

Rubies Limited

Rubies Limited

Inspection report

Thornbank House
38 Moorgate Road
Rotherham
S60 2AG

Tel: 07824443870

Date of inspection visit:
25 July 2022

Date of publication:
17 August 2022

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

Rubies Limited is a domiciliary care agency, providing personal care to people living in their own homes. At the time of our inspection there were three people using the service.

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

People received a service which was person-centred and met their needs. Risks associated with people's needs had been identified and were managed safely. Staff had a good understanding of the provider's safeguarding process and knew what action to take if they suspected any abuse.

The provider ensured staff wore appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE), and were mindful about infection prevention and control.

The provider had systems in place to ensure people were supported to take their medicines as prescribed. We found people received this support in a safe way.

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.

The provider had a system in place to ensure staff were recruited safely. Staff informed us they received appropriate training to carry out their role in a safe and effective way. Staff told us they felt supported by the management team. Staff felt valued and involved in the service.

Care plans detailed people's needs and preferences and staff were knowing people well. People were supported to maintain good health and staff liaised with health care professionals when required. There was a complaints policy in place and people felt they could raise concerns and would be listened to.

The provider had effective systems in place to monitor the quality of the service. This process helped identify any concerns or areas for improvement and gave clear actions to rectify them in a timely way.

The provider sought feedback from people, their relatives, staff and other professionals. This feedback was used to develop the service.

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 11 November 2020 and this is the first inspection.

Why we inspected

This inspection was prompted by a review of the information we held about this service.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service, which will help inform when we next inspect.

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.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Good 

Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

Details are in our effective findings below.

Good 

Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

Details are in our caring findings below.

Good 

Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

Details are in our responsive findings below.

Good 

Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

Details are in our well-led findings below.

Good 

Rubies Limited

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 Health and Social Care Act 2008.

Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Service and service type

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

Registered Manager

This service is required to have a registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. 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.

At the time of our inspection there was a registered manager in post.

Notice of inspection

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

What we did before inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since registration. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. The provider was not asked to complete a Provider Information Return (PIR) prior to this inspection. A PIR is information providers send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We used all this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We reviewed a range of records. This included three people's care records and medication records. We looked at two staff files in relation to recruitment and staff supervision. We looked at a variety of records relating to the management of the service, including some policies and procedures.

We spoke with people who used the service and their relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with five members of staff including the registered manager, care workers and the nominated individual. The nominated individual is responsible for supervising the management of the service on behalf of the provider.

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 of this newly registered service. This key question has been rated good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- The provider had systems in place to safeguard people from the risk of abuse. Staff received training in safeguarding and knew what action to take if they suspected abuse. One care worker said, "I would definitely raise the alert if something was wrong. The manager would act swift and take appropriate actions."
- People, their relatives and professionals felt the service was safe and could raise any concerns with the management team. One professional said, "[Person's name] is safe and is well supported by a small and consistent staff team who respond well to their needs]."

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risks associated with people's care and support had been identified and were managed safely.
- Environmental risks were also considered for each property staff visited. This ensured the safety of both staff and people who used the service.
- Risk assessments were kept under review and updated as required.

Staffing and recruitment

- The provider had a system in place to ensure staff were recruited safely. This included pre-employment checks such as references and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. These checks provide information including details about convictions and cautions held on the Police National Computer. The information helps employers make safer recruitment decisions.
- Staff told us they were able to meet people needs in a timely way. One care worker said, "There is a good sense of teamwork. We all work well together."

Using medicines safely

- People were supported to take their medicines as prescribed.
- Staff received training in the safe handling of medicines and knew how to administer them safely. The management team carried out competency checks to ensure medicines were administered safely.
- People also had a medication administration record (MAR) in place. Staff recorded medicines they administered, and the management checked these for accuracy.

Preventing and controlling infection

- The provider was using PPE effectively and safely. The management team carried out spot checks to ensure staff were following good infection control practices.
- The provider was accessing COVID-19 testing for staff.

