

Watra Care Limited

Watra Care Birmingham

Inspection report

357 Dudley Road
Birmingham
B18 4HB

Tel: 01214547999

Website: www.watracare.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
12 August 2021

Date of publication:
27 September 2021

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

About the service

Watra Care Birmingham is a domiciliary service which provides personal care to adults with a range of support needs in their own houses and flats. At the time of this inspection the service was supporting 18 people with personal care.

Not everyone who used the service received personal care. CQC only inspects where people receive personal care. This is help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating. Where they do, we also consider any wider social care provided.

People's experience of using this service and what we found

Quality assurance checks were in place but had not identified that the provider's COVID-19 policy was not reflective of current government guidance. The system in place to record staff COVID-19 testing needed further development. The management were responsive to concerns highlighted and some changes were made immediately.

Staff had received training in infection control and demonstrated an understanding of what personal protective equipment (PPE) should be used when supporting people. Relatives confirmed staff wore PPE when coming into people's homes.

People were protected from abuse and relatives told us their loved ones received safe care. People received support from a regular staff team. Staff were trained in administering medicines safely. Competency checks had been completed to ensure staff were following safe practices.

People's needs were assessed and staff with the right skills helped to meet these. There were enough staff to support people's needs, people and relatives told us they usually saw the same staff. Staff supported people with their eating, drinking and to access healthcare support.

People and their relatives were able to give feedback about their care in a variety of ways. Examples included care reviews and during spot checks monitoring staff performance.

There was an enthusiastic, positive and caring culture amongst staff at the service. Staff had good knowledge about the people they supported and told us they enjoyed working at the service. People's independence was promoted and respected.

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection

This service was registered with us on 9 January 2020 and this is the first inspection.

Why we inspected

This inspection was carried out due to the length of time the provider had been registered with CQC without receiving a formal rating.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our reinspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe? The service was safe.	Good ●
Is the service effective? The service was effective.	Good ●
Is the service caring? The service was caring.	Good ●
Is the service responsive? The service was responsive.	Good ●
Is the service well-led? The service was well-led.	Good ●

Watra Care Birmingham

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by one inspector. An expert by experience also spoke with people and a relative on the telephone. An Expert by Experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

Service and service type

This service is a domiciliary care agency. It provides personal care to people living in their own houses and flats.

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

Notice of inspection

We gave the service 48 hours' notice of the inspection. This was because we needed to be sure that the provider or registered manager would be in the office to support the inspection.

Inspection activity started on 12 August 2021 and ended on 18 August 2021. We visited the office location on 12 August 2021.

What we did before inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service. The provider was not asked to complete a provider information return prior to this inspection. 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. We took this into account when we inspected the service and made the judgements in this report.

During the inspection

We spoke with five members of staff including the registered manager, care supervisors and care workers. We spoke with seven people using the service and one relative about their experience of the care provided. We reviewed a range of records. This included three people's care records. We looked at three staff files in relation to recruitment and staff supervision. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including policies and procedures were reviewed.

After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found and received information from the registered manager about the improvements they were making.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

This is the first inspection for this newly registered service. This key question has been rated Good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Staffing and recruitment

- There were enough staff to support people's needs. One member of staff told us, "The rota is well organised, there is usually enough travel time, I have no concerns about being able to get to calls on time and stay for the required duration."
- People told us they had not experienced any missed calls and saw the same staff who were usually on time.
- We looked at the recruitment procedures followed for three members of staff. The provider's recruitment process was robust and included background checks and references to ensure they were safe to work at the service.

Preventing and controlling infection

- Staff had received infection prevention and control training and updated guidance via newsletters and emails from the registered manager on how to manage risks associated with COVID-19, including regular testing for COVID-19.
- Staff were positive about the support from the registered manager since the COVID-19 pandemic started and confirmed they had never had any issues getting personal protective equipment (PPE). The provider had systems in place to ensure they used this effectively when in people's homes.
- People who used the service confirmed staff wore appropriate PPE when supporting them.

Using medicines safely

- At the time of the inspection only a limited number of people who used the service required support from care staff with their medicines. Where any support was needed, this was detailed in their care plan. One person told us, "They get the medicine out for me and place it in front of me. I'm happy with this."
- Staff were trained in administering medicines safely. Competency checks had been completed to ensure staff were following safe practices.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risks to people's health and safety were assessed, including an assessment of the home environment where care was provided.
- The majority of support plans generally contained good levels of personal information about people's needs and risks. Staff told us how they supported people safely and understood people's risks.
- Risk assessments such as for moving and handling were detailed and gave clear guidance for staff and how to safely use equipment. One person told us, "As far as I know, they know what they're doing with the hoist."

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- Policies and procedures in relation to safeguarding and whistleblowing were in place.
- Staff received training on safeguarding and understood how to recognise and report abuse. One member of staff told us, "I've done safeguarding training and would report any issues to my manager."
- Staff told us they would always report any concerns such as, unexplained bruising or change in a person's behaviours.
- People confirmed they received safe care. One person told us, "I have three carers that come around that are very good. I always feel very safe with them."

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- The service had a system in place so it could analyse any occurrence and learn lessons should things go wrong. The registered manager reviewed accidents and incidents regularly to identify any trends and update people's care as appropriate.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence.

