

Care Quality draft assessment for NurtrioSupported Living

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	Outstanding ●	Read this section
Well-led	Good ●	Read this section

Overall Service Commentary

This assessment took place between 23 April 2026 and 15 May 2026. We visited the service on 23 and 28 April 2026.

Nurtrio is a supported living service which consists of 15 separate buildings with communal facilities and easy access to the community. People living at these locations had their own tenancy; and received varying levels of support from the provider. Not everyone who used the service received support with personal care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) only inspects where people receive personal care. This is help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating. Where they do; we also consider any wider social care provided. At the time of our assessment the service was supporting 33 people with learning disabilities, autism and mental health conditions.

We completed this assessment to follow up on previous enforcement action taken. The provider was previously in breach of legal regulations related to consent, safe care and treatment, staffing and good governance. At this assessment, we found improvements had been made and the provider was no longer in breach of regulations. We assessed all the quality statements.

We assessed the service against 'Right support, right care, right culture' guidance to make judgments about whether the provider guaranteed autistic people and people with a learning disability respect, equality, dignity, choices, independence and good access to local communities that most people take for granted.

People consistently received highly personalised, person-centred care from the provider and staff team who demonstrated an exceptional commitment to promoting independence, choice, and the protection of people's rights. Staff invested meaningful time in developing strong, trusting relationships with people and their relatives, enabling a deep understanding of what mattered most to each person. A person-focused approach was fully embedded which ensured people were not only supported in their day-to-day lives but were also empowered to pursue their ambitions, achieve their goals, and live fulfilling, self-directed lives.

People were provided with the information they needed to make informed decisions, and the principles of the Mental Capacity Act were applied appropriately. The provider not only supplied people with the information they required, but did so in a personalised manner, delivering it at a pace suited to each person and in a way that promoted and maximised their independence.

Staff treated people with dignity, respect and compassion, while recognising and supporting their individual preferences, culture and identity. People were empowered to make choices and access opportunities that enhanced their confidence and developed their skills.

Care plans were regularly reviewed and updated in partnership with people and their relatives. Information was shared in accessible formats, ensuring people were active partners in planning and reviewing their care.

Staff received effective support and appropriate training to carry out their roles confidently. Staff spoke positively about their work and demonstrated high levels of satisfaction and engagement.

The provider demonstrated strong leadership underpinned by clear values and a commitment to inclusivity. There was a strong focus on transparency, learning and continuous improvement. Effective governance systems ensured robust oversight, and partnership working contributed to positive outcomes for people.

Overall People's Experience

The provider demonstrated an extremely person-centred approach to care, ensuring that people were treated with dignity, respect, and compassion at all times. Staff had an excellent understanding of people's needs, preferences, and personalities, which enabled them to deliver highly tailored and effective care. Comments from people and their relatives included, "I love it here" "There is a stable staff team who have developed a good understanding of [person's name] learning disabilities, communication style and their individual preferences. This enables them to live as independently as possible within a supportive environment" and "[Person's name] is so happy and proud of themself, and this is thanks to the staff team."

People received compassionate and effective care that promoted independence, choice and control. Staff demonstrated a strong understanding of each person's communication style, preferences and beliefs, ensuring care was centred on what mattered to them.

People were supported to express their wishes, take part in everyday decisions and engage in meaningful activities that built confidence and skills. Positive risk-taking was encouraged, enabling people to develop and maintain their independence safely.

Care was delivered in a way that upheld dignity and respected people's rights at all times. Staff responded sensitively to individual needs, recognising both verbal and non-verbal communication and providing reassurance when needed.

Accessible information was used effectively to help people understand their options, remain informed and make decisions about their care. Support plans were regularly reviewed with people and their relatives to ensure they remained relevant and meaningful.

People felt included in shaping both their own care and the wider service. They were encouraged to share feedback, and there was clear evidence of action being taken to improve their experiences. Staff listened to concerns and responded promptly and effectively.

The provider fostered a culture where people's rights, safety and wellbeing were central, and where staff worked creatively to achieve the best possible outcomes.

[↑ 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.

