

Fire Fighters Charity

Jubilee House Therapy Centre

Inspection report

Eamont Park
Eamont Bridge
Penrith
Cumbria
CA10 2BN

Tel: 01768890009

Website: www.firefighterscharity.org.uk

Date of inspection visit:
14 September 2016

Date of publication:
14 December 2016

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

The inspection took place on 14 September 2016 and was unannounced.

The service was previously inspected on 3 July 2014 when it was found to be fully compliant with the regulations in force at that time.

The Fire Fighters Charity is a national Charity providing assistance to serving and retired members of the fire and rescue service community, as well as eligible dependants. The Charity aims to enhance quality of life and make a positive difference to the lives of people who use their services.

The Fire Fighters Charity operates Jubilee House Therapy Centre which is a purpose built rehabilitation and therapy centre, situated near to Penrith. This facility provides a bespoke service to people in the fire and rescue community.

People who used this service did not permanently reside at Jubilee House. The four beds registered with the Care Quality Commission were used to accommodate people who required nursing input during their planned programme of rehabilitation and therapy. The registered beds were located on the ground floor in large, ensuite rooms which enabled people with a wide range of needs to be accommodated.

There is a registered manager at the service. 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.

During our inspection of this service we saw, and people told us, that they were well supported and cared for. Comments from the people who used this service included; "The staff here always check with me at each visit, what I need and how much help I would like. I am respected here." And "I am very lucky to have access to this service. The staff are brilliant and the facilities are excellent. It's truly marvellous and I would live here if I could."

All the people who used this service, who we spoke to, commented on the way in which staff respected their individual needs and choices. No one could "fault" the service in any area.

We reviewed the care and support records of people who were using the service at the time of our inspection. We checked this information with people who used this service during our discussions with them and found that the information was accurate and up to date. We found that care and support was tailored and personalised to meet each person's needs and aspirations.

We spoke to two members of staff who were working in the nursing unit at the time of our inspection. They told us that they liked "the management style" at the service. They said that the management team were "supportive and approachable." Staff told us that they regularly met with their manager and that they were

provided with suitable training to help them keep their skills and knowledge up to date. We reviewed staff training and supervision records during the inspection, which verified what we had been told by the staff and the manager at the service.

The premises were well maintained, clean and fresh smelling. There were extensive policies and procedures in place and staff understood their roles with regards to infection control and prevention.

Maintenance records kept at the service showed that the premises and the equipment were regularly serviced. There were risk assessments in place, which included emergency and contingency plans should the service need to be evacuated.

People who used the service told us they were well supported with their nutritional and hydration needs, including special diets such as weight reducing diets or vegetarian diets. People were able to choose what they wanted for their meals. Everyone that we spoke to was very complimentary and satisfied with the standard of food and drink available.

We observed that staff showed concern for people in a caring way. Staff approached people in a friendly manner, provided explanations or just stopped to have a chat with people using the service.

People had access to social and leisure activities, both at the service and in the wider community.

There was a complaints process in place at the home. People knew who to raise concerns with, but no one we spoke to had ever made a complaint about the service.

The service carried out quality assurance surveys and checks. People who used this service told us they were asked about their experiences at the end of every stay. People told us they felt the service listened to them and they gave us examples of changes that had been made as a result of their comments.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Good ●

The service was safe.

There were sufficient numbers of skilled and experienced staff on duty to safely meet the needs of people who used the service.

Risks had been appropriately assessed and identified. Staff had been provided with clear guidance to help ensure people who used this service were safely supported.

The service had robust processes and checks in place to help ensure suitable people were recruited to work at Jubilee House Therapy Centre.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Staff were motivated and well supported in their job roles. They were well trained and there were robust induction training programmes to help ensure new members of staff understood their roles and responsibilities.

People who used this service were very independent. The service ensured that people were involved in decision making processes and people gave their consent prior to any treatment plan being implemented.

People were well supported with their nutritional needs. Any special dietary requirements were met and appropriately planned for.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring

The staff team was well established and knew the people who used the service very well. We observed that they treated people in a friendly, caring and courteous manner.

People who used the service told us that staff treated them with dignity at all times and respected their independence, rights and

choices.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

People's care and treatment plans were detailed, personalised and contained information to enable staff to meet their identified care needs and personal goals.

People who used the service were empowered to make meaningful decisions about their rehabilitation programmes, goals and how they lived their lives.

There were systems and transitional processes in place to make sure people had access to emergency healthcare should they become ill during their stay at the service.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well led.

Managers provided staff with leadership, direction and support.

Staff at the service worked closely and effectively to ensure people were supported in having their individual needs, goals and aspirations met.

There were effective quality assurance systems in place designed to both monitor the quality of care provided and drive improvements within the service. The provider placed great emphasis on listening to the people who used the service.

Jubilee House Therapy Centre

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 was planned to check 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 inspection took place on 14 September 2016 and was unannounced.

The inspection was undertaken by one adult social care inspector.

The registered manager was aware of their duty to inform us of different incidents and we saw evidence that this had been done in line with the regulations. Records were kept of incidents and issues. Prior to our inspection we looked at the information we held about the service, including statutory notifications and the Statement of Purpose for the organisation. The provider also completed 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. We also reviewed this document prior to our inspection visit.

During the inspection we spoke to all three of the people who were using the service. We interviewed two members of staff and spoke to the registered manager. We looked at the care records of all three of the people who were using the service at the time of our inspection. We looked at the recruitment records of two members of staff and we sampled the supervision records of three members of staff.

We reviewed the internal evaluation reports of the service provided by Jubilee House. We reviewed a sample of the provider's policies and procedures, including emergency protocols, complaints and compliments, safe management of medicines and infection control and prevention.

We also reviewed records relating to the management of safety and maintenance of the premises and

equipment.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

One person who used this service told us; "I am a regular visitor to this service. The staff always check with me at every visit what help I need. There are some things I can and prefer to do for myself. Staff are very respectful about my needs and wishes."

Another person said; "They (staff) check my care and support needs with me every time I visit. I am given a tour of the centre. As well as checking my care needs the staff also go through the emergency procedures here, including the fire evacuation procedures. I am very well supported and feel very safe here."

We reviewed the care records of the people using this service. We found that everyone had received a review of their risk assessments on admission with regards to manual handling, mobility equipment, medication and potential skin care needs. The assessments took into consideration people's personal needs, any risks involved and the level of their independence.

We looked at the way in which medicines were managed at the service. At the time of our visit everyone using the service was managing their own medicines. The service had policies