

Nobilis Care Limited

# Nobilis Care Gloucestershire

## Inspection report

Unit 5, Griffin Mill  
London Road,  
Stroud  
GL5 2AZ

Tel: 01242650548

Date of inspection visit:  
02 June 2021  
03 June 2021

Date of publication:  
26 July 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

Nobilis Care Gloucestershire is a domiciliary care service providing personal care to people living in their own houses and flats. The service supported 158 people at the time of the inspection.

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

People and their relatives were positive about the caring nature and approach of staff. They told us they felt safe when staff visited and were confident that any concerns would be dealt with promptly. The service had reviewed their staffing levels and had recruited more staff to ensure they had sufficient staff to meet people's needs.

Appropriate measures had been implemented to minimise and manage risk to people. Where people were supported with medicines, they were supported by staff who had received appropriate training and medicines were managed safely.

Infection prevention measures had been established within the service. Staff had a good understanding of these procedures and people confirmed staff were wearing protective equipment when visiting people in their homes.

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.

People received care which had been developed in partnership with them and their representatives. People and relatives told us their opinions had been considered when developing their care plans. Where people were supported with their nutritional needs, they told us staff offered them a choice as to what they would like to eat and took their preferences into account.

Staff had received training which was appropriate to their role. Staff told us they received regular support from management and could seek advice from the registered manager. The service communicated and engaged with others such as family members to improve the lives for people who used the service.

The registered manager acted on concerns to ensure people received care which was safe and responsive to their needs. Any concerns or accidents were reported and acted on.

The registered manager had developed a variety of quality assurance systems to monitor the overall quality of the service provided to people.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

### Rating at last inspection

This service was registered with CQC on 06/09/2019 and this is the first inspection.

#### Why we inspected

This was a planned inspection.

#### Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our re-inspection 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?

Good ●

The service was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

### Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Details are in our effective findings below.

### Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

Details are in our caring findings below.

### Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

Details are in our responsive findings below.

### Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

Details are in our well-led findings below.

# Nobilis Care Gloucestershire

## 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

This inspection was completed by two inspectors and an Expert by Experience (ExE). 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 a short period of notice of the inspection because we needed to arrange telephone conversations with people who use the service and staff so that we could gain their views and experiences of the service.

Inspection activity started on 1 June 2021 and ended on 8 June 2021. We visited the office location on 2 and 3 June 2021.

#### What we did before inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service. 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 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. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

#### During the inspection

We spoke with 28 people who used the service and 31 relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with seven members of staff including the provider, registered manager, senior care workers and care workers.

We reviewed a range of records. This included eight people's care records and multiple medication records. We looked at six 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. We looked at training data and quality assurance records.

# 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.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- People told us they felt safe with the staff who supported them. One person said, "They are mostly the same and of course we are safe-we have a laugh."
- Relatives we spoke with told us confirmed they felt their family members were safe. One person said, "She feels safe with everyone and I would call them Caring and Compassionate, yes."
- Staff received training on safeguarding and were knowledgeable about the procedures to follow if concerns arose.
- Staff knew what action to take if they suspected abuse or poor practice. Staff told us they felt confident to raise concerns about poor care. Staff were confident to 'whistle blow' and knew which outside agencies to involve if needed.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- Risk assessments were in place for people. When risks were identified, care plans provided guidance for staff on how to reduce the risk of harm to people.
- Where people required support with moving and handling, their risk assessments and care plans contained guidelines for staff on how to support them safely.
- When reviewing people's care records, staff rotas and call monitoring data, we saw that in some instances, where people required two carers to support with moving and handling, these care calls would be provided by one carer.
- We discussed this with the registered manager who told us a risk assessment would always be completed to ensure this practice was safe. The registered manager told us they had on-call staff who would support in these situations. However, this would not always be possible, and they would assess if a family member or the person receiving care could assist the member of staff.
- Where family members were supporting staff with moving and handling of people, this had been risk assessed to ensure it was safe and the family member had appropriate training to support this practice.
- Risk assessments had been developed in partnership with healthcare professionals. For example, risk assessment around moving and handling had been developed with the relevant health professional. Staff we spoke with were knowledgeable about the guidelines provided and could explain how they would support people in a safe manner.
- Where people were at risk of developing pressure sores, we saw their risk assessment contained guidance for staff to manage and minimise the risk. Risk assessments also contained contact details for the relevant health professional to enable staff to raise any concerns and seek advice.
- Environmental risk assessments of people's homes had been completed to ensure the safety of people receiving care and the staff who supported them.

