

MSH Health Care Ltd

# MSH Health Care

## Inspection report

72  
Market Street  
Dalton-in-furness  
LA15 8AA

Tel: 01229311157

Date of inspection visit:  
29 April 2021  
18 May 2021

Date of publication:  
12 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

MSH Health Care provides personal care to people in their own homes. The service is based in Dalton-in-Furness and provides support to people in the Furness, South Lakeland and Allerdale districts of Cumbria. Not everyone who used the service received personal care. CQC only inspects where people receive a regulated activity. This is help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating. Where they do we also consider any wider social care provided. At the time of our inspection 98 people were receiving personal care.

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

People were safe and protected from abuse. There were enough staff to support people. People received support from a small team of staff who they knew. Staff supported people to take their medicines safely. Staff followed robust infection prevention and control procedures to protect people from infection. The provider learnt from incidents to further improve the safety of the service.

The provider carried out thorough assessments of people's needs. People received the support they required. Staff were trained and competent to provide people's care. Staff provided the support people needed with preparing and enjoying their meals and drinks. Staff liaised with healthcare services to ensure people received the support they needed. People made decisions about their care and their rights were protected. 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.

Staff were kind and caring to people. People valued the care they received. Staff asked people for their views about their care and respected the decisions they made. Staff promoted people's privacy, dignity and independence.

The service was responsive to people's needs and took account of their preferences. People received high-quality, person-centred care. The provider had an effective procedure for receiving and responding to complaints about the service. Concerns received were used to improve the service provided. People received compassionate care and were supported to remain at home as they reached the end of life.

The provider had developed a positive, person-centred culture. The provider, management team and staff were committed to providing people with high-quality care. The provider and staff understood their responsibilities under the duty of candour. The provider asked for people's views about the care they received. They used feedback received to ensure the continuous improvement of the service. Staff and people who used the service said they would recommend it.

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 us on 5 July 2019 and this is the first inspection.

Why we inspected:

The service was registered with us on 5 July 2019 and this was the first inspection for the service.

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.

# MSH Health Care

## 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 and an Expert by Experience. 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 homes.

The service had a manager registered with the Care Quality Commission until April 2021. A new manager had been appointed and was in the process of applying to be registered. Registered managers are 'registered persons'. 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 24 hours' notice of the inspection. This was because we needed to be sure the manager would be in the office to support the inspection.

Inspection activity started on 29 April 2021 and ended on 18 May 2021. We visited the office location on 29 April 2021 and contacted people who used the service, relatives of people and care staff by telephone and email to gather their views between 10 and 18 May 2021.

#### What we did before the inspection

We reviewed the information we held about the service including feedback from the local authority and notifications of significant events the provider had sent to us. We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return. This is information providers are required to send us with key information

about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. This information helps support our inspections. We used all of this information to plan our inspection.

#### During the inspection

We spoke with three members of the management team. We reviewed the care records for two people and four staff files in relation to recruitment, training and supervision. We also looked at a range of records relating to the management of the service.

#### After the inspection

We contacted ten people who used the service and nine relatives to gather their views. We also contacted five care staff to gather their views of the service. We looked at additional records including three people's care files and three staff files. We reviewed records relating to the management of the service.

# 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 were protected from abuse. The staff were trained to identify and report abuse. They told us they would report any concerns to a member of the management team and were confident appropriate action would be taken.
- People told us they felt safe with the staff who visited their homes. One person said the staff, "Always make sure I am safe." Another person said, "I feel very safe with all the staff."

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- The provider had assessed and managed risks to people's safety. People's care records included guidance for staff about how to provide their care in a safe way.
- Staff told us they knew how to provide people's care safely. They said people's care records gave them information about how to manage risks to people's safety.

Staffing and recruitment

- There were enough staff to support people. People received care from a small team of staff who they knew. One person told us, "I know all of my staff."
- People told us the staff usually arrived at the times planned. They said they were informed if there was going to be a significant delay in their visits. They told us this was important to them. One person said, "I like the fact I know when they are coming, and I can plan my day. They are reliable."
- Staff told us their rotas were well organised to ensure they had enough time to travel from one call to the next. They said the provider had introduced a system to ensure there were always enough staff available. This included staff available to cover calls in the event of an unexpected delay or emergency.
- The provider carried out checks on new staff to ensure they were suitable to work in people's homes. This included checking records held by the Disclosure and Barring Service and taking up references to confirm new staff were of good character. We discussed with the provider how the recruitment processes could be further improved. The provider was open to advice to further improve the service.

Using medicines safely

- People received the support they needed to take their medicines. Staff supported people to have their medicines as their doctors had prescribed.
- Staff were trained in how to support people with their medicines. This included training specific to people's needs. Staff completed thorough records of the support they had given to people.

### Preventing and controlling infection

- People were protected from the risk of infection. Staff were trained in preventing infection and using Personal Protective Equipment, (PPE), effectively to reduce the risk of infection
- Staff told us the provider had ensured they had appropriate protective equipment, such as face masks, disposable gloves and aprons throughout the pandemic. They had completed training in how to put on, take off and dispose of PPE safely.
- People told us staff used appropriate PPE when they provided their care. One person said, "The PPE guidelines are meticulously adhered to."

### Learning lessons when things go wrong

- The provider had systems to identify and learn from any incidents. This included sharing the learning from incidents with the staff team to further improve the safety of the service.



# 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 provider ensured a thorough assessment of people's needs was carried out before they agreed to provide their care. This helped to ensure the service was suitable to meet people's needs.
- People were included in developing their needs assessments. One person told us, "The initial assessment was good." The provider used the needs assessments to develop individual care plans which guided staff on how to support people.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- Staff were trained and competent to provide people's care. People told us the staff who supported them were trained to provide high-quality care. One person said, "The staff seem to be skilled and trained. Training seems to be proactive." Another person said, "I have wonderful staff, the staff are truly amazing."
- Staff told us they completed a range of training to give them the skills and knowledge to provide people's care. They said this included induction training and training to meet people's specific needs. Staff were also supported to gain qualifications relevant to their roles.
- Staff had regular meetings with the managers in the service where they could discuss their roles and training needs. Staff said they felt very well supported by the managers in the service. One staff member said, "I feel very supported by my managers."

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

- People received the support they needed to eat and drink enough and to enjoy a balanced diet. People told us the staff gave them choices about their meals and drinks and respected the decisions they made. One person told us, "They [staff] do lunch and preference and choice are absolutely respected."
- Staff understood the importance of supporting people to eat and drink enough to maintain their health. They gave people the time and support they needed to enjoy their meals. One relative told us, "[Relative's] appetite is an issue but they try to come up with suggestions to coax her to eat."

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

- People told us the staff worked effectively with other services to ensure they received the care they needed. One person said, "They liaise with the chemist and GP which really helps." Another person told us, "The company communication has been excellent, particularly with other professionals."
- Staff told us they knew people well and could identify if an individual was unwell and may need to call their doctor. They said they would, with the person's consent, contact the doctor if needed. The staff also said they would report any concerns about a person's health to the service managers to ensure people

received support as 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 maintained control of their lives and their rights were protected. Everyone we spoke with told us the staff gave people choices and respected the decisions they made.
- The managers and staff understood their responsibilities under the MCA. Staff were trained to ask people what support they wanted and to respect the decisions they made. Staff told us they would respect a person's right to refuse care. They said they would inform the service managers if someone refused an important aspect of their care. This meant the provider could take action if refusing care placed a person at risk.
- There was no one being supported by the service who required restrictions on their liberty to receive the care they required.

# 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

- Staff were kind and caring and treated people with respect. People told us they liked the staff who visited them and valued the support they provided. One person told us, "We know all the staff and they go the extra mile for us." Another person said, "All the staff are really very good and helpful. I get on very well with them and they will do anything to help."
- People said they felt comfortable and confident with the staff who visited their homes. The staff understood people may not be comfortable receiving care and took time to place people at ease. One person told us, "We were really nervous and quite averse to the idea of care, but it has truly surprised us."

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

- The managers and staff asked people for their views about their care and respected the decisions they made. One person told us, "They treat me with respect and listen to my wishes." Another person said, "They respect my choices and preferences and are respectful to my home."

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- Staff respected people's privacy and promoted their dignity and independence. People told us the staff always treated them with respect. One person told us, "They treat [relative] with respect and dignity as a person. They will close the door to protect her privacy."
- Staff understood the importance of supporting people to maintain their independence. They gave people the time and guidance they needed to carry out tasks themselves. One person told us, "They go at my pace." Another person said, "They know [relative] well and help her to do what she can for herself as well as supporting her."

# 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 were included in planning their care and received personalised care which took account of their preferences and met their needs. One person told us, "I receive great personal care."
- People told us the staff had the time to get to know them and the things that were important to them in how they were supported. They said the staff were "very helpful". One person told us, "They always respect whatever it is I ask of them."
- People were asked if they had a preference about the gender of staff who supported them. Their preferences were taken into account when their visits were arranged.
- The provider developed people's care plans with them and with people who knew them well. The care plans included guidance for staff on how people wanted their care to be provided. Staff said they knew the support people needed because this was detailed in their care plans. People's care plans were reviewed regularly, and if their needs changed, to ensure they gave the staff up-to-date information.

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.

- The provider assessed people's communication needs to identify how they needed information to be provided. This was recorded in people's care records to guide staff on how to share information with them.

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- The provider had a procedure for receiving and responding to complaints about the service. Guidance about how people could raise concerns was included in the information given to people and on the provider's website. People told us they would "speak to the office" if they had any concerns about the service provided.
- Concerns received were highlighted on the provider's database and a senior manager maintained oversight of any concerns until they had been actioned and resolved. The provider analysed concerns received to identify how the service could be further improved.
- The staff knew how people could complain about the service. They said they would be confident supporting someone to complain if they required assistance to raise any concerns.

End of life care and support

- The service worked with other agencies to ensure people were supported, where possible, to remain in

their homes as they reached the end of their lives. The staff had received training in supporting people who required end of life care.

- People received caring and compassionate support at the end of their lives. Relatives of people who had been supported at the end of their lives told us the care provided had been very important to them and to their relative. They said they had valued the care given and described the staff as "wonderful" and "a magnificent team".

# 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

- The provider had developed a positive culture which had been embraced by the staff team. The provider and staff were committed to providing people with high-quality care.
- People valued the service provided and told us they would recommend it to other people. One person told us, "Everything runs really smoothly and it seems a very well-run company." Another person said, "It is a consistently high standard of care."

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 and staff team understood their responsibilities under the duty of candour. The provider had notified us of significant events, such as serious injuries, as required. The notifications showed the provider had been open and honest and shared information about incidents with relevant people.

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

- The provider, management team and staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities. The staff felt well supported and were confident they provided good care to people. They told us they would recommend the service as a good place to work. One staff member said, "I would recommend MSH [MSH Health Care] as an employer and from a service user's point of view. They go above and beyond to ensure service users are properly cared for and listen to any needs they may have."
- People told us the service was well managed. They were very complimentary about the service provided. One person said, "We are so impressed with the company as a whole." Another said, "Our relationship and opinion of the service could not be improved upon."
- The provider was committed to the continuous improvement of the service. They assessed the quality of the service to identify how it could be further improved.

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

- The provider had systems to gather people's views about the service. They had asked people to complete a quality survey to share their views of the service they received. People were also asked for their views by telephone and at meetings to review their care.
- Staff told us the management team in the service listened to them and said they could share their views

about how the service could be further improved. One staff member said, "Senior members of staff are all approachable and listen to us."

- Staff told us if they raised concerns with the managers in the service action was taken promptly to address the issues. One staff member said, "Problems raised have always been dealt with swiftly."

Working in partnership with others

- The service worked with other appropriate agencies to ensure people received the care they needed. People told us the staff liaised effectively with other services, such as their doctor, to ensure they received the support they needed.