

Care Quality draft assessment for Parry Healthcare WiltshireHomecare

Overview

Overall Rating: Good ●

The service is performing well and meeting our expectations.

Summary

Safe	Good ●	Read this section
Effective	Good ●	Read this section
Caring	Good ●	Read this section
Responsive	Good ●	Read this section
Well-led	Good ●	Read this section

Overall Service Commentary

Date of assessment 12 January 2026. The service is a care at home service providing support to 10 adults of all ages, people living with dementia, people with mental health challenges and people with sensory impairment. We completed an assessment on 5 June 2025, and during that assessment we found breaches in regulations and issued a warning

notice. We completed this recent assessment to see if improvements had been made. During this assessment we found that the provider had made improvements and the service was no longer in breach of regulations.

Care plans contained detailed information to support people's needs and preferences, and people's risks had been assessed and mitigated. The provider had focused on improvements in the timings of people's visits and had systems to monitor this. Medicines were managed safely.

The provider employed 13 staff. We looked at 5 staff records and spoke with 5 staff. Staff had received supervision and competency assessments. Recruitment was managed in line with legislation and good practice. Staff told us they were supported well. Comments included "We are listened to" and "This is a good place to work".

[↑ Back to top](#)

Overall People's Experience

We spoke to 5 people and their relatives. Feedback we received was positive. People told us staff were kind and caring. Comments included, "They are brilliant" and "They go above and beyond".

During our assessment on 05 June 2025 feedback we received about timings of visits was not positive. However, feedback we received during this assessment improved. People told us late visits occurred less often. One person said, "They were only late once, it hasn't happened again".

Most people told us the registered manager was available to them and communicated well. However, one relative felt that they would like more communication. They told us, "I don't really hear from them".

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is safe

Commentary

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

At our last assessment we rated this key question Requires improvement. At this assessment the rating has changed to Good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Learning culture

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:  1 2 3 4

The provider had a proactive and positive culture of safety, based on openness and honesty. Staff listened to concerns about safety and investigated and reported safety events. Lessons were learnt to continually identify and embed good practice.

We spoke to 5 staff. They told us they were confident to raise concerns about safety and when they did the provider listened and acted. We were told incidents were discussed during staff meetings and supervision. We saw action plans were developed to identify learning and these were shared during staff meetings and supervision. This meant the provider could be assured they were promoting a culture of safety.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe systems, pathways and transitions

Overall Score

 1 2 3 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of

at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: **1** 2 **3** 4

The provider worked with people and healthcare partners to establish and maintain safe systems of care, in which safety was managed or monitored. They made sure there was continuity of care, including when people moved between different services.

We reviewed care records for 5 people. Care plans contained clear details about people’s needs and risks. Each person had a comprehensive needs assessment, which meant the provider had the information available to ensure they met people’s needs and preferences. The registered manager told us they met with people to complete their needs assessment and develop their care plan. People we spoke to said they had an assessment completed when they first began support with the provider. Comments included, “We had a meeting when we first started”.

We spoke to 5 staff who told us information about new people was shared with them using email and care plans. We were told, “When someone new comes for support a care plan is developed quickly. This meant the provider could be assured that there was continuity of care for people.”

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Safeguarding

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► **How do we score this?**

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes



The provider worked with people and healthcare partners to understand what being safe meant to them and the best way to achieve that. Staff concentrated on improving people’s lives while protecting their right to live in safety, free from bullying, harassment, abuse, discrimination, avoidable harm and neglect. The provider shared concerns quickly and appropriately.

The provider had a safeguarding policy which outlined procedures for staff. Staff had completed safeguarding training and were able to describe how they would identify safeguarding concerns and how to report them. Comments

included, “I would report it to the manager or safeguarding lead”. People told us they felt safe. This meant people were supported to live their lives free from harm.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Involving people to manage risks

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider worked with people to understand and manage risks by thinking holistically. Staff provided care to meet people’s needs that was safe, supportive and enabled people to do the things that mattered to them.

We observed care records for 5 people. These records included clear risk assessments. For example, a person who had reduced mobility was at higher risk of experiencing difficulties with their skin integrity. This risk had been fully assessed and mitigated. Another person was at higher risk of falls. We saw a risk assessment that contained clear guidance for staff to follow to mitigate the risk of these falls for the person. These risk assessments had been reviewed regularly in line with the provider policy. Staff told us they had access to risk assessments and were updated when there were changes. Comments included “Managers inform us if risk assessments have changed” and “We must read them and understand them before visiting”.