The service had a positive and open approach to safety. Staff were encouraged to raise concerns and felt confident to do so. Any safety issues were taken seriously, investigated, and reported appropriately. The provider used these experiences to learn and continuously improve how care was delivered.

The registered manager demonstrated a strong commitment to improving the quality of care. Learning from incidents and day-to-day experiences was a key focus. Staff were supported to reflect on their practice, with learning shared through regular staff meetings, weekly newsletters and daily handovers to help embed good practice throughout the service.

[↑ 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.

Staff worked closely with everyone involved in people’s care, including GPs, social workers, case managers, community services and mental health professionals. Important information was shared with the staff team and used to make sure people received the right support.

Each person had a “hospital passport” in place. This helped other professionals quickly understand their needs, preferences and how they communicate. Staff often went with people to their appointments, especially when they needed reassurance or help to understand the information they were given.

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

Score: 1 2 3 4

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.

People received safe and respectful care because safeguarding and the protection of people's rights were firmly embedded across the service. Systems were in place to keep people safe, and the management team consistently followed internal and external safeguarding procedures to ensure people were protected. People spoke positively about their experiences. Comments included, "I am very safe here, they [staff] know me well, know what I like and how I like things" and "The staff help me to keep safe. I love it here."

People's right to safety, dignity and respect was understood by staff at all levels.

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the Mental Capacity Act, whether appropriate legal authorisations were in place when needed to deprive a person of their liberty, and whether any conditions relating to those authorisations were being met. All legal applications had been made in accordance with Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). This meant people's rights were fully respected. The manager kept a record of DoLS applications and authorisations, and this was regularly reviewed to make sure authorisations were current.

[↑ 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.

Processes

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.

The provider actively promoted positive risk-taking so people could develop skills and lead safe, meaningful, and fulfilling lives. People were supported to understand risks in appropriate ways, helping them stay safe while building confidence.

Staff consistently balanced safety with choice, encouraging independence while respecting each person’s decisions. For example, one person wanted to begin administering their own medication. Previously, this task had been carried out by staff. In response, the staff introduced a structured programme of learning designed to build the person’s skills, confidence, and understanding, with the aim of supporting them to safely achieve their goal of greater independence.

Records relating to risk management were not always reflective of the work staff had already undertaken with people in relation to risk management. We fed this back to the management team who said this would be addressed.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe environments

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

Staff supported people to maintain a clean, tidy, and hazard-free home environment and ensured that any required repairs were reported promptly.

Staff carried out regular environmental safety checks, including routine inspections of fire safety equipment and fire drills, to ensure both people and staff understood the procedures to follow in the event of a fire.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe and effective staffing

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 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.

People, relatives, and staff confirmed that appropriate staffing levels were in place. People who were funded for one-to-one support received this as planned, and staff were consistently available when support was needed.

The provider made sure staff received the right training to meet people’s needs. The registered manager explained that a tailored mandatory training programme was in place, so staff had the right skills for the people they support. This included additional training on learning disabilities, autism, and mental health needs. Staff were also supported to develop professionally through regular supervision, appraisals and opportunities to gain recognised qualifications.

The provider followed safe recruitment practices, including completing all necessary pre-employment checks, to ensure staff were suitable for their roles.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Infection prevention and control

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

Staff received training in Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) and were confident in the correct use of Personal Protective Equipment to help minimise the risk of infection. They supported people using the service to maintain a clean and hygienic living environment.

↑ [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: 

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.

People were supported by staff to take their medicines safely. Where people were prescribed medicines to be taken ‘as and when’ required (PRN), such as for pain relief, there were clear protocols in place to guide staff on when and how these should be administered.

The provider also had a comprehensive programme in place to support people to become more independent with their medicines administration, where this was their choice and assessed as safe to do so.

Systems were in place to audit medicines management, enabling any administration errors to be identified promptly and ensuring medicines stock levels were accurately monitored.

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

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

People's needs were assessed at the point they began using the service. This assessment covered their support requirements, personal preferences, and individual likes and dislikes. The registered manager explained that the decision-making process also took into account the needs of people already receiving support within the supported living service. This included considering whether a potential new tenant would be a suitable and compatible fit alongside others living in the accommodation, taking into account shared spaces, individual support needs, and promoting positive and person-centred living arrangements.