- The provider had a COVID-19 policy and procedure in place. This promoted safe working systems such as wearing appropriate PPE, social distancing, hand hygiene and enhanced cleaning.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- The registered manager ensured accidents and incidents were recorded and was keen to learn and improve practice as required.

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 prior to them using the service. This assessment formed the basis of their care planning documentation.
- Assessments and care plans were reviewed regularly to ensure people received care and support in line with their needs and preferences.
- People, their relatives and professionals felt involved in assessments and worked together to ensure care and support was current and appropriate.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- Staff received training and support to carry out their role effectively. Staff felt training provided gave them the skills and knowledge they required. One care worker said, "The manager is very supportive and approachable."
- Staff received an induction when they commenced their employment. This included meeting people, reading care documentation and completing training. New staff also shadowed experienced staff to ensure they were supported in their first weeks of employment.

Supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain a balanced diet

- People were supported to maintain a balanced diet that met their needs and considered their preferences.
- Information regarding people's dietary requirements was documented in their care plans.

Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care; Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- People had access to healthcare services and support where required.
- People were referred to other professionals after consultation with them and their relatives. Staff supported people with this process.

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 MCA 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.

- The management team and staff were knowledgeable about their responsibilities regarding the MCA.
- People were supported to make decisions about their care and support and people's preferences were adhered to.

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

- The provider's policies and procedures demonstrated a service where people were treated well and supported in line with their preferences.
- People and relatives, we spoke with were complimentary about the care and support they received. One relative said, "Staff are very caring. I visit twice a week and staff know [relative] well and [relative] is always happy in the company of the staff."

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

- Care plan documentation showed people had been involved in decisions about their care. Relatives we spoke with told us their family member was actively involved in making choices.
- Staff we spoke with could explain how they involved people in their care. The management team and staff placed high importance on people being the centre of their care and support.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People and their relatives spoke highly of the provider and all the staff.
- People felt their privacy was respected and their independence maintained. One relative said, "The staff are very respectful and always involve us." One staff member said, "People feel valued when they are listened to."

Is the service responsive?

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

- The provider's policies and procedures demonstrated a service where people were treated well and supported in line with their preferences.
- People and relatives, we spoke with were complimentary about the care and support they received.

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

- Care plan documentation showed people had been involved in decisions about their care. Relatives we spoke with told us their family member was actively involved in making choices.
- Staff we spoke with could explain how they involved people in their care. The management team and staff placed high importance on people being the centre of their care and support.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People and their relatives spoke highly of the provider and all the staff.
- People felt their privacy was respected and their independence maintained. One relative said, "The staff are very respectful and always involve us." One staff member said, "People feel valued when they are listened 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; 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 management team consisted of the registered manager and team leader, with dedicated support from the nominated individual. The team worked well together, supporting staff to provide good care.
- The management team were clear about their roles and understood their legal requirements.
- Staff told us they worked well as a team and felt everyone was considered a valuable part of the organisation.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

- The management team worked alongside staff to ensure people received person-centred care which supported them to achieve good outcomes.
- Staff were committed to providing a good quality service that met people's individual needs. ● Staff spoke highly of their job and were happy supporting people to meet their goals and objectives.

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

- The provider had a system in place to gain feedback from people, their relatives and other stakeholders.
- Feedback we reviewed was complimentary. Comments included, 'Overall Rubies Limited is a caring service which is person centred and are committed to meeting the service user's needs,' and 'In my brief period of involvement with Rubies Limited, I have found the service to be person-centred, caring, flexible and approachable. I do not have any concerns so far.'

Continuous learning and improving care

- The provider had systems in place to monitor the service.
- The management team completed a range of audits to ensure the service was meeting the standards the provider expected.
- Spot visits were carried out to ensure care workers were carrying out their tasks in accordance with people's needs and in line with the provider's policies.

Working in partnership with others

- The management team demonstrated they were working in partnership with others to meet people's

needs.