

We are the regulator: Our job is to check whether hospitals, care homes and care services are meeting essential standards.

Carewatch (Telford)

Annex 1, Suite B, 2nd Floor Cornerstone House,
13 Stafford Park, Telford, TF3 3AZ

Tel: 08451298157

Date of Inspection: 04 September 2012

Date of Publication:
September 2012

We inspected the following standards as part of a routine inspection. This is what we found:

Respecting and involving people who use services ✓ Met this standard

Care and welfare of people who use services ✓ Met this standard

Safeguarding people who use services from abuse ✓ Met this standard

Supporting workers ✓ Met this standard

Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision ✓ Met this standard

Details about this location

Registered Provider	Carewatch t/a Sentinel Care Limited
Registered Manager	Mrs. Sally Harris
Overview of the service	Carewatch (Telford) is a domiciliary care agency registered to provide personal care to people in their own homes. The agency currently provides services to 144 adults and one child with a range of needs across Shropshire, Staffordshire and Wolverhampton.
Type of services	Domiciliary care service Extra Care housing services Rehabilitation services Supported living service
Regulated activity	Personal care

When you read this report, you may find it useful to read the sections towards the back called 'About CQC inspections' and 'How we define our judgements'.

	Page
Summary of this inspection:	
Why we carried out this inspection	4
How we carried out this inspection	4
What people told us and what we found	4
More information about the provider	5
Our judgements for each standard inspected:	
Respecting and involving people who use services	6
Care and welfare of people who use services	7
Safeguarding people who use services from abuse	8
Supporting workers	9
Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision	10
About CQC Inspections	11
How we define our judgements	12
Glossary of terms we use in this report	14
Contact us	16

Summary of this inspection

Why we carried out this inspection

This was a routine inspection to check that essential standards of quality and safety referred to on the front page were being met. We sometimes describe this as a scheduled inspection.

This was an unannounced inspection.

How we carried out this inspection

We looked at the personal care or treatment records of people who use the service, carried out a visit on 4 September 2012, checked how people were cared for at each stage of their treatment and care and talked with people who use the service. We talked with staff.

What people told us and what we found

We spoke with five people who used the service, five care workers and two members of the management team. People shared very positive experiences of the care and support they received. Comments included, "The staff are really wonderful to us, we couldn't wish for anything better." "I've never regretted choosing Carewatch, the staff do their job perfectly, I'm very happy indeed."

People told us they received information about the agency before they agreed to the service. They said their care needs were assessed and they were involved in planning and reviewing their care. People told us staff respected them and maintained their privacy and dignity.

People said they felt comfortable and safe in the presence of the staff. One person commented, "The staff are very trustworthy." Another person said, "I feel safe with the staff and trust them all." Staff told us they had received training in safeguarding people and knew the procedure to follow to report any concerns that may arise.

People said they liked the staff. Staff told us the agency had undertaken checks on them to ensure they were safe to work with vulnerable people. We saw the agency had effective recruitment and selection processes in place.

People told us they were 'very' satisfied with the service. They said the agency regularly gained their views about quality through satisfaction surveys or spot check visits to their home.

You can see our judgements on the front page of this report.

More information about the provider

Please see our website www.cqc.org.uk for more information, including our most recent judgements against the essential standards. You can contact us using the telephone number on the back of the report if you have additional questions.

There is a glossary at the back of this report which has definitions for words and phrases we use in the report.

Our judgements for each standard inspected

Respecting and involving people who use services ✓ Met this standard

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected. People's views and experiences were taken into account in the way the service was provided and delivered in relation to their care.

Reasons for our judgement

People told us they had received lots of information about Carewatch before they started using the service. They said their needs were assessed and they were involved in planning and reviewing their care. We saw that the agency had requested and obtained information important to each individual. For example how the person wished to be addressed, their preferred first language and their expected outcomes to include improving their quality of life, choice, control and maintaining their privacy and dignity. One person told us the agency had taken their views into account when they had requested a change of care workers.

People said they felt listened to and were respected by their care workers. People who received support with their intimate daily routines told us their privacy was maintained and staff were respectful towards them. Staff shared positive examples of how they promoted this in their everyday work practice. One member of staff said, "I always ask service users what they want me to do, I never just presume. I always respect them and maintain their privacy and dignity."

People told us they were supported in promoting their independence and community involvement. One person told us they were regularly supported to go shopping and to visit their local café, which they thoroughly enjoyed. They said, "We so much look forward to them coming, the carers are very nice and always so kind to us."

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

Reasons for our judgement

Everyone we spoke with told us that they had the care and support they needed and were very complimentary of the service they received. Comments included, "The carers know about my needs and I'm very happy with the care that I receive". "I haven't got anything but wonderful words to say about them, they are so respectful, kind and caring."