Care plans and risk assessments were reviewed on a regular basis, and people using the service and their relatives confirmed they were involved in both the assessment and review processes. However, some care plans and risk assessments did not consistently reflect the care being delivered in practice. We raised this with the registered manager, who acknowledged this and explained that the service was in the process of transitioning to electronic care records. The registered manager confirmed that these records would be updated to ensure they accurately reflected current practice.

↑ [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.

The provider followed best-practice guidance when assessing people’s needs. Staff demonstrated an understanding of people and clearly explained how they delivered personalised care and support. Care records also showed active involvement from GPs, district nurses, occupational therapists, and other healthcare professionals in planning and reviewing people’s care.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Effective

How staff, teams and services work together

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 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.

People received safe and well-coordinated care because staff worked closely together and communicated effectively. Regular reviews, welfare visits, team meetings and daily handovers helped make sure important information about people’s needs was shared clearly, so everyone involved understood how best to support them.

When needed, staff asked for advice from specialists to ensure people were given the right care and treatment for their individual circumstances.

Staff knew the people they supported well and understood what mattered to them. They were able to explain how good communication and teamwork helped people receive consistent, personalised care. One staff member told us, "The communication between staff is really good, we are always kept up to date with any changes to people or the service."

↑ [Back to top](#)

Effective

Supporting people to live healthier lives

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 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.

People were supported to maintain a healthy lifestyle. Staff promoted good care practices into day-to-day support and care planning. Staff worked with people in a person-centred manner, recognising their needs, preferences, cultural considerations, and health conditions when promoting wellbeing.

People were supported to access and engage with weight management and weight loss programmes where this has been identified as a goal. This included staff providing encouragement, regular monitoring, and working in partnership with healthcare professionals such as GPs and dietitians.

Staff promoted healthy eating by supporting people to make informed choices about their diet. This included assistance with menu planning, shopping, and meal preparation, as well as education around balanced nutrition and portion control.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Effective

Monitoring and improving outcomes

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 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.

People were encouraged by staff to work towards goals that improved health and quality of life. Staff reviewed care plans often with people and updated goals together. They promoted skill development and independence at a pace that suited each person. For example, managing their own finances and medicines.

The provider and management team gathered feedback and used it to improve care and support. Staff worked closely with health and social care professionals, when needed. Records showed a focus on improving people's wellbeing and progress towards agreed goals.

[↑ 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.

People were supported to make informed choices. Information was available in different formats to support people in making choices and decisions. For example, the provider ensured easy read information sheets were available when people needed extra support to understand options.

Staff involved relatives or advocates when people wanted help with decisions. The provider recognised when people required additional support to make decisions and followed the Mental Capacity Act correctly. Staff made best interest decisions with the right people and always considered the person’s wishes.

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.

People were supported by staff who consistently showed kindness and took a genuine interest in their lives. People and their relatives told us how kind staff were. Comments included "The staff are really lovely" and "I feel [Person's name] are safe and treated with kindness and respect at all times. I also know that if I have any concerns, I can raise them and they [staff] will be addressed immediately."

People's dignity was protected at all times. Staff could clearly explain how they maintained people's dignity and encouraged them to make their own choices throughout daily routines. People were meaningfully involved in decisions about their care and were supported in ways that reflected their needs, wishes, and preferences.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Caring

Treating people as individuals

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 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.

People were supported by staff who knew them well and were attentive to their needs. This included recognising when someone required additional reassurance or more time and responding in a calm and supportive manner.

People and their relatives told us staff recognised what mattered to them as individuals and treated them with respect, including their beliefs, cultural backgrounds, and personal preferences. Relatives expressed how staff were mindful of how these things affected their day-to-day lives and provided support in a sensitive and respectful way. One person told us, "They [staff] never rush me, they know me well. They know when I need time to myself and they respect that."

↑ [Back to top](#)

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.

People were supported to make choices and have control over their daily lives. Staff encouraged them to try new things, which helped build their confidence. People and their relatives were involved in decisions about everyday activities

and felt that their preferences were listened to and respected by staff. One relative told us, "The staff are really good. They listen to us as parents and give [Person's name] choice which is respectful to our culture."

