

Infinite Intermediate Care Limited

# Infinite Intermediate Care Limited

## Inspection report

Litton House  
Saville Road Industrial Estate  
Peterborough  
PE3 7PR

Tel: 01733857805  
Website: [www.iicltd.org.uk](http://www.iicltd.org.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
04 October 2021

Date of publication:  
25 October 2021

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inadequate ●

Is the service safe?

**Inspected but not rated**

Is the service well-led?

**Inspected but not rated**

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

### About the service

Infinite Intermediate Care Limited is a domiciliary care service. At the time of our inspection the service provided personal care to two people. The service provides care to adults in Peterborough and the surrounding areas.

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

Action had been taken to ensure people received their medicines as prescribed. Staff had completed training and competency checks to ensure they had the knowledge they required to meet people's needs. The providers recruitment policy was being followed to ensure that the right people were employed to work with vulnerable people.

The quality assurance systems were being followed to ensure any areas for improvement were identified and action was taken in a timely manner.

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

The last rating for this service was inadequate (report published May 2021).

At this inspection we found improvements had been made and the provider was no longer in breach of regulations.

### Why we inspected

We undertook this targeted inspection to check enforcement action we previously took in relation to Regulation 12 Safe care and treatment, Regulation 17 Good Governance and Regulation 19 Fit and proper persons employed of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 had been met. The overall rating for the service has not changed following this targeted inspection and remains inadequate.

CQC have introduced targeted inspections to follow up on enforcement action or to check specific concerns. They do not look at an entire key question, only the part of the key question we are specifically concerned about. Targeted inspections do not change the rating from the previous inspection. This is because they do not assess all areas of a key question.

### 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 overall rating for this service is 'Inadequate' and the service remains in 'special measures'. This means

we will keep the service under review and, if we do not propose to cancel the provider's registration, we will re-inspect within 6 months to check for significant improvements.

If the provider has not made enough improvement within this timeframe. And there is still a rating of inadequate for any key question or overall rating, we will take action in line with our enforcement procedures. This will mean we will begin the process of preventing the provider from operating this service. This will usually lead to cancellation of their registration or to varying the conditions the registration.

For adult social care services, the maximum time for being in special measures will usually be no more than 12 months. If the service has demonstrated improvements when we inspect it. And it is no longer rated as inadequate for any of the five key questions it will no longer be in special measures.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### **Is the service safe?**

At our last inspection we rated this key question inadequate. We have not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we only looked at the parts of this key question we had specific concerns about.

**Inspected but not rated**

### **Is the service well-led?**

At our last inspection we rated this key question inadequate. We have not reviewed the rating at this inspection. This is because we only looked at the parts of this key question we had specific concerns about.

**Inspected but not rated**

# Infinite Intermediate Care Limited

## Detailed findings

### Background to this inspection

#### The inspection

This was a targeted inspection to check whether the provider had met the requirements of the enforcement action we previously took in relation to Regulation 12 Safe care and treatment, Regulation 17 Good Governance and Regulation 19 Fit and proper persons employed Staffing of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

#### Inspection team

One inspection manager and one inspector carried out this inspection.

#### 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 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 the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We 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.

During the inspection-

We spoke with the relative of one person who used the service about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with the registered manager (who is also the nominated individual) and a support worker. The nominated individual is responsible for supervising the management of the service on behalf of the provider.

We reviewed a range of records. This included one person's medication records. We looked at one staff file in relation to recruitment, training and staff supervision.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as inadequate. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we have only looked at the part of the key question, we had specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to check if the provider had met the requirements of the enforcement action we previously took. We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

At our last inspection the provider had failed to ensure staff were recruited safely and they had the right knowledge and skills to meet people's needs. This was a breach of regulation 19 (Fit and Proper persons employed) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

Enough improvement had been made at this inspection and the provider was no longer in breach of regulation 19.

### Staffing and recruitment

- Safe recruitment practices were being followed to ensure the right people were employed. Checks were completed to ensure that new staff were suitable to work with vulnerable people.
- Staff had completed induction training to ensure that they had the knowledge and skills required to meet people's needs.

At our last inspection the provider had failed to ensure that people received their medicines as prescribed. This was a breach of regulation 12 (Safe Care and Treatment) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

Enough improvement had been made at this inspection and the provider was no longer in breach of regulation 12.

### Using medicines safely

- People were receiving their medicines as prescribed. Staff had the training and skills required to administer medicines.
- Support workers had received training in the administration of medicines and completed competency assessments before administering medicines unsupervised.
- The medicines administration records were being regularly monitored to identify any issues so that they could be dealt with immediately.

# 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.

At the last inspection this key question was rated as inadequate. We have not changed the rating of this key question, as we have only looked at the part of the key question, we have specific concerns about.

The purpose of this inspection was to check if the provider had met the requirements of the enforcement action we previously took. We will assess all of the key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

At our last inspection the provider had failed to ensure areas for improvement were identified and action was taken in a timely manner. This was a breach of regulation 17 (Good governance) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

Enough improvement had been made at this inspection and the provider was no longer in breach of regulation 17.

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

- Effective quality assurance systems were in place to identify areas for improvement. The registered manager was undertaking checks to ensure that the care and support provided met people's assessed needs.
- Regular audits were being carried out to ensure that any issues were identified quickly so the appropriate action could be taken. When needed action had been taken to ensure staff were competent to carry out their roles effectively.
- The registered manager had put processes in place to ensure staff were completing their refresher training as required. Dates for staff to refresh their training was identified in advance so that training courses could be booked to ensure staff had up to date knowledge.
- People, their relatives and staff had been asked for their feedback of the service provided so that any improvements could be made.