. Community professionals said the service provided personalised care that was responsive to people's needs and reflected their personal and cultural preferences and one added, "Definitely."

People's care plans were based on a full assessment, with information gathered from the person and others who knew them well. The assessments and care plans captured details of people's abilities and wishes regarding their personal care. Their usual preferred daily routines were also included in their care plans so that staff could provide consistent care in the way people wanted. The daily notes demonstrated staff knew the people well and provided personal care based on the way individuals liked things done. People's needs and care plans were regularly assessed for any changes. People's changing needs were monitored and the package of care adjusted to meet those needs if necessary. Staff reported any changes in people's health or needs to their senior or manager so that the care plans could be updated. The care plans we saw were well written and up to date.

Information was provided, including in accessible formats, to help people understand their care and support. The manager and directors were aware of the Accessible Information Standard. From August 2016 onwards, all organisations that provide adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard. The standard sets out a specific, consistent approach to identifying, recording, flagging, sharing and meeting the information and communication support needs of people who use services. The standard applies to people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss and in some circumstances to their carers. The service was in the process of documenting the communication needs of people in a way that meets the criteria of the standard.

People and their relatives knew how to raise a complaint and were confident the service would take appropriate action. They said staff responded well to any concerns they raised. Staff were aware of the procedure to follow should anyone raise a concern with them. One person commented, "They are very professional and responsive. I'm very happy with them." and another said, "They are very good." We saw a compliment sent by a relative to the service after their family member had passed away. The relative wrote, "The care [Name] received from Home Instead was exemplary, it could not have been better.... In particular I would like you to pass on my sincere thanks to [two staff names] for the patience, kindness and understanding they showed."

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

The service continued to be well-led.

It is a condition of registration with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) that the service has a registered manager in place. The previous registered manager left the service in November 2017. The provider had employed a new manager who was in the process of being registered with the Care Quality Commission at the time of our inspection. The manager and provider had notified CQC about significant events. We used this information to monitor the service and ensure they responded appropriately to keep people safe.

During the week of our inspection the service was notified they had been given a "Top 20 Home Care Award" for 2018. This was an annual award published by a home care review website. The website explains that the awards, "highlight the most recommended Home Care Providers in each region of the UK. The awards are based on the review score, as of 4th April 2018. Home care providers are excluded from the awards if their regulatory authority report is Requires Improvement or below or there were any compliance issues with their regulatory authority at the time of the announcement of the awards." Any reviews placed on the website are validated as genuine prior to being published.

Feedback on the service provision was sought regularly from people and the staff. The practice at the service was to contact people the day after their service began and then four weeks later. The purpose of those calls was to ensure people were happy with the service being provided and to enable the service to deal with any issues or questions at an early stage. We saw some comments from people in their files made at the time of those calls. One comment the day after a service started was, "[staff name] has been fantastic!" and then at week four another person had commented they were very happy with the carers who visited them.

The franchise company, Home Instead Senior Care (UK) Ltd, carry out annual surveys of people who use the service and staff. The results are then correlated and sent to the service for their information and action. The survey results for 2018 were expected by the end of May 2018. The manager told us they would be looking at the results and consulting with people who use the service and staff to make improvements if and where indicated.

The directors were active in the local community and took part in a number of initiatives. For example, one director was an "I Care Ambassador" and attended monthly meetings and delivered talks to explain their role. The directors also produced a monthly care worker newsletter and a monthly client newsletter. In those newsletters, as well as stories about what had been happening the previous month, helpful information was included. For example, in one newsletter there was information about a scheme set up by a local utility company specifically to provide help and assistance to vulnerable people at times of power cuts. The newsletter gave instructions to people on how to register for the service. Other newsletters contained information about the service's new "Goodwill Library" and details of local clubs and upcoming social events. At Christmas the service was also involved in a local "Be a Santa to a Senior" event. This was a tea party for 120 local older people with a raffle, sing-a-long, entertainment, school choir and high tea all provided.

Team meetings were held and, where possible, were arranged for times when the majority of staff were able to attend. The meetings were often timed to coincide with staff training. In the meeting minutes we saw staff had the opportunity to take part in open discussions and to put their views forward. Topics discussed in the meeting that took place at the end of November 2017 included health and safety in client's homes, writing daily records and managing medications. Also discussed was a "Mental Capacity Act factsheet" from the Alzheimer's Society.

Community professionals felt the service demonstrated good management and leadership, delivered good quality care and worked in partnership with other agencies. People said they would recommend the service to another person.

People received a service from staff who worked in an open and friendly culture and were happy in their work. Staff told us their managers were accessible and approachable and dealt effectively with any concerns they raised. They also said they would feel confident about reporting any concerns or poor practice to the managers.

Staff said they were asked what they thought about the service and felt their views were taken into account. They felt well supported by the management team. Comments received from staff included, "The current Directors are absolutely wonderful and all the office staff are great. I have to say I feel very comfortable and happy with the complete office team. I feel I could approach any member of staff and feel I am heard, understood and appreciated." and, "Home Instead is a great organisation to work for. The management/office staff are very helpful, knowledgeable and friendly in their approach whenever I have been in contact for various reasons. I would be happy to recommend the company both from a care givers point of view for job satisfaction and also if I had a relative needing the care and support that they give!"