

Review of compliance

Southwark Disablement Association SDA Domiciliary Care Services

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Region: | London |
| Location address: | 305-307 Camberwell Road Camberwell London SE5 0HQ |
| Type of service: | Domiciliary care service |
| Date of Publication: | January 2012 |
| Overview of the service: | <p>SDA Domiciliary Care Services provides care and support to people in their own homes.</p> <p>The service is registered for the regulated activity of personal care.</p> |

Summary of our findings for the essential standards of quality and safety

Our current overall judgement

SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety.

The summary below describes why we carried out this review, what we found and any action required.

Why we carried out this review

We carried out this review as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews.

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, carried out a visit on 29 November 2011, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

About 60 people were receiving care from SDA Domiciliary Care Services at the time of our inspection. The majority of these were people under the age of 65 with a physical disability and care was also provided to some older people. The six people who gave us their views were very complimentary about the service. They said that the care workers were "wonderful" and that the management team were "friendly and efficient".

We spoke with five care workers, who told us that they received the training and support they needed to do their job well.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting them

Outcome 01: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run

People who use the service are treated with respect and kindness by the care staff. They are kept informed about the arrangements for their care and are given opportunities to comment on the care they receive.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights

People who receive services are provided with care and support that are appropriate for their needs.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights

People who use services feel well supported by their care workers. Care workers have training in safeguarding vulnerable adults and know when to report concerns.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 14: Staff should be properly trained and supervised, and have the chance to develop and improve their skills

People who use the service are cared for by staff who are well trained and supported.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care

People who use the service have opportunities to give their views. The management team actively seek ways of maintaining quality.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Other information

Please see previous reports for more information about previous reviews.

**What we found
for each essential standard of quality
and safety we reviewed**

The following pages detail our findings and our regulatory judgement for each essential standard and outcome that we reviewed, linked to specific regulated activities where appropriate.

We will have reached one of the following judgements for each essential standard.

Compliant means that people who use services are experiencing the outcomes relating to the essential standard.

A **minor concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard.

A **moderate concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and there is an impact on their health and wellbeing because of this.

A **major concern** means that people who use services are not experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and are not protected from unsafe or inappropriate care, treatment and support.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary improvements are made. Where there are a number of concerns, we may look at them together to decide the level of action to take.

More information about each of the outcomes can be found in the *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*

Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- * Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
- * Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
- * Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
- * Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People using the service told us that they had regular care workers who knew them well. They said care workers were kind and considerate and that their preferences were respected. One person told us "My care worker is pleasant, caring and treats me like a person rather than just a job that needs doing".

We were told that the office staff were polite and efficient. They kept people informed about what was happening and let them know when a care worker was going to be late. If the regular care worker was not able to come, the office staff telephoned and gave the name of the substitute care worker.

People we spoke with also said that they could contact the office if they had concerns, and that they were regularly asked to give their views about the service.

Other evidence

Care workers we spoke with talked about the importance of treating everyone as an individual. They said that there had been a reduction in the time allocated for visits in some cases, but they tried to manage so that people did not feel rushed.

We saw evidence in the records that the assessment took into account people's

individuality. For example, when a person could not communicate verbally, there was information about the methods care workers could use to communicate with them. We saw that the service ensured continuity of care as much as possible, and that they matched the skills and characteristics of the care worker with the needs and preferences of the people using the service.

A Guide for Service Users was given to everyone who received care with comprehensive information about the service, including expectations of care workers, expectations of the person using the service, and how to complain.

Our judgement

People who use the service are treated with respect and kindness by the care staff. They are kept informed about the arrangements for their care and are given opportunities to comment on the care they receive.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

The people we contacted said that the care workers arrived at the expected time and stayed for the allocated time. They said that they were well looked after. The service regularly asked them whether they needed a change in their care plan.

Other evidence

Care workers told us that they always knew what was needed when they went to visit people. If they were covering for another worker, the office staff gave them some details about the person and what was needed on the telephone. The care plan kept at the person's home detailed the care required and the person's preferences for how this should be provided.

The care plans and risk assessments we saw were detailed and included information on when a person should be supported to do a task and when this task should be done for them. A second care worker was allocated if this was needed to move people safely. We saw from the records that there were regular reviews at which people, and their relatives if appropriate, were asked if there were any changes in their needs. Care workers were asked to contribute to the reviews.

Care workers said that if they thought that the person using the service needed something, they would pass on this information and action would be taken. We were given examples of when health services and housing services had been contacted to address a concern.

Our judgement

People who receive services are provided with care and support that are appropriate for their needs.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are respected and upheld.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People using the service told us that they had confidence in the care workers and the management of the service.

Other evidence

Care workers said that they had received training in safeguarding. They described the process they followed when handling people's money, recording the expenditure and keeping receipts. We also saw examples of reports made by care workers to managers when they had concerns about the wellbeing of people using the service.