Staff took time to understand how best to work with each person. They aimed to help people stay independent while considering any risks, reducing these risks where possible but still supporting people to make their own choices. For example, regular welfare visits supported people to express their ambitions and provided opportunities for them to explore these in depth and work towards achieving their goals.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Caring

Responding to people's immediate 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.

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.

Staff routinely checked in with people to understand how they were feeling before offering support, enabling them to identify changes in presentation at an early stage. Staff were attentive and responsive to both verbal and non-verbal cues, recognising emerging signs of distress or anxiety.

Staff demonstrated a strong understanding of each person’s preferred communication style and adapted their approach to suit individual needs. Interactions were consistently kind, patient, and reassuring.

Staff remained aware of potential triggers and drew on their knowledge of people to respond appropriately, helping to minimise anxiety and promote a sense of calm. For example, staff recognised that the presence of the inspector may have been unsettling for one person. They provided gentle reassurance, introduced the inspector in a sensitive manner, and supported the person to understand the purpose of the visit.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Caring

Workforce wellbeing and enablement

Overall Score

 1 2 3 4

▶ [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.

Staff felt supported by the registered manager and provider. Staff received regular supervision meetings and team meetings, giving them opportunities to discuss any concerns they may have. Comments from staff included, "The team communication is brilliant and helps me feel confident in supporting [Person's name]. It really is a supportive working environment" and "The management team are always visiting not just to check in with people but to check in with the staff too. "

The provider demonstrated commitment to recognising and valuing staff contributions to the service. This was evident through the implementation of a range of staff initiatives designed to promote appreciation, motivation, and engagement. For example, each month staff were nominated by their colleagues for a 'Making a Difference' award, and compliments received were shared with staff via a personalised email from the provider, recognising their commitment, positive impact, and dedication to people.

Responsive

Rating: Outstanding ●

Percentage Score: 89.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is exceptionally 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 good. At this assessment the rating has changed to outstanding. This meant services were tailored to meet the needs of individuals and delivered to ensure flexibility, choice and continuity of care.

[↑ 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

Outstanding – This service is exceptional at maximising 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 was exceptional at making 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 consistently felt heard, respected, and genuinely empowered to shape their own care. Staff worked in true partnership with people and their relatives, actively involving them in care planning and reviewing support regularly to ensure it continued to reflect individual wishes, preferences, and changing needs. Relationships were exceptionally strong; staff knew people extremely well and were highly attuned to subtle changes, responding promptly when someone needed additional reassurance, time, or emotional support. For example, one person told us about how staff had consistently gone above and beyond to support them become more independent and use strategies in times of distress and agitation, and promote their wellbeing. This person told us, "The staff are just excellent, I love them all."

Emotional wellbeing was prioritised at all times. Staff engaged with people calmly and patiently, creating safe and trusting environments where people felt confident to express what truly mattered to them. Regular welfare visits and meaningful conversations enabled staff to gain a deep understanding of people's aspirations, strengths, and personal goals. Where people shared hopes, ambitions, or outcomes they wished to achieve, staff were consistently proactive, working creatively with people to develop personalised support that promoted independence, confidence, and a sense of purpose. One staff member told us, "I love the relationships and the bonds we have all formed. Supporting [Person's name] to live a full and meaningful life. Teaching them life skills brings deep reward and seeing them thrive and experience life to the fullest is just the best feeling in the world."

People were given choices so they could maintain their cultural practices and feel comfortable and valued. A relative told us, "Staff honour our religion, and provide support by leading or saying a prayer with [Person's name] to ensure this practice is maintained."

[↑ 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

Outstanding – This service is exceptional at maximising 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 an exceptional understanding of the diverse health and care needs of people and their local communities, so care was joined-up, flexible and supported choice and continuity.

Staff demonstrated an exceptional understanding of each person's individual health and social needs and consistently used this knowledge to deliver highly personalised care. Care was flexible and responsive, ensuring people received the right support at the right time. Staff worked in strong partnership with relatives, where appropriate, advocates and external professionals to ensure

care remained fully coordinated. For example, staff were supporting a person by working alongside professionals and adapting care to meet the person's mobility needs. With appropriate support and specialist equipment in place, a person was able to achieve levels of independent mobility they had not achieved before.