- We saw evidence of appropriate action being taken to manage people's risks when their needs changed.

#### Staffing and recruitment

- The service had reviewed their staffing levels and had recruited more staff to ensure they had sufficient staff to meet people's needs.
- We received mixed feedback from people about the punctuality of staff. Most people told us they received their care calls at their agreed times. However, some people told us staff would arrive at different times and they were not always informed of this.
- The provider used a call monitoring system to assist them in the management and monitoring of the delivery of people's care visits. When staff used the system, it alerted the management team in real-time if staff were running late, missed a call or aspects of people's care were not delivered in line with people's care requirements.
- Shortfalls in staff punctuality had been identified by the provider's quality assurance systems and the registered manager was working with care staff to improve in this area.
- People were protected against the employment of unsuitable staff because robust recruitment procedures were followed. Checks had been made on relevant previous employment as well as identity and health checks. Disclosure and barring service (DBS) checks had also been carried out. DBS checks are a way that a provider can make safer recruitment decisions and prevent unsuitable people from working with vulnerable groups.

#### Using medicines safely

- Guidance was in place to support staff when giving medicines prescribed on an 'as and when required' basis (PRN).
- Staff were trained to handle medicines in a safe way. They completed a competency assessment every year to evidence they had maintained their knowledge and skills.
- Medicines were administered and disposed of safely. Medication administration records (MAR) were accurately completed and showed people received their medicines as prescribed.
- The people and relatives we spoke with confirmed people received appropriate support from staff with their medicines and they received their medicines as prescribed.

#### Preventing and controlling infection

- The service managed the control and prevention of infection. They had policies and procedures in place along with guidance to support staff in this area.
- There were suitable arrangements in place for the control and prevention of COVID-19 and other infections. Staff had received appropriate training in infection prevention and control and received regular reminders on how to work safely and minimise the risks of COVID-19.
- People and relatives told us staff had access to and used personal protective equipment (PPE) during care calls. The staff we spoke with confirmed they had access to PPE and did not have any concerns over the availability of PPE.
- Staff took part in regular COVID-19 testing; staff who received a positive test result were removed from working and did not provide care to people until it was safe to do so.

#### Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Systems were in place for staff to report and record any accidents, incidents and near misses. We were told that all records of incidents were reviewed by the manager and prompt actions would be taken such as additional staff training and a review of people's care needs to reduce the risk of repeat incidents.



# 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

- The registered manager assessed people's needs before they started receiving support from the service. People and their representatives told us they were involved in the assessment and decisions about their support needs.
- Where required, health professionals involved in people's care had been consulted when planning their care and support requirements. A copy of people's care plan was kept in the persons home and a duplicate copy kept in the office.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- People and their relatives told us they were supported by staff who they felt had been suitably trained to support them.
  - Staff told us they had received training appropriate to their role.
- The service used a mixture of in-house and external training providers. Where staff required specialist training such as PEG (percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy) feeding, this would be provided to ensure staff could meet people's needs.
- New staff were required to undertake an induction period which included shadowing experienced colleagues and familiarise themselves with the service's policies and people's care plans. New staff were also required to complete mandatory training and undertake the care certificate which is a set of national standards that health and social care workers adhere to in their daily working life.
  - Staff told us they received regular support and one to one meetings with the registered manager to discuss work related issues and their development needs.

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

- Where people required support with their nutritional needs, we saw these had been recorded in their care plans.
- Staff knew people's preferences and choices for their meals and were aware of people's individual needs.

Staff working with other agencies to provide consistent, effective, timely care

- Staff worked closely with relatives to monitor people's wellbeing. Relatives confirmed that staff contacted them if they had observed changes in people's health.
- Staff worked closely with other health professionals to support people with their health needs. This included health professionals involved in people's skin care or moving and handling needs.

Supporting people to live healthier lives, access healthcare services and support

- Staff supported people to access healthcare such as GP appointments.
- Staff were aware of how to escalate concerns and who to contact if they had concerns relating to people's health or there was a medical emergency.

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 were supported by staff to make day to day decisions about their care in accordance with the principles of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA). Staff told us they asked people's permission to provide them with the care they needed. People told us they were always informed of the care being provided, asked for their consent and given choices about the support they received.