This is the first inspection for this newly registered service. This key question has been rated good. This meant people's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

Assessing people's needs and choices; delivering care in line with standards, guidance and the law

- People's needs were assessed and regularly reviewed as and when required if a change occurred. People and relatives were involved in developing their care plans. One person told us, "Yes, there was an assessment."
- People's preferences likes and dislikes, past life histories and background information were recorded in their care documentation.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- The registered manager had systems in place to monitor staff training to ensure staff undertook training regularly. Staff we spoke with told us the training was thorough and provided them with the skills to undertake their role.
- An induction was in place to support new staff. This included on-line training and shadowing more experienced staff. One member of staff told us, "I have had really good support, lots of good training, lots of shadowing, I felt prepared for my role."
- People informed us they felt staff had the right skills and knowledge to support them. One person told us, "The lady who comes is really good, I would say she is properly trained."

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet: Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care; Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- Not all people using the service required support from care staff with their eating and drinking needs. Where support was needed this was detailed in the person's care plan.
- Staff assisted some people with the preparation of a favourite meal, drink or food. One person told us, "I'm happy with my meals."
- People were supported by staff who were aware of their healthcare needs. Systems were in place for staff to alert the administrative office if they became concerned for a person's health.
- Staff worked closely with health and social care professionals to ensure people's changing needs were addressed, and people received the support they needed.

Ensuring consent to care and treatment in line with law and guidance

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (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 can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. When people receive care and treatment in their own homes an application must be made to the Court of Protection for them to authorise people to be deprived of their liberty. We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA

- People's capacity had been considered as part of the initial and subsequent assessment process and staff worked alongside people to involve them in decision making when required.
- People and their relatives had been involved, consulted with and had agreed with the level of care and treatment provided. One person told us, "They're really good with consent."

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

This is the first inspection for this newly registered service. This key question has been rated good. This meant people were supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

Ensuring people are well treated and supported; respecting equality and diversity

- People spoke positively about the caring nature of staff. One person told us, "They're very patient". Another person told us, "Those that come here are caring. We wouldn't have them if they weren't."
- Staff spoke with kindness about the people they supported. They told us they enjoyed their role and had got to know people well. One member of staff told us, "We try to keep to the same three carers for people."
- The service was committed to meeting the cultural and religious needs of people with specific protected characteristics and staff had received training on equality and diversity issues.
- Staff demonstrated an understanding of people's care needs and the importance of respecting diversity.

Supporting people to express their views and be involved in making decisions about their care

- Care plans were developed with input from people and their family members. One person told us, "I've always felt involved and in control."
- Conversations with staff demonstrated an understanding of people's needs and how they encouraged people to make choices about their care.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- Staff maintained people's independence wherever possible. One relative told us, "He is encouraged to be independent and do little things for himself."
- Care records included information for staff about the tasks the person could do themselves or could be encouraged to do, along with what they needed support with and how they liked it to be done.
- People's right to confidentiality was respected and protected appropriately in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). We saw people's confidential private information was respected and kept secure.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the service met people's needs.

This is the first inspection for this newly registered service. This key question has been rated good. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

Planning personalised care to ensure people have choice and control and to meet their needs and preferences

- People received care that was person centred and responsive to their needs. One person told us, "There are regular reviews. It's usually between myself and the agency. Sometimes social services are involved."
- Staff had a good understanding of people's care and support needs and care records provided person centred information on how they wanted to be supported and how staff could communicate effectively with the person. The care plan also covered any religious and cultural needs, including any preference of gender of staff that worked with the person.

Meeting people's communication needs

Since 2016 onwards all organisations that provide publicly funded adult social care are legally required to follow the Accessible Information Standard (AIS). The standard was introduced to make sure people are given information in a way they can understand. The standard applies to all people with a disability, impairment or sensory loss and in some circumstances to their carers.

- Information on people's individual methods of communication was included in their care plan.
- The registered manager informed us the service could provide adapted information for people, and information in different formats such as large print if required.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- Information was provided to people on how to raise concerns or make a complaint, if needed. The registered manager told us no formal complaints had been received but if any complaints were received, they would be used to help improve the service.
- People told us they had not had to make any complaints and felt able to raise any concerns. One person told us, "I have no complaints, if I wasn't happy, I would just call the agency. There is always someone at the office."

End of life care and support

- The registered manager told us they would work closely with relatives and healthcare professionals, including GPs to support people at the end of their life.
- Where appropriate, people's end of life wishes, and contacts were known and recorded for staff to refer to.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-Led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

This is the first inspection for this newly registered service. This key question has been rated Good. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements; Continuous learning and improving care

- Quality assurance checks were in place but had not identified that the provider's COVID-19 policy was not reflective of current government guidance. The system in place to record staff COVID-19 testing needed development as the system in use made it difficult to track results.
- The registered manager was responsive to feedback during the inspection and changes were made immediately.
 - The provider had invested in a computer system that monitored staff arrival and departure times on care calls to help make sure people received their calls on time.
 - The provider ensured spot checks and observations on staff were carried out to monitor performance.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people; How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong

- The registered manager and staff were passionate about providing people with a personalised service. This was evident throughout our inspection and from the positive feedback we received.
- Through our discussions with the registered manager we determined they were aware of and acted in line with the duty of candour requirements.
- The registered manager understood their role and legal responsibilities, including appropriately notifying CQC about any important events that happened in the service.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

- We saw evidence of the provider asking people's and relative's views about the service through care reviews and surveys. One person told us, "They did a survey once last year, I was upset with the routine. They improved once I spoke up." Another person told us, "They've always acted on any suggestions and feedback I've given."
- Staff were encouraged to raise concerns about the care provided, including whistleblowing. One member of staff told us, "The registered manager is very approachable, I'm able to raise any new ideas, we work as a team."

Working in partnership with others; Continuous learning and improving care

- We saw the service acted quickly when there was a concern for people's health, for example getting in

contact with health professionals.