People told us they were supported safely. This meant people were supported to manage risks within their lives and staff had the knowledge to support people safely.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe environments

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories

and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► **How do we score this?**

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider detected and controlled potential risks in the care environment. They made sure equipment, facilities and technology supported the delivery of safe care.

The provider had assessed people’s environmental risks and identified measures to mitigate these risks. Care records contained details of equipment people used and how to use them. We also saw risks related to people’s environment had been assessed and mitigated. Guidance was available for staff to enable them to use people’s equipment safely, they had completed training in relation to equipment used and their competency had been assessed by a trained staff member. Staff told us they had completed training to enable them to use equipment safely. This meant people were supported safely within their environment.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe and effective staffing

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider made sure there were enough qualified, skilled and experienced staff, who received effective support, supervision and development. They worked together well to provide safe care that met people’s individual needs.

Staff had completed relevant training to enable them to provide the support needed to meet people’s needs. For example, all staff had completed training in moving and handling, medicines administration and dementia care. Staff’s competency had been checked where required to ensure they were providing support safely and in line with people’s needs.

The provider had an induction policy. Staff told us they had completed an induction when they started this included shadowing competent staff. Comments included “Everything I needed was covered in the induction” and “I was shadowing other staff”.

The provider had a recruitment policy. Recruitment records contained the required documents to safely employ staff. These included references and work history for staff and evidence of a comprehensive interview completed by the Registered Manager. The Registered Manager told us they had been making improvements to the recruitment process which included a focus on recruiting new staff with previous experience. This meant the provider could assure themselves staff had been recruited safely and in line with guidance.

The provider had an induction and supervision policy. We observed induction records and supervision for 5 staff. Supervision records contained discussion in relation to developmental opportunities available to staff and training requirements. The Registered Manager described how support was currently being offered to a staff member to enable them to progress and gain further qualifications. Staff told us they had supervision each month and these were supportive. Comments included "They listen if I need something". This meant staff received the required training and support to complete their role safely.

People told us they felt staff were trained well. One person said, "They know what they are doing". This meant people were supported well by staff who had the right skills and knowledge.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Infection prevention and control

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system

to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► **How do we score this?**

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:

1

2

3

4

The provider assessed and managed the risk of infection. They detected and controlled the risk of it spreading and shared concerns with appropriate agencies promptly.

The provider had an infection prevention control (IPC) policy to provide guidance to staff. Staff had completed infection prevention control training. Staff told us there was personal protective equipment such as gloves and aprons available to them. Comments included, “If we need gloves, we tell them and they have it for us in the blink of an eye”. People told us staff wore this equipment.

The registered manager told us about the spot checks completed regularly, part of these spot checks included observation of staff compliance with IPC procedures and good practice. Staff told us the registered manager completed spot checks with them to ensure they were working in line with IPC guidance. This meant staff had the equipment and support to reduce the risk of infection to themselves and people they supported.

We saw that infection risks had been assessed and mitigated for people. For example, we saw that a person whose skin was at high risk of infection had a risk assessment which identified this risk and had control measures to reduce the risk for the person. This meant people were supported to control their risk of infection.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Medicines optimisation

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider made sure that medicines and treatments were safe and met people’s needs, capacities and preferences. Staff involved people in planning, including when changes happened.

During our visit we reviewed the providers training records. Staff had completed training and their competency assessed to administer medicines safely. Staff told us they had received training for administering medicines and

changes in people's medicines were communicated to them quickly. Comments included, "I get an email or telephone call if peoples medicines have changed".

The provider completed medicines audits to enable them to identify any shortfalls. We saw that errors in administrations were investigated fully and actions taken to mitigate risk of reoccurrence.

Medicines administration records were fully completed by staff, and contained accurate and detailed information to enable staff to administer medicines safely.

The provider had assessed the risk to people who took medicines with side effects. For example, we saw a risk assessment for a person who was taking a medicine that increased the risk of bleeding, the risk for this had been clearly identified and mitigated. People said they were happy with the support they received with their medicines. This meant people were supported to manage their medicines safely.

Effective

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is effective

Commentary

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.

At our last assessment we rated this key question requires Improvement. At this assessment the rating has changed to Good. This meant people's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Effective

Assessing needs

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider made sure people’s care and treatment was effective by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

We observed care records for 5 people. We saw that the provider had completed Assessments and reviews of people's needs with them. The registered manager told us how they communicated regularly with the local authority to ensure that the support they provided was meeting the needs of people. We observed communication from the provider explaining the changing needs of a person and requesting a review for this person in order to ensure that the persons needs were fully met in a safe and preferred way. We spoke to 5 staff who told us that care plans contained the details they needed to support people. One staff member told us that when a new person was supported, the registered manager completed a care plan quickly.