We spoke with the care co-ordinator about the referral, assessment and care planning process. They demonstrated a clear understanding of providing care and support centred on the needs of individuals using the service. They told us people's needs were regularly reviewed and care plans updated. We saw this in the care records we looked at. People who used the service told us they had meetings to discuss any changes in their needs and that their care was kept under regular review.

Staff considered that care plans provided them with enough information to carry out their work effectively and meet the individual needs of the people they supported. One staff member said, "The care plans are regularly reviewed and updated. I feel comfortable working with the people I support." Another staff member said, "I support the same service users all of the time so I get to know them and their needs very well. It really helps as I can pick up on any changes in their health."

We looked at the care plans for five people with a range of needs. We saw care plans were detailed, regularly reviewed and updated. Assessments of identified risks had been completed and actions implemented to ensure the health and welfare of each individual.

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

People who used the service were protected from the risk of abuse because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening.

Reasons for our judgement

People told us they felt safe with the care workers. Comments included, "I feel safe having them in my home, they are very trustworthy." "I feel safe in their hands and trust them all." Care workers we spoke with knew what to do if someone raised concerns about their care or the service they received.

Following an adult protection investigation the provider reviewed how they recruited new staff to ensure staff were safe to work with vulnerable people. A member of the management team told us, "There's been a big shake up and a huge change in the way we do things."

We saw the provider had obtained copies of the multi-agency safeguarding policies for all local authorities they contracted with. Staff confirmed they had received training on protecting vulnerable people. They knew what constituted abuse and poor practice. They were able to identify the various forms of abuse and knew whom to report to if they had concerns. One member of staff said, "If I saw anything that would affect a client's welfare I would immediately report it, everything goes back to the office."

When concerns regarding safety had been raised, there was evidence that the provider had taken the appropriate action by informing the relevant authorities and following their own procedures for responding to it.

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

People were cared for, or supported by, suitably qualified, skilled and experienced staff.

Reasons for our judgement

People were complimentary about their care workers. They told us they generally had the same care workers and this helped with their continuity of care. They considered staff were fit to do their jobs.

Following an adult protection investigation the provider had reviewed how they recruited new staff. A member of the management team told us about the improvements made to safeguard people better. We looked at the records held for four staff. We saw appropriate checks were undertaken before staff began work. We saw additional safeguards had been introduced to ensure recruitment and selection was effective and safeguarded vulnerable people.

We were told that a criminal record bureau (CRB) check was now obtained before a new member of staff was allowed to directly work with vulnerable people. This was confirmed in discussions with new staff we spoke with. They told us they considered recruitment procedures were robust.

Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

✓ Met this standard

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

The provider had an effective system to regularly assess and monitor the quality of service that people received.

Reasons for our judgement

People told us they were 'very' satisfied with the quality of the service they received. They said they had the opportunity to share their views about the service and offer suggestions for improvement through review meetings and satisfaction surveys. We saw a number of completed satisfaction surveys. Comments included, "Whenever I see anyone from Carewatch I am treated very well. I feel sure they do their very best to help you." "All carers are helpful, polite and considerate to my needs and wishes." We also saw a number of thank you cards. Comments included, "Thank you for caring for x so kindly and compassionately. We appreciate all that you have done for her."

People said they were aware of how to raise concerns about their care should they arise. Staff spoke positively about their work and told us they received regular support and supervision to carry out their roles. They told us they were provided with good training opportunities and felt well supported by the management team. One care worker considered communication could be improved. Another told us the time allocated between calls should be reviewed to allow for sufficient travel time. Staff told us they were regularly asked for suggestions for improving the service and managers encouraged their feedback. Comments from staff included, "I enjoy working for the agency, we are a really good team." "I absolutely love my job, I wish I'd done this work years ago."

Feedback we gained from people who used and worked for the agency evidenced that the provider was very much focused on providing an individualised service, ensuring the views of people were paramount in how the service was run.

About CQC inspections

We are the regulator of health and social care in England.

All providers of regulated health and social 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 essential standards are described in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009. We regulate against these standards, which we sometimes describe as "government standards".

We carry out unannounced inspections of all care homes, hospitals and domiciliary care services in England at least once a year to judge whether or not the essential standards are being met. We carry out inspections of dentists, primary medical services and other services at least once every two years. All of our inspections are unannounced unless there is a good reason to let the provider know we are coming.

There are 16 essential standards that relate most directly to the quality and safety of care and these are grouped into five key areas. When we inspect we could check all or part of any of the 16 standards at any time depending on the individual circumstances of the service. Because of this we often check different standards at different times but we always inspect at least one standard from each of the five key areas every year. We may check fewer key areas in the case of dentists and some other services.

When we inspect, we always visit and we do things like observe how people are cared for, and we talk to people who use the service, to their carers and to staff. We also review information we have gathered about the provider, check the service's records and check whether the right systems and processes are in place.