Our records show that CQC has not been informed of a safeguarding concern by or about the service.

We saw records of the safeguarding training received by care workers. Care workers were always asked if there were any issues about safeguarding and health and safety at supervision. We also saw the recently updated safeguarding policy, the policy about handling service users' money and the medication policy.

Our judgement

People who use services feel well supported by their care workers. Care workers have training in safeguarding vulnerable adults and know when to report concerns.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 14: Supporting staff

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by competent staff.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 14: Supporting staff

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People using the service told us that the care workers provided a good standard of care.

Other evidence

Care workers told us that management was supportive and flexible. If they had difficulty in carrying out their visits, for example because of caring responsibilities, the service would arrange cover and let them have the time off they needed. One worker said that she had asked if the homes she visited could be closer together and this had been arranged so that her travel time was reduced. Care workers said that they could contact the office with any problem, and that the service had someone on duty out of hours so that there was always someone available.

We looked at the staff records, which included information about training attended, notes of regular supervision, and notes of the annual appraisal. We saw that care workers had supervision every six weeks when they could talk about any concerns. The annual appraisal was an opportunity for care workers to reflect on the things that they did well and the areas of their work that they could develop.

We saw evidence that when concerns were raised about a care worker's performance, this was well documented and procedures were followed.

There was an analysis of the workforce training needs. Staff told us that they were encouraged to gain qualifications. The four members of staff in coordinating and supervisory roles had all originally been care workers and had been encouraged by the

service manager to take NVQ level 4 and to apply for the posts.

Care workers told us about their pride in working for "best service" in the area. The retention rate for staff was very good and the majority of care workers had worked with the service for many years.

Our judgement

People who use the service are cared for by staff who are well trained and supported.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support, due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

The people we contacted said they felt they could talk to their care worker or contact the office at any time if they had a concern. They said they were regularly asked whether they were satisfied with the service.

Other evidence

We saw that there were regular reviews of care plans and that there was a quick response if people's needs changed.

The management team also carried out spot checks, during which they observed the care worker and asked the person using the service about the quality of their care.

We saw examples in staff files of discussions about service quality at supervision. If there was a complaint, for example about timekeeping, this would be raised with the care worker concerned.

The organisation had recently undertaken their annual survey of people who used the service. The previous survey had found a very high satisfaction rate.

The service manager showed us some of the compliments that had been made about the service from service users and from other services, such as occupational therapy and social work.

Our judgement

People who use the service have opportunities to give their views. The management team actively seek ways of maintaining quality.

Overall, we found that SDA Domiciliary Care Services was meeting this essential standard.

What is a review of compliance?

By law, providers of certain adult social care and health care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has written guidance about what people who use services should experience when providers are meeting essential standards, called *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*.

CQC licenses services if they meet essential standards and will constantly monitor whether they continue to do so. We formally review services when we receive information that is of concern and as a result decide we need to check whether a service is still meeting one or more of the essential standards. We also formally review them at least every two years to check whether a service is meeting all of the essential standards in each of their locations. Our reviews include checking all available information and intelligence we hold about a provider. We may seek further information by contacting people who use services, public representative groups and organisations such as other regulators. We may also ask for further information from the provider and carry out a visit with direct observations of care.

When making our judgements about whether services are meeting essential standards, we decide whether we need to take further regulatory action. This might include discussions with the provider about how they could improve. We only use this approach where issues can be resolved quickly, easily and where there is no immediate risk of serious harm to people.

Where we have concerns that providers are not meeting essential standards, or where we judge that they are not going to keep meeting them, we may also set improvement actions or compliance actions, or take enforcement action:

Improvement actions: These are actions a provider should take so that they **maintain** continuous compliance with essential standards. Where a provider is complying with essential standards, but we are concerned that they will not be able to maintain this, we ask them to send us a report describing the improvements they will make to enable them to do so.

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. Where a provider is not meeting the essential standards but people are not at immediate risk of serious harm, we ask them to send us a report that says what they will do to make sure they comply. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action to make sure that essential standards are met.

Enforcement action: These are actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers are set out in the law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

Information for the reader

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Document purpose | Review of compliance report |
| Author | Care Quality Commission |
| Audience | The general public |
| Further copies from | 03000 616161 / www.cqc.org.uk |
| Copyright | Copyright © (2010) Care Quality Commission (CQC). This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part, free of charge, in any format or medium provided that it is not used for commercial gain. This consent is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and on proviso that it is not used in a derogatory manner or misleading context. The material should be acknowledged as CQC copyright, with the title and date of publication of the document specified. |

Care Quality Commission

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Website | www.cqc.org.uk |
| Telephone | 03000 616161 |
| Email address | enquiries@cqc.org.uk |
| Postal address | Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA |