

# Highworth Care Ltd

# Highworth Care Ltd

## Inspection report

5 Alington Terrace  
Horseheath  
Cambridge  
CB21 4RF

Tel: 07932333360

Date of publication:  
30 December 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

Highworth Care Ltd is a domiciliary care agency providing personal care support to five people living in their own homes. Personal care is help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating, we also consider any wider social care provided.

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

The provider had systems in place to manage risks and keep people safe from avoidable harm. Staff followed good practice guidance to prevent the spread of infection and gave people their medicines safely.

People liked the staff that cared for them. Staff were kind and caring and made sure people's privacy and dignity was respected. People, and their relatives, were involved in making decisions on the care they wanted. Their preference for how staff delivered their care was recorded in their care plans.

Staff received training, supervision and support so that they could do their job well. Staff enjoyed working at Highworth Care Ltd and felt supported by the registered manager.

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.

Effective systems were in place to monitor and review outcomes for people. Complaints and concerns were followed up to make sure action was taken to rectify the issue. People were asked their view of the service and action was taken to change any areas they were not happy with.

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 03 November 2020 and this is the first inspection.

### Why we inspected

This was a planned inspection based on the date of registration with the CQC.

### 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.

# Highworth Care Ltd

## Detailed findings

### Background to this inspection

#### The inspection

We carried out this performance review and assessment under Section 46 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act). We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements of the regulations associated with the Act and looked at the quality of the service to provide a rating.

Unlike our standard approach to assessing performance, we did not physically visit the office of the location. This is a new approach we have introduced to reviewing and assessing performance of some care at home providers. Instead of visiting the office location we use technology such as electronic file sharing and video or phone calls to engage with people using the service and staff.

#### Inspection team

This inspection was carried out by two inspectors.

#### 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 notice of the inspection. This was because it is a small service and we needed to be sure that the registered manager would be able to support the inspection and provide us with information we requested.

#### What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service and sought feedback from the local authority. 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

This performance review and assessment was carried out without a visit to the location's office. We used technology such as telephone calls to enable us to engage with people using the service and staff, and electronic file sharing to enable us to review documentation. Inspection activity started on 13 December 2021 and ended on 16 December 2021.

We spoke with one person who used the service and two relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with two members of staff including the registered manager.

We reviewed a range of records. This included two people's care records. We looked at files in relation to recruitment and training. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including policies and procedures were reviewed.

# 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

- The provider had systems in place to protect people from harm. Staff had received safeguarding training as part of their induction. This would be updated when necessary.
- Staff knew how to recognise safeguarding concerns and were confident on the procedures to follow to raise these concerns.
- People told us that they felt safe. One person said, "I feel safe with them ... they make sure my doors are locked ... I always get to see the same staff."
- Relatives told us they were assured their family members were safe with the support they received from staff. One relative gave us examples of how staff had helped to make the person safe, including removing fall hazards, they told us, "I think [relative] is safe."

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- People had risks identified in their care plans, this included emergency evacuation risk assessments.
- Staff said they had time to read people's care plans and risk assessments prior to delivering care and support to the person. Staff also told us records were reviewed regularly and updated more often if changes to the persons needs occurred.

Staffing and recruitment

- The provider had a recruitment process to ensure staff were suitable to work for the service. Staff told us, and records showed, the process had involved a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) record check and previous employment checks.
- People and relatives were positive about staff attendance and time keeping. People knew the staff who cared for them and told us staff were rarely late.

Using medicines safely

- People's care plans guided staff in the level of help each person needed to take their medicines. Risk assessments had been carried out for people having support with medication administration, and for those self-administering medicines without support.
- Records showed, and staff confirmed they had received training in medicine administration and had received a medicine competency assessment.
- Relatives were assured staff were supporting people with their medicines appropriately.

Preventing and controlling infection

- The registered manager had up to date policies and procedures in place to safeguard people and staff and

reduce the risk of transmission of infection. This also included risk assessments for people and staff.

- The service had a plentiful supply of personal protective equipment (PPE) to prevent the spread of infection. Relatives we spoke to confirmed that staff always wore PPE when visiting people's homes.

#### Learning lessons when things go wrong

- Incidents and concerns involving people using the service, or staff, were managed effectively. Staff recorded these appropriately and the registered manager took action to reduce the risk of these reoccurring.
- Outcomes from lessons learnt were shared with staff during team meetings.

# 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 met with people new to the service to assess their needs and agree the support staff at the service could offer. A relative told us both the manager and carer visited their relative, "They came to discuss [relatives] needs, we discussed everything about what we wanted, and how [relative] would like [their] care."
- A professional shared feedback with us from a service user they worked with. They said, "[Staff] listened to what [they] wanted during the pre-assessment and worked with social care to express these wishes. They said that [staff] really listened and took on board their wishes."
- Care plans contained information about people's diverse needs and included any preferences in relation to culture, religion and diet. Staff received training in equality and diversity.

