

Ms Ann Mangham

Ann Mangham

Inspection report

Whiteley House
5 Whiteley Street, Featherstone
Pontefract
West Yorkshire
WF7 5HB

Tel: 01977695425

Date of inspection visit:
04 May 2017

Date of publication:
14 June 2017

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service effective?

Good ●

Is the service caring?

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Ann Mangham provides accommodation for up to 10 people with mental health needs. The service mainly provides guidance and supervision to promote an independent lifestyle. The accommodation consists of the main house which supports five people (four people at the time of inspection), Four individual flats and a separate house for one person. At the time of inspection there were nine people receiving a service.

At the last inspection, the service was rated Good.

One key question was rated 'Requires Improvement.' The service had not always ensured the premises was effective for people. At this inspection we found the provider had made improvements in this area.

At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

Why the service is rated Good

People received support if and when they needed this which was individual to their needs, and risks were minimised wherever possible whilst maintain people's independence. Staff received training and support which helped them be effective in their roles. The deputy on the day of inspection had placed three staff on a first aid course which ensured all staff were up to date with their training. People had maximum choice and control of their own lives. The service provider's policies and systems were up to date and in place. We observed a relaxed atmosphere in people's own flats and house, and saw people were free to decide how they spent their time. The deputy and registered manager ensured the quality of the service was monitored, and improvements were made when required.

Further information is in the detailed findings below.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

At our last inspection we rated this key question 'Requires Improvement'. At this inspection we saw the required action had been taken, and we were able to improve the rating to Good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Ann Mangham

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection checked whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014. This was a comprehensive inspection which took place on 04 May 2017 and was unannounced.

The inspection was carried out by one adult social care inspector and an expert-by-experience who had experience of services for people with mental health. An expert-by-experience is a person who has personal experience of using or caring for someone who uses this type of care service.

Before our inspection we reviewed all the information we held about the service. This included any statutory notifications that had been sent to us. Before the inspection, the provider can be asked to complete a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. On this occasion we did not ask the provider to complete this. We contacted the local authority and Healthwatch. Healthwatch is an independent consumer champion that gathers and represents the views of the public about health and social care services in England.

At the time of our inspection there were nine people living at the service. During our visit we spoke with four people who used the service, three members of staff, the deputy manager and the registered manager. We spent some time observing support given to people at their home. We also spent some time looking at documents and records that related to people's care and the management of the service. We looked at three people's care plans.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People we spoke with who lived at Whitely House told us they felt safe living there. One person said, "Yes I am safe here." A second person said, "Oh yes, I am safe." A third person said, "Yes, I always feel safe here. I like the home I have got." A fourth person said, "Yes, I feel safe."

We looked at the recruitment records for three staff members. We found recruitment practices were safe. Relevant checks had been completed before staff worked unsupervised at the home which included records of Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. The DBS checks assist employers in making safer recruitment decisions by checking prospective staff members are not barred from working with vulnerable people.

People were protected from abuse and harm by staff who understood the principles of safeguarding and understood when and how to report any concerns. They had confidence the deputy and registered manager would act appropriately on any concerns brought to them.

Risks were identified in assessments in people's care plans which were appropriately assessed, managed and reviewed. The deputy was in the process of changing over to new care plans to include more positive risk assessments for people to maintain their independence in their homes.

We observed that people were able to move around freely and safely in the communal areas of the main house. We saw that people came in and out of the main house as they wished. On the day of inspection we saw that there were two care staff, one domestic and the deputy manager available to people. We looked at the rotas for the previous and following two weeks. We saw there were adequate members of staff on shift to support people if they required this.

The main house was clean and there were no odours present. We observed the domestic staff cleaning in the main house during our visit. People living at the service told us they kept either their rooms/flats clean although there was a cleaner most days at the service. One person said, "The cleaner comes in and cleans my flat." A second person said, "I keep my flat clean but we do have a cleaner every day."

Medicines were managed safely and stored securely. We found records relating to medicines administration were up to date and completed with no gaps. Stocks of medicines were checked weekly, meaning any errors would be identified in a timely and efficient way.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our last inspection on 21 December 2015, we rated this key question as 'requires improvement'. We identified one breach of regulations. We found the premises needed further work in relation to a hazard in the garage floor. At this inspection saw evidence of the work been carried out, and we concluded the provider was no longer in breach of regulations.

People told us that they felt that their needs were being met by staff who knew what they were doing. People confirmed they had access to health care services. One person told us they had been to see the doctor the day before and that they visited other health care professionals. A second person said, "I went to see the GP yesterday but I also go to the dentist and I go to Spec Savers opticians." A third person said, "If I need the doctor I go see him. I go to Pontefract to have my bloods done regularly." We saw evidence to show people were involved in making decisions about their care. Where people could they signed to say they agreed and understood in relation to their care plans.