The Registered Manager told us how they completed needs assessments with people they supported. These assessments included information provided by the local authority and information provided by people and their relatives. This meant that people's needs were assessed and the support they required could be tailored to meet their preferences.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Effective

Delivering evidence-based care and treatment

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft

report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider planned and delivered people’s care and treatment with them, including what was important and mattered to them. They did this in line with legislation and current evidence-based good practice and standards.

Care records contained comprehensive information about people’s needs and wishes. For example, one person’s care record identified how to support the person when brushing their teeth. It identified what the person could do for themselves and where support was required.

People we spoke to told us that the Registered Manager spoke with them frequently to gain feedback and ensure that support was meeting their needs. Comments included “[Registered Manager] is always asking if anything needs changing”

Staff told us that care plans contained clear information on how to support people. Comments included, “The care plan has everything we need to know what the person likes”.

This meant people had opportunity to plan their support and staff were aware of what was important to people when supporting them.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Effective

How staff, teams and services work together

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider worked well across teams and services to support people. They made sure people only needed to tell their story once by sharing their assessment of needs when people moved between different services. During our visit we saw the provider had communicated with other professionals. For example, the provider had communicated with the local speech and language therapy [SALT] team to ensure a person’s eating and drinking needs were fully assessed and that the provider was aware of these needs. at the time of our visit the provider did not support this person with their eating and drinking needs. However, the registered manager told us they had requested this information to ensure that staff had full knowledge of the person and could

identify any changes in their needs quickly. This information was clearly detailed in their care records. This meant people's needs were clear and easily shared between services.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Effective

Supporting people to live healthier lives

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider supported people to manage their health and wellbeing to maximise their independence, choice and control. Staff supported people to live healthier lives and where possible, reduce their future needs for care and support.

We spoke to a person's relative; they told us how staff encouraged their relative to walk as well as use their wheelchair. We were told, "Staff Encourage [person] to walk rather than use their wheelchair". This meant the person was supported to maintain their mobility.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Effective

Monitoring and improving outcomes

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:  1 2 3 4

The provider routinely monitored people’s care and treatment to continuously improve it. They ensured that outcomes were positive and consistent, and that they met both clinical expectations and the expectations of people themselves.

The provider had a complaints policy and maintained a record of complaints. Action plans were created where required to ensure that actions were taken and responses provided to people. We saw meetings had been held with people and their relatives to discuss complaints and to monitor the actions taken to resolve people’s concerns.

People told us they had regular contact with the Registered Manager and their support was monitored. Comments included “[Registered Manager] pops in to ask if everything is ok” and, “If I have a concern I just call or ask the staff, they sort it quickly”.

This meant the provider was able to closely monitor people’s outcomes and take action quickly when needed.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Effective

Consent to care and treatment

Overall Score

 1 2 3 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider told people about their rights around consent and respected these when delivering person-centred care and treatment.

Care plans contained records of consent gained from people in relation to their care and treatment. Staff were able to describe how they gained consent when supporting people daily. Comments included, “I always ask for permission first”. People confirmed this. We spoke to one relative who told us, “Staff ask for consent, they ask if its ok”.

Staff had received Mental Capacity Act training. We spoke to staff, most of whom were able to describe what the Mental Capacity Act was and how they support people’s capacity. This meant people were supported to give consent for their care and where people lacked capacity they were supported in line with legislation.

Caring

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is caring

Commentary

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the provider involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.

At our last assessment we rated this key question Requires improvement. At this assessment the rating has changed to Good. This meant people were supported and treated with dignity and respect; and involved as partners in their care.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Caring

Kindness, compassion and dignity

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider always treated people with kindness, empathy and compassion and respected their privacy and dignity. Staff treated colleagues from other organisations with kindness and respect.

During our visit the Registered Manager told us how they had supported a person with their garden. Although this was not within the support they were required to provide, they were aware this was important to the person. They therefore arranged to complete this task outside of the care hours they provided.

Staff told us they respected people’s privacy. Comments included “I always communicate with people to ensure they understand”, “I make sure doors are closed” and, “I ask permission”. This meant staff were showing compassion and kindness when supporting people.