Staff support: induction, training, skills and experience

- Staff told us they received the training needed to ensure they could deliver support safely. All staff had received induction training when they first started working for the service.
- Staff told us the registered manager carried out competency checks to ensure they were demonstrating best practice.
- Staff members received supervision as individual meetings and could also contact the registered manager for support in between these meetings. Staff received a yearly appraisal.

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

- People had care plans in place which contained information regarding nutrition and fluid needs. This included relevant guidance if necessary, and people's personal preferences.
- A relative told us their family member chose what food they wished to eat, and the staff cooked it for them. This was working well.

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

- Staff worked with guidance and information from external health and social care professionals including specialist nurses, social workers and GP's. This was to promote people's well-being and deliver effective care and support.
- Relatives told us they had received positive feedback from the specialist nurses regarding the care, "The nurse has attended and is happy with everything."

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

- Staff knew how the MCA applied to their work. Staff ensured that people were involved in decisions about their care and knew what they needed to do to make sure decisions were made in people's best interests.
- Staff understood the importance of giving people choice and respecting the choices which they made. This was also reflected in people's care plans.

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

- People and relatives made positive comments about the staff and the service they received. A relative told us, "[Person] is happy with the care they get. Staff are kind and they take the time to talk to her."
- People's care plans had enough guidance for staff to follow to ensure that people were well treated and supported. People's preferences and what was important to them was clearly documented in their care plan to ensure staff understood what was important to them. For example, a care plan we reviewed stated, '[Person] enjoys having a shower once or twice a week. [They] will request for the shower when [they] want one in the morning otherwise a wash is good.'

Respecting and promoting people's privacy, dignity and independence

- People's care plans contained clear guidance on how staff were to respect and promote people's dignity and independence.
- People were supported to remain as independent as possible. A professional told us they had received feedback from a service user which stated, '[Person] said that the care staff are really nice and supportive in helping her remain as independent as possible.'
- People's records were kept in their homes, and personal information was held securely at the providers office. A relative confirmed that care plans are kept in people's property and updated after each visit.

# 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 told us staff supported them in a way that met their individual needs and preferences. People told us they were given choice and control and could request changes or additional support when needed. One person said, "They [staff] ask my permission. They [staff] wouldn't do anything without my permission first."
- Staff said they understood the importance of people being given choice to meet their needs. One member of staff said, "I meet with people to discuss their needs and what we are going to do ... Care plans are reviewed two weeks after people start using the service, and then quarterly, unless [people's] needs change."

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.

- Care plans evidenced people's communication needs had been considered and gave clear guidance on whether people needed support or used equipment to support their communication.
- Relatives told us staff communicated well with people, and adapted their method of communication to suit people's needs. They said, "[Relative] is deaf and cannot hear on the phone. Staff know that if they stand close to [relative] and speak normally she will understand. This works well."

Improving care quality in response to complaints or concerns

- The service had systems in place to deal with any concerns or complaints. Complaints had been investigated and responded to by the provider. Concerns raised by people receiving care, or by relatives were recorded and responded to appropriately. People had a complaints procedure to follow if these were raised.

End of life care and support

- Staff were not currently supporting anyone who was at the end of their life.
- The registered manager was in the process of reviewing people's future wishes for advance care planning to take place.
- The provider had arranged for staff to attend end of life care training. This provision would support staff to provide care to people in the last year or months of life.

# 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 registered manager was committed to developing a person-centred culture within the service. They understood their responsibilities to ensure people received the care they needed and were committed to providing a good service for people.
- People and relatives appreciated having the same staff visit them. The registered manager understood this was important to people. A relative told us, "The care has been good. Everybody has got to know each other well. [Relative] has the same care staff."

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; Continuous learning and improving care

- The registered manager used information gathered from audits, complaints, spot-checks and feedback to develop the service and make improvements.
- The registered manager had good knowledge in regard to their responsibility to report notifiable incidents or events to the Care Quality Commission and local authority.
- Lessons learnt from incidents or complaints were discussed in team meetings with the staff team.
- Professionals from the local authority were confident the registered manager would raise any concerns they had with them. They told us, "They [registered manager] are quick to call or email me if they need support, so, I am confident if any concerns arose, they would raise with me."

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

- Feedback was sought from people using the service and their relatives. Although some people spoken with had not yet been asked to formally feedback as they had not used the service very long.
- We reviewed feedback which had been obtained, which was all positive. Comments included, "Excellent and reliable care service. Cheerful and professional care which could not have been bettered." And "Lovely, professional, and kind carers. Listen to service user and took on board their wishes and do not rush care."
- Staff told us they felt supported by their manager and told us they, "Had a voice."
- The provider evidenced regular meeting opportunities were available to both relatives and the staff team.

Working in partnership with others

- Staff and managers worked in partnership with other professionals and agencies to meet the needs of people.
- People were supported with accessing services, such as their GP, specialist nurses, Social Workers and the local authority. This support ensured people received effective joined- up care.