# 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 received care from staff who were kind and who knew them well. People we spoke with told us the carers who visited them were kind and caring. Relatives told us they felt staff were caring towards their loved ones. One relative said, "They are very compassionate, they know exactly what they are doing and sing to my Mum, whilst doing her breakfast and making her a cup of tea."
- Staff were respectful of people's diverse needs. People told us that they were treated with a non-judgmental approach and staff respected their wishes, views and choices.
- The staff we spoke with told us they were aware of the importance of offering people choice to enable and empower people to make their own decisions about their care.

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

- People and their relatives confirmed that they were involved in planning and reviewing their care. One relative said, "The care -plan is in the folder, Dad was involved, and it was signed."
- People told us they were consulted in relation to day to day decisions in relation to their care.

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People and their relatives told us that they or their family member were treated with dignity and respect. They also told us the staff upheld people's privacy when they provided care. People told us staff ensured any personal care was delivered in privacy. Staff had completed training in privacy and dignity.
- People's preference for the gender of staff supporting them with personal care was known and respected.
- People and relatives told us staff encouraged people to retain and promote levels of independence as far as they could. For example, staff supported people to carry out some of their own personal hygiene and maintain their mobility. Staff we spoke with told us about the importance of enabling people to retain as much independence as possible.

# 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's care plans contained information about the support they required, communication, dietary needs and risk profiles in these areas which meant staff had access to information they required.
- People and their relatives told us they felt their care was personalised and reflected their individual needs and preferences.

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.

- People's communication needs were assessed and recorded. The registered manager told us people were given information about the service in a format that met their needs such as large print.

Supporting people to develop and maintain relationships to avoid social isolation; support to follow interests and to take part in activities that are socially and culturally relevant to them

- Some people required support to access the community and social activities. We saw these needs had been recorded in their care plan and they received appropriate support in this area.
- Where required, people had been supported to maintain contact with their family and friends through various methods such as telephone and video calls.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- People and relatives had information detailing how to provide feedback to the service or raise a complaint. People and their relatives told us they were aware of how to raise a concern or complaint.
- Where people had raised concerns, we saw these had been investigated and prompt action had been taken to address any concerns.

End of life care and support

- Where the service was providing end of life care, we saw people's care needs and preferences had been reviewed to ensure the service had the staff and skills to support people to manage their end of life care needs.
- Staff had received appropriate training in relation to end of life care.
- The service had sought advice and worked in partnership with people's GP and palliative care specialists to ensure people's wishes were fulfilled and they remained living comfortably in their own home.

# 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.

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

- There was a registered manager at the service at the time of the inspection.
- The registered manager and provider were clear on their responsibility to ensure the service provided to people met their needs and also met regulatory requirements. The registered manager understood their responsibilities to notify CQC and other authorities of certain events.

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 provider, registered manager and staff understood their responsibility to be open and honest with people and their families when things went wrong. A clear system was in place for staff to report any concerns, accidents and near misses promptly. The manager was aware of their legal obligation to report any concerns to CQC and to do so with transparency and to take action and learn from any mistakes.

Managers and staff being clear about their roles, and understanding quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

- The provider and registered manager had developed a number of quality assurance systems to ensure they met legal requirements.
- Audits had been developed to monitor the quality of the service provided to people. This included audits of people's care records to ensure the care plans and risk assessments were up to date and accurately reflected people's needs.
- Medicine's audits had been completed to ensure any issues with people's medicines were identified promptly and appropriate actions taken to improve the service provided to people. For example, where staff had not always recorded medicines accurately, additional training and support was provided in this area.
- Following audits of call monitoring logs, action was being taken to improve staff punctuality.
- The registered manager conducted regular spot checks of staff to ensure they were providing safe care to people.

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

- The registered manager told us they would visit people in their homes to speak with people and to provide them with an opportunity to give feedback on their care. Areas covered included infection control, staff punctuality, quality of care provided and people's satisfaction with care.

- The registered manager maintained contact with people's relatives to provide updates relating to their family member's care and health.

#### Continuous learning and improving care

- The provider told us they held meetings with staff to discuss work practices, training, development needs and staff well-being.
- All the staff we spoke with told us they were happy in their job roles and had received the required training to do their job effectively.

#### Working in partnership with others

- The service had working arrangements with the local authority. The service had also built relationships with other health professionals including local GP practices and pharmacies. This helped people access and sustain the support they required.