People told us, “We have 4 carers that are brilliant”, “[person] is a private person, he feels comfortable with them” and, “They are exceptional. We say they are A star”. One person told us “[Registered Manager] has gone above and beyond for us”. This meant people were being supported by caring staff that showed them compassion and respected their privacy.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Caring

Treating people as individuals

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► **How do we score this?**

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider treated people as individuals and made sure people’s care, support and treatment met people’s needs and preferences. They took account of people’s strengths, abilities, aspirations, culture and unique backgrounds and protected characteristics.

We saw care plans contained detailed information about people's needs and preferences. For example, we saw clear guidance for staff to follow to ensure that they made a person's bed in the manner they preferred. We also saw guidance related to a person's preference in how they wanted staff to behave within their home.

Staff told us they supported people in the way they preferred and adapted the support to meet people's preferences. Comments included, "Everybody likes things done differently". One staff member explained how a person's support was adapted to meet their needs. They told us, "Some mornings [person] can be energetic but other mornings slower, we don't pressure [person] we take our time".

One relative told us "Staff don't assume". One person preferred same sex carers their relative told us, "We mentioned this and they only send women now". This meant support was being offered to meet people's individual needs and preferences.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Caring

Independence, choice and control

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft

report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider promoted people’s independence, so people knew their rights and had choice and control over their own care, treatment and wellbeing.

Care records contained details of people’s preferences, what they could do independently and what they needed support with.

Staff explained to us how they supported people to remain independent. One staff member told us, “We support [person] to do as much as they can themselves and be independent”. This meant staff were offering support which promoted people’s independence.

We spoke to people and their relatives. Comments included, “They listen to [person’s] wishes” and “They involve [person] in all decisions”. This meant people were able to have choice and control within their lives and were supported to remain as independent as possible.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Caring

Responding to people’s immediate needs

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider listened to and understood people’s needs, views and wishes. Staff responded to people’s needs in the moment and acted to minimise any discomfort, concern or distress.

We spoke to staff who told us how they supported people. One staff member told us about a time when someone required antibiotics when they were unwell. We spoke to people and their relatives who said that staff acted promptly when people’s needs changed. For example, one relative told us that staff had identified an infection and called a healthcare professional, this enabled the person to be prescribed the correct antibiotics. They told us, “Thanks to staff the antibiotic was changed and it was resolved”. This meant people’s immediate needs were supported promptly.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Caring

Workforce wellbeing and enablement

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider cared about and promoted the wellbeing of their staff and supported and enabled staff to always deliver person-centred care.

The Registered Manager told us how they were supporting a staff member to develop within their role. We saw that the registered manager had promoted learning and development during the staff supervisions.

Staff told us that leaders were very supportive. Comments included, “We have regular supervision” and “The manager helps us and checks that we are ok”. This meant that staff were supported and their wellbeing promoted.

Responsive

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is responsive

Commentary

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the provider met people’s needs.

At our last assessment we rated this key question Requires Improvement. At this assessment the rating has changed to Good. This meant people’s needs were met through good organisation and delivery

↑ [Back to top](#)

Responsive

Person-centred Care

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider made sure people were at the centre of their care and treatment choices and they decided, in partnership with people, how to respond to any relevant changes in people’s needs.

People’s care plans were person centred. For example, we saw records for a person who could be more disorientated in the mornings, details were clear and guidance was available for staff to enable them to support the person in the mornings to ensure they had time to take on information that was being provided.

We saw records that held comprehensive information about how people wanted their support delivered and how they wanted staff to perform tasks. For example, care records contained details of a person’s use of assistive technology to communicate their wishes and make choices,

Staff we spoke to told us how they supported people in a person-centred way. One staff member explained a person’s preferences with their breakfast and how they adapted support dependent on the persons frame of mind that day. They told us

“I adapt to respond to how [person] is feeling that day”. This meant staff had the guidance and knowledge of people to ensure they provided person centred care.

We spoke to people and their relatives. One person told us, “They always ask if there is anything else they can do”. This meant that people were offered the choice to adapt their support to meet their preferences and wishes.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Responsive

Care provision, Integration and continuity

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider understood the diverse health and care needs of people and their local communities. Care was joined-up, flexible and supported choice and continuity.

Staff and leaders kept professionals up to date with any concerning information about a person's wellbeing. They were also invited to care reviews, which enabled coordinated and improved support for the person to be implemented.

Leaders were knowledgeable about people's diverse health and social care needs. They gave examples of these and explained how other professionals were involved to ensure the person's wellbeing. For example, leaders described one person who had a dependency. They said they regularly liaised with other professionals about this, and provided additional support to the person to ensure continuity of care was being provided.