Information was communicated clearly and proactively, enabling everyone involved to understand people's changing needs and ensuring timely referrals to additional services when required. As people grew older and developed additional conditions, such as dementia, staff worked closely with relevant health and social care professionals to ensure continuity of support was maintained and people's changing needs continued to be met.

The registered manager promoted continuity by deploying familiar staff wherever possible, which enhanced trust, emotional wellbeing and consistency of care. People were actively supported and encouraged to engage in a wide range of community activities and day services, alongside maintaining meaningful connections with their wider support networks.

People and their relatives consistently told us staff knew them well, understood what mattered to them and supported them to remain active, connected and valued members of their community. One person told us, "The staff know me and my ways, we work really well together." A relative told us, "[Person's name] is having the best life that I could wish for them. They make their own choices and enjoys a great range of activities."

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Providing Information

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

The provider demonstrated commitment to inclusion through an extensive suite of easy-read guidance and supporting materials, including clear pictorial documents, large-print correspondence, and verbal explanations delivered in a structured, step-by-step manner to ensure full understanding.

Staff ensured people fully understood their choices, rights and care plans. Information was explained clearly using simple, inclusive language, and staff took time to check people’s understanding rather than assuming comprehension.

↑ [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

Outstanding – This service is exceptional at maximising the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:

A horizontal row of four circles, numbered 1 to 4. The first three circles are light purple, and the fourth circle is a darker purple, indicating the current score.

The provider was exceptional at enabling people to share feedback and ideas, or raise complaints about their care, treatment and support. Staff always involved people in decisions about their care and told them what had changed as a result.

People were fully supported to share their views and raise concerns in ways that worked for them. Everyone had access to clear, easy-read information explaining how to make a complaint, and regular surveys and discussions were used to actively seek feedback about the service. We saw clear evidence that people's views directly influenced improvements, and outcomes were shared with them so they could see the difference their voices made. For example,

when people said they would like to spend more time in communal areas with others, staff worked with people to develop a communal games room which promote social engagement.

Staff consistently involved people in decisions about their care and took time to explain what had changed as a result of their feedback. For example, one person expressed their wish to become financially independent, staff supported this wish and was working with the person to ensure this was achieved.

The service demonstrated a strong, open culture of reflection and learning, with complaints used positively to drive meaningful change. People told us they felt listened to, valued, and respected, and were confident that staff would always act in their best interests with kindness, dignity, and respect.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Equity in access

Overall Score



► [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: 

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

Staff demonstrated a good understanding of people’s holistic needs, making appropriate adjustments to reduce barriers. Staff supported people to attend appointments and a variety of community activities. Staff were proactive in

recognising when people were finding things difficult and arranged additional support.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Equity in experiences and outcomes

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

Outstanding – This service is exceptional at maximising 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 were innovative in how they listened to information about people who are most likely to experience inequality in experience or outcomes. Staff and leaders actively used this information to provide exceptionally tailored care, support and treatment in response to this.

Staff worked collaboratively to proactively remove barriers and significantly enhance people's experiences and wellbeing. For example, one person was supported by staff who developed bespoke routines to enable this person to become more independent within the community. Staff personalised their approach which led to a marked improvement in the person's quality of life and enabled them to demonstrate skills and abilities that had previously remained hidden.

Staff demonstrated a deep understanding of people's life histories, identities and protected characteristics, and consistently shaped care around these factors. This created a genuinely inclusive culture where people felt valued, respected and treated fairly. Care was regularly reviewed and adapted to reflect individual needs, risks, strengths and preferences.

Staff actively promoted people's rights, supported them to express their views and advocate for themselves, and remained vigilant to any experience of discrimination. When concerns were identified, staff took prompt and effective action to address them, ensuring people received equitable, dignified and person-centred care at all times.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Planning for the future

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

▶ [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.

People had end of life care plans in place that reflected their wishes, and staff understood who to contact if additional support was required. Where people chose not to express their end-of-life wishes, this was fully respected, and staff revisited these conversations sensitively on a regular basis.

