

The Action Group - Seafield and Edinburgh South Housing Support Service

The Action Group
The Prentice Centre
1 Granton Mains Avenue
Edinburgh
EH4 4GA

Telephone: 01312855207

Type of inspection:
Announced (short notice)

Completed on:
21 January 2026

Service provided by:
The Action Group

Service provider number:
SP2003002593

Service no:
CS2018367075

About the service

The Action Group - Seafield and Edinburgh South, is a combined care at home and housing support service based across two areas of Edinburgh.

The service provides support for adults living in their own homes or within small group living settings. Support is based on people's assessed needs and ranges from a few hours visiting support to 24 hour 1:1 care.

The provider, The Action Group, is a third sector organisation which has been registered with the Care Inspectorate to provide the service since 04 April 2019.

At the time of the inspection 50 people were experiencing support across the service.

About the inspection

This was a short notice announced inspection which took place between 13 January and 19 January 2026. The inspection was carried out by one inspector from the Care Inspectorate.

To prepare for the inspection we reviewed information about this service. This included previous inspection findings, registration information, information submitted by the service and intelligence gathered since the last inspection.

In making our evaluations of the service we:

- Spent time with and spoke with 18 people experiencing care
- Spoke with three of their relatives and considered three completed questionnaires
- Spoke with 17 staff and management
- Considered 30 questionnaires completed by staff
- Observed practice and daily life
- Reviewed documents
- Spoke with one visiting professional and considered three completed questionnaires.

Key messages

- People's health and wellbeing benefitted from their support.
- Staff were well trained and provided consistent and caring support.
- People and their families were involved and consulted.
- Staff generally felt well supported.
- The service was well led.
- Recording of quality assurance processes could be improved.

From this inspection we evaluated this service as:

In evaluating quality, we use a six point scale where 1 is unsatisfactory and 6 is excellent

How well do we support people's wellbeing?	5 - Very Good
How good is our leadership?	4 - Good

Further details on the particular areas inspected are provided at the end of this report.

How well do we support people's wellbeing?

5 - Very Good

We found significant strengths in aspects of the care provided and how these supported positive outcomes for people, therefore we evaluated this key question as very good.

The staff and leadership team worked well together to improve people's health and wellbeing. We spoke with people and families who were very positive about the care they received. This demonstrated that people could be confident that they would receive high quality care. One relative said:

"They have a good team of carers who are responsive to [my relatives] needs and timetable."

Another family member spoke highly of the care their loved one had received to regain mobility after a fall. Staff showed good understanding of their role in supporting people to access healthcare. We saw that people were supported to attend a range of medical and health appointments, and good records were kept of any action taken. This meant people benefitted from the right healthcare at the right time. One professionals said about the team:

"I would say they have all displayed a high level of knowledge and care for the individual and are keen to balance safety with quality of life and right to self-determination."

Medication was stored, recorded, and managed well. Staff had good knowledge about people's health needs and the medication they required, including 'as required' medication. This meant that people experienced treatment and interventions that were safe and effective.

Everyone had a personal support plan which contained accurate and comprehensive information about their support needs. This included risk assessments and, where it was beneficial, a positive behaviour support plan. Personal plans were person centred and encouraged staff to promote people's independence and skills. We observed this approach in action, with encouraging and compassionate interactions between people and those supporting them. This showed that staff had the right information and training to support people according to their needs and preferences.

There were systems in place for sharing day to day information about people's wellbeing. This included handovers, team meetings, and daily contact records. While generally this meant that important information was shared between staff and leaders, we found that some contact records contained minimal information. We spoke with the manager about improving consistency in recording across the teams, and she assured us that this would be a focus of improvement. We will consider this at the next inspection.

People were encouraged to eat and drink well, making choices that supported their health and wellbeing while also respecting preferences. Where people needed additional support, the service has introduced enhanced measures and requested assistance from specialist services. Some people living in group setting chose to plan menus together. These people described a shared menu where they were able to pick meals they enjoyed and eat together if they wished. This meant that people had a range of options around how they enjoyed their meals.

How good is our leadership?

4 - Good

We evaluated this key question as good where several strengths impacted positively on outcomes for people and clearly outweighed areas for improvement.

Staff we spoke with generally felt positive about the leadership team, with the majority of staff describing managers as supportive, approachable, and flexible. Most staff reported that any issues raised were followed up quickly, and that they felt able to communicate openly. Staff felt proud of working for The Action Group, and this meant people experienced a positive team culture and consistency of staffing.

Relatives we spoke with felt confident in approaching management and felt reassured that any issues would be followed up quickly. Evidence of regular communication demonstrated that the service maintained ongoing contact with relatives, keeping them informed and involved.

Newsletter, Facebook, flyers, and the Action Group website were all used effectively to advise people about events and updates in the service. This meant that people were included and involved. People could participate in The Action Group's yearly evaluation survey and regular 'Have Your Say Meetings', which meant people were consulted and their opinion valued. The manager had an improvement plan, which included building on this strength with a service specific evaluation. If introduced, this would support more people being consulted on local service delivery and development.

Team meetings were organised, though some staff felt that more regular team discussions about individual's support would be beneficial. While staff received supervision, called 'Quality Conversations', frequency was not consistent across the service. We observed that team leaders worked hard to retain good oversight of support services, however direct observations of practice were not regularly recorded. The importance of effective auditing systems was discussed, and the service was intending to develop this further. This would maintain safety and strengthen the quality assurance process across the service.

Recruitment and induction of staff was well organised. New staff received support from more experienced colleagues during multiple shadow shifts. This meant that people had time to get to know their staff team, and that staff were knowledgeable and confident when providing support.

Relevant and up to date policies and procedures were in place. Incidents and concerns were managed effectively with timely notifications to relevant professional bodies. This helped keep people safe.

Complaints

There have been no complaints upheld since the last inspection. Details of any older upheld complaints are published at www.careinspectorate.com.

Detailed evaluations

How well do we support people's wellbeing?	5 - Very Good
1.3 People's health and wellbeing benefits from their care and support	5 - Very Good
How good is our leadership?	4 - Good
2.2 Quality assurance and improvement is led well	4 - Good

To find out more

This inspection report is published by the Care Inspectorate. You can download this report and others from our website.

Care services in Scotland cannot operate unless they are registered with the Care Inspectorate. We inspect, award grades and help services to improve. We also investigate complaints about care services and can take action when things aren't good enough.

Please get in touch with us if you would like more information or have any concerns about a care service.

You can also read more about our work online at www.careinspectorate.com

Contact us

Care Inspectorate
Compass House
11 Riverside Drive
Dundee
DD1 4NY

enquiries@careinspectorate.com

0345 600 9527

Find us on Facebook

Twitter: @careinspect

Other languages and formats

This report is available in other languages and formats on request.

Tha am foillseachadh seo ri fhaighinn ann an cruthannan is càinain eile ma nithear iarrtas.

অনুরোধসাপেক্ষে এই প্রকাশনাটি অন্য ফরম্যাট এবং অন্যান্য ভাষায় পাওয়া যায়।

یہ اشاعت درخواست کرنے پر دیگر شکلؤں اور دیگر زبانوں میں فراہم کی جا سکتی ہے۔

ਬਿਨਤੀ 'ਤੇ ਇਹ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਸ਼ਨ ਹੋਰ ਰੂਪਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰਨਾਂ ਭਾਸ਼ਾਵਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਹੈ।

هذه الوثيقة متوفرة بلغات ونماذج أخرى عند الطلب

本出版品有其他格式和其他語言備索。

Na życzenie niniejsza publikacja dostępna jest także w innych formatach oraz językach.