We focus on whether or not the provider is meeting the standards and we are guided by whether people are experiencing the outcomes they should be able to expect when the standards are being met. By outcomes we mean the impact care has on the health, safety and welfare of people who use the service, and the experience they have whilst receiving it.

Our inspectors judge if any action is required by the provider of the service to improve the standard of care being provided. Where providers are non-compliant with the regulations, we take enforcement action against them. If we require a service to take action, or if we take enforcement action, we re-inspect it before its next routine inspection was due. This could mean we re-inspect a service several times in one year. We also might decide to re-inspect a service if new concerns emerge about it before the next routine inspection.

In between inspections we continually monitor information we have about providers. The information comes from the public, the provider, other organisations, and from care workers.

You can tell us about your experience of this provider on our website.

How we define our judgements

The following pages show our findings and regulatory judgement for each essential standard or part of the standard that we inspected. Our judgements are based on the ongoing review and analysis of the information gathered by CQC about this provider and the evidence collected during this inspection.

We reach one of the following judgements for each essential standard inspected.

✓ Met this standard This means that the standard was being met in that the provider was compliant with the regulation. If we find that standards were met, we take no regulatory action but we may make comments that may be useful to the provider and to the public about minor improvements that could be made.

✗ Action needed This means that the standard was not being met in that the provider was non-compliant with the regulation. We set a compliance action requiring the provider to produce a report setting out how and by when changes will be made to make sure they comply with the standard. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action.

✗ Enforcement action taken If the breach of the regulation was more serious, or there have been several or continual breaches, we have a range of actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers include issuing a warning notice; restricting or suspending the services a provider can offer, or the number of people it can care for; issuing fines and formal cautions; in extreme cases, cancelling a provider or managers registration or prosecuting a manager or provider. These enforcement powers are set out in law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

How we define our judgements (continued)

Where we find non-compliance with a regulation (or part of a regulation), we state which part of the regulation has been breached. We make a judgement about the level of impact on people who use the service (and others, if appropriate to the regulation) from the breach. This could be a minor, moderate or major impact.

Minor impact – people who use the service experienced poor care that had an impact on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The impact was not significant and the matter could be managed or resolved quickly.

Moderate impact – people who use the service experienced poor care that had a significant effect on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The matter may need to be resolved quickly.

Major impact – people who use the service experienced poor care that had a serious current or long term impact on their health, safety and welfare, or there was a risk of this happening. The matter needs to be resolved quickly

We decide the most appropriate action to take to ensure that the necessary changes are made. We always follow up to check whether action has been taken to meet the standards.

Glossary of terms we use in this report

Essential standard

The essential standards of quality and safety are described in our *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*. They consist of a significant number of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009. These regulations describe the essential standards of quality and safety that people who use health and adult social care services have a right to expect. A full list of the standards can be found within the *Guidance about compliance*. The 16 essential standards are:

Respecting and involving people who use services - Outcome 1 (Regulation 17)

Consent to care and treatment - Outcome 2 (Regulation 18)

Care and welfare of people who use services - Outcome 4 (Regulation 9)

Meeting Nutritional Needs - Outcome 5 (Regulation 14)

Cooperating with other providers - Outcome 6 (Regulation 24)

Safeguarding people who use services from abuse - Outcome 7 (Regulation 11)

Cleanliness and infection control - Outcome 8 (Regulation 12)

Management of medicines - Outcome 9 (Regulation 13)

Safety and suitability of premises - Outcome 10 (Regulation 15)

Safety, availability and suitability of equipment - Outcome 11 (Regulation 16)

Requirements relating to workers - Outcome 12 (Regulation 21)

Staffing - Outcome 13 (Regulation 22)

Supporting Staff - Outcome 14 (Regulation 23)

Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision - Outcome 16 (Regulation 10)

Complaints - Outcome 17 (Regulation 19)

Records - Outcome 21 (Regulation 20)

Regulated activity

These are prescribed activities related to care and treatment that require registration with CQC. These are set out in legislation, and reflect the services provided.

Glossary of terms we use in this report (continued)

(Registered) Provider

There are several legal terms relating to the providers of services. These include registered person, service provider and registered manager. The term 'provider' means anyone with a legal responsibility for ensuring that the requirements of the law are carried out. On our website we often refer to providers as a 'service'.

Regulations

We regulate against the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009.

Responsive inspection

This is carried out at any time in relation to identified concerns.

Routine inspection

This is planned and could occur at any time. We sometimes describe this as a scheduled inspection.

Themed inspection

This is targeted to look at specific standards, sectors or types of care.

Contact us

Phone: 03000 616161

Email: enquiries@ccq.org.uk

Write to us
at: Care Quality Commission
Citygate
Gallowgate
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 4PA

Website: www.cqc.org.uk

Copyright Copyright © (2011) 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.