People told us the service worked well with other professionals when needed. This included local GP surgeries, occupational therapists, social workers and pharmacies.

Staff liaised with people's relatives once consent to do so had been sought. Supportive measures included leaders looking up travel disruptions so that care continuity was least affected. This was especially useful for people who required time sensitive support.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Providing Information

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider supplied appropriate, accurate and up-to-date information in formats that were tailored to individual needs.

Care records contained details of people’s preferred communication methods. For example, where electronic equipment was required by a person to communicate, this was clearly noted in the persons care plan. The Registered Manager told us how they can provide written information in large print for those who prefer this.

People and their relatives generally said communication was good between the service. Comments included. “[registered Manager] calls in regularly to see how things are”. This meant people were given the opportunity to receive information in the way that suited their needs.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Responsive

Listening to and involving people

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider made it easy for people to share feedback and ideas, or raise complaints about their care, treatment and support. Staff involved people in decisions about their care and told them what had changed as a result.

The provider had a complaints policy, complaints were recorded, and these records contained details of actions taken and lessons learnt.

During our visit the Registered Manager told us about a complaint they had received from a person they supported. As a result of this complaint the registered manager had completed an action plan, this plan detailed the

actions taken to address the concern raised. The registered manager had met with the person and their relatives in order to fully identify areas of concern and agree actions to address these. The identified actions were monitored by the provider to ensure that measures were sufficient. This meant people's views and concerns were listened to.

One person told us "I don't like it when someone new comes without an introduction. I mentioned this, they listened and it hasn't happened again" and "[Registered Manager] calls every couple of weeks to get feedback and points for improvement". This meant people were given opportunity to be involved in their support and their concerns and opinions were listened to and actions taken.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Responsive

Equity in access

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider made sure that people could access the care, support and treatment they needed when they needed it.

Assessments covering the accessibility of people’s environment? and whether any adaptations, equipment or referrals to occupational therapists were needed, had been completed.

People could choose who they wanted to support them for their care. If additional support was needed, the provider ensured staff were made available for this. For example, one person we spoke to told us, “They listen to my preferences of staff when planning the rota. I couldn’t be happier”. This meant people were supported in an equitable way.

Further, when a person’s needs increased, the provider ensured additional staffing was available. These adjustments meant the provider was ensuring an individual approach to ensure all people received a service that was holistic in its approach. The staffing roster was arranged flexibly to support people’s needs.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Equity in experiences and outcomes

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

Staff and leaders actively listened to information about people who are most likely to experience inequality in experience or outcomes and tailored their care, support and treatment in response to this. Staff had completed training in equality and diversity. The staff and people we spoke to did not raise any concerns about discrimination. Staff we spoke to told us they had been supported by the registered manager when they had felt discriminated against whilst undertaking their duties. Comments included “The organisation is very good with equality, diversity and inclusion” and “I have no concerns”. People told us that they could find common ground with their carers. One person told us “we talk about culture”. The registered manager confirmed that there was an equality and diversity policy and every one was treated equally. This meant the provider focused on people’s experiences and strived for equality

↑ [Back to top](#)

Responsive

Planning for the future

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

People were supported to plan for important life changes, so they could have enough time to make informed decisions about their future, including at the end of their life.

Care records included details of people's choice and plans for care they wished to receive at the end of their life.

Staff had received training for end of life care. This meant staff had the knowledge they needed to enable them to support people at the end of their lives.

Well-led

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is well-led

Commentary

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 our last assessment we rated this key question Requires Improvement. At this assessment the rating has changed to Good. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Well-led

Shared direction and culture

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider had a shared vision, strategy and culture. This was based on transparency, equity, equality and human rights, diversity and inclusion, engagement, and understanding challenges and the needs of people and their

communities.

Staff were able to tell us about the providers vision and could explain the ethos the service promoted. One staff member told us, “We treat everyone with respect, and treat everyone fairly without discrimination”. This meant the provider had shared their vision effectively and staff were able to provide support to people in line with the providers values.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Capable, compassionate and inclusive leaders

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with

them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider had inclusive leaders at all levels who understood the context in which they delivered care, treatment and support and embodied the culture and values of their workforce and organisation. Leaders had the skills, knowledge, experience and credibility to lead effectively. They did so with integrity, openness and honesty.

We spoke to the Registered Manager who was clear about the vision of the service and had a strong knowledge of the people they supported. The registered Manager was passionate when they spoke about staff and how they could be supported to develop within their role.