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.

Well-led

Shared direction and culture

Overall Score



► [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: 

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.

The provider created a positive and open environment where people, relatives and staff felt comfortable sharing their views. Staff worked with kindness, honesty and respect and demonstrated a clear understanding of the providers values in their daily practice.

Equality and diversity were promoted across both service delivery and the workforce. The provider worked collaboratively with people and partner organisations to shape and enhance experiences. Staff described the provider and management team as visible, approachable and supportive. One staff member told us, "The culture is very open. All the staff get on well and the management team support us really well. Any concerns are discussed freely and actioned in the best possible way for the person

Well-led

Capable, compassionate and inclusive leaders

Overall Score



▶ [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.

The provider and registered manager showed effective leadership, supported by good knowledge and clear expectations. The registered manager was visible, responsive, and actively involved in care delivery, contributing to a strong sense of trust and confidence in the leadership.

The provider's systems and processes ensured all staff understood their roles and responsibilities and knew when and how to escalate concerns.

Well-led

Freedom to speak up

Overall Score



► [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:
A horizontal row of four circles representing a score from 1 to 4. The first circle contains the number 1, the second contains 2, the third contains 3 and is filled with a dark purple color, and the fourth contains 4. The circles are light purple with dark purple numbers.

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

People, their relatives, and staff all felt able to speak up if they had concerns, trusting that something would be done about them. There was a clear complaints process in place, with information available in different formats so everyone could understand it. Concerns and complaints were recorded, along with any actions taken in response. Staff also knew how to report issues through whistleblowing procedures and felt supported by an open and approachable environment where they could raise concerns freely.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Workforce equality, diversity and inclusion

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

► [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 management team demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of promoting an open, inclusive, and diverse workforce. They gave careful consideration to both staff wellbeing and how staff supported the people in their care.

A range of staff recognition initiatives had been implemented, celebrating achievements and encouraging a positive workplace culture. These initiatives supported diversity, valued contributions, and reinforced the organisation’s commitment to staff wellbeing and inclusion.

The management team supported staff with reasonable adjustments and flexible working when needed. Staff reported that managers were approachable and supported everyone to raise concerns at an early stage. One staff member told us, "The management team are great, they were really supportive when I had a change in my personal life."

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Governance, management and sustainability

Overall Score



► [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.

The registered manager was well organised, and the providers governance systems ensured the service remained safe and effective. The management team all had clearly delegated responsibilities and knew what they needed to do and when to ensure effective oversight was maintained.

A range of audits were regularly conducted, covering areas such as medicines management, health and safety and incident and accidents. These audits were effective in identifying areas for improvement and driving positive changes.

Actions identified from audits were clearly recorded and shared with the staff to ensure appropriate timely action was taken.

Statutory notifications were completed in line with requirements, and the registered manager collaborated with the local authority to ensure safeguarding issues were addressed and people’s safety remained the primary focus. Workforce planning was effectively organised, with recruitment and staff development managed appropriately to respond to the service’s changing needs.

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:

A horizontal row of four circles representing a score from 1 to 4. The first circle contains the number '1', the second '2', the third '3', and the fourth '4'. The third circle is filled with a dark purple color, while the others are light purple.

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.

Management and staff supported people to stay connected with their local communities by helping them access and join meaningful groups. In addition, when existing options didn't fully meet people's needs, staff created tailored in-house activities to ensure people had opportunities that enriched their lives in a way that worked best for them. For example, people using the supported living services were thoughtfully introduced to others with similar interests and preferences, helping them to build meaningful relationships. Staff demonstrated a strong understanding of each person's personality and used this to encourage social interaction, including organising group activities such as gaming afternoons.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Well-led

Learning, improvement and innovation

Overall Score



► [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:
A horizontal row of four circular icons representing a score of 3 out of 4. The first circle contains the number '1', the second '2', the third '3' (which is dark purple and highlighted), and the fourth '4'. All circles are light purple.

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 provider actively engaged with both local and national initiatives to support the ongoing development of the service. Through participation in networks, forums, and collaborative programmes, the provider stayed informed of

emerging best practice, policy changes, and sector developments, which in turn was shared with the staff team.