We observed two people having lunch in the dining kitchen. There were two staff sat chatting with people at the large table in the dining kitchen. We saw one person was having a sandwich whilst another person was having a microwaved meal. We saw throughout the day that people made their own drinks. People either came into the dining kitchen in the main house or made drinks in their own flats. Staff we spoke with told us that most people did their own breakfast. One member of staff said, "They are all pretty independent."

People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). Everyone we spoke to had capacity. Everyone told us they could do what they wanted and if they needed support staff were there to assist and guide them. Staff showed a good understanding of protecting people's rights to refuse care and support. They said they would always explain the risks from refusing care or support and try to discuss alternative options to give people more choice and control over their decisions.

Staff we spoke with told us they received regular training. One member of staff told us they had recently completed mental health training which was relevant to their role. A second member of staff told us they had completed training in the following areas: Fire, Health and Safety, First Aid, mental health and safeguarding.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

Everyone we spoke with told us they thought that the staff were kind, caring and treated them with respect. One person said, "The staff are all right." A second person said, "The staff are good." A third said, "The staff are lovely here. They have a laugh and a joke with you. [Name of manager] is lovely. It is lovely here they take care of me - all the lot of them." A fourth person said, "The staff are all right. They are all nice people."

People living at the service told us that staff always knocked on their bedroom/flat doors before being asked to enter. We observed throughout the day that staff did knock on doors and waited to be asked to enter people's flats.

There was good interaction between people living at the service and the staff. We observed people laughing and joking with staff whilst having their lunch. We did not see any poor interaction as everyone appeared to be relaxed in their surroundings.

People were supported to maintain their independence. We saw people were involved in household tasks such as doing their own laundry and cooking.

People we spoke with all confirmed that their friends and relatives could visit at any time and there were no restrictions. One person said, "Yes my family come to visit – they don't come all of the time." A staff member said "The best bit of working here is seeing how well residents are doing – becoming more independent and having happy lives." A second member of staff said "I love it here."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People we spoke with told us that they were able to get up and go to bed as they wished. People also told us they were able to go out into the community as and when they wanted to. One person said, "Yes, I can get up and go to bed as I want. I go out to Castleford sometimes." A second person said, "I go to bed get up as I want. I go to coffee mornings or go around the shops. There used to be a drop in centre, but it is shut now." A third person said, "I go out shopping with staff." A fourth person said, "I go out nearly every day for a coffee."

People were supported in promoting their independence and community involvement. People told us they took part in a range of activities which included accessing the local and wider community.

People received care which was personalised and responsive to their needs. Staff who worked with them helped ensure their preferences and wishes were identified and their involvement in the support planning process was continuous. They also liaised with family members and other professionals when required. We looked at the care plans for four people who used the service and saw evidence confirming this was the case.

There were policies and procedures in place to ensure concerns or complaints were responded to appropriately. The deputy manager told us they had not received any complaints since our last inspection. People we spoke with knew who to speak to if they had a complaint or any concerns. One person said, "I would speak to staff if I had a complaint." A second person said, "I would speak with staff if I was not happy." A third person said, "I would go straight to [name of manager] or one of the staff. I never have any complaints as I am happy with everything." A fourth person said, "I would speak to staff if I was unhappy."

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

There was a registered manager in post when we inspected. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

People living at the service told us they thought it was well run, and they were satisfied with everything. One person said, "I am happy with everything here." A second person said, "I am happy with everything you could not have any better home to live in and I have lived in a few." A third person said, "Overall, I would say that I am happy here most of the time. If I wasn't happy here I would leave."

Our discussions with people and our observations during our inspection showed there was a positive culture and atmosphere, which was person-centred and inclusive. For example people chose what they wanted to do each day and had a say in everything that happened in the service.

Staff said they felt well supported in their role. They said the deputy and registered manager worked alongside them to ensure good standards were maintained and the team were aware of any issues that may have affected the service. Staff said they felt listened to and could contribute ideas or raise concerns if they had any.

We looked at ten surveys that had been sent in October 2016 to people. One comment stated 'The staff here are really helpful. They are always willing to sit and listen to you and help and motivate you,' All the surveys we saw had been ticked that people were happy with the service.

One member of staff told us they held regular residents meetings. A second member of staff said, "We have regular residents and staff meetings." Staff meetings had been recorded as being held on January, February, March and April 2017. We did not see any detailed records of what had been discussed at these meetings but staff told us they were happy they received all relevant information needed to complete their role and support people if needed.

There were systems and processes in place to ensure the quality of the service was kept under review, and improvements put in place where necessary. The deputy and registered manager had good systems in place to ensure they worked effectively together to maintain and drive standards. There was a system for auditing and these were monthly. The audits included medication, finances, training, care plans and the environment. We saw the deputy and registered manager recorded any issues in relation to the premises, complaints and safeguarding. Records included the action to be taken where issues had been identified; and the person responsible for completing the task and when it should be completed.