Staff told us the manager was approachable and supportive. We were told, "I feel listened to" and "The manager is fair and approachable". This meant staff had confidence in the Manager's ability to lead effectively.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Well-led

Freedom to speak up

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be

able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► **How do we score this?**

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider fostered a positive culture where people felt they could speak up and their voice would be heard.

The provider had a policy and systems to support staff to speak up. Guidance was clearly available for staff and the registered Manger actively promoted and supported staff to speak up. Staff told us they felt able to speak up and that when they did they were listened to and actions were taken. This meant the provider promoted staff to speak up when needed.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Workforce equality, diversity and inclusion

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider valued diversity in their workforce. They worked towards an inclusive and fair culture by improving equality and equity for people who worked for them.

The provider had supported staff to make reasonable adjustments to their working patterns where needed to support them to remain at work. Staff informed us the provider was supportive in enabling them to manage their work patterns Comments included: “I travel by public transport and the registered manager ensures that my roster is accessible via my transport means”.

Staff told us they were treated as individuals by the provider. We were told “I feel this is a supportive place to work”. This meant that the provider promoted an inclusive and fair culture.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Governance, management and sustainability

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider had clear responsibilities, roles, systems of accountability and good governance. They used these to manage and deliver good quality, sustainable care, treatment and support. They acted on the best information about risk, performance and outcomes, and shared this securely with others when appropriate.

We visited the provider on June 5 2025 to complete an assessment. During that assessment we found shortfalls in the governance of the service, we issued the provider with a warning notice in relation to this.

We revisited the provider again on January 12 2026 to see if these shortfalls had been addressed. During this assessment we found significant improvements had been made, and the service was no longer in breach of regulations.

During the previous inspection we found that visit times to people were often late The provider did not have systems to monitor, identify impact to people or address these shortfalls. During this assessment we saw the provider had implemented systems to address this. Action plans had been developed and learning had taken place. This resulted in a significant improvement of the timings of people's visits. This meant people were receiving their support at agreed times most of the time and were happier with the service they received.

During the previous assessment we found shortfalls in recruitment records. Leaders had ensured a recruitment drive had taken place. Further, the registered Manager had ensured that all recruitment records were in line with legislation.

Risks to people had previously not been thoroughly assessed and mitigated. During this assessment we found improvements had been made to the details held within people's risk records.

Policies were easily available to staff to enable them to access clear guidance. This meant staff were able to complete their role in line with good practice and legislation.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Well-led

Partnerships and communities

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider understood their duty to collaborate and work in partnership, so services worked seamlessly for people. They shared information and learning with partners and collaborated for improvement.

We saw the provider had communicated with other professionals such as the local authority and healthcare professionals. The Registered Manager told us about the changing needs of a person had been identified. We saw the provider had gained additional support from the local speech and language therapy team to ensure a person’s needs had been assessed by trained care professionals. This meant that people were supported safely with their nutrition and hydration.

One relative explained that the Registered Manager had attended a meeting with the person and a healthcare professional. They told us, “We found that really helpful”. This meant people were supported to share their information with other services to ensure their needs were met.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Learning, improvement and innovation

Overall Score



This score has been adjusted by CQC.

Read about why we adjusted scores (<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-regulation/providers/assessment/assessing-quality-and-performance/reach-rating>)

This assessment has been carried out using our updated assessment process. This means we score and report at quality statement level instead of at evidence category level. We still consider all relevant evidence categories and then use professional judgement to score each quality statement. To be able to do this, we have used the moderation functionality within our system to ensure the correct quality statement score is given, this is a system workaround. The evidence category heading and score will show in your draft report, but they can be disregarded; they will not be in your published report. The published report will show all findings under each quality statement.

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider focused on continuous learning, innovation and improvement across the organisation and local system. They encouraged creative ways of delivering equality of experience, outcome and quality of life for people. They actively contributed to safe, effective practice and research.

The registered manager told us how they had learnt from shortfalls in relation to timings of visits which we found during our previous assessment. We saw that actions had been taken to identify learning and address these shortfalls. For example, staff briefings were held in order to revisit expectations regarding timings. The records for these meetings evidenced the providers expectations and clear guidance for staff to follow. The provider had addressed shortfalls by developing systems to ensure that any delays such as road works were factored into the planning of people's visits.

Where shortfalls had been identified by the provider, action plans had been developed which contained details of actions taken and lessons learnt. This meant the provider had focused on learning and driving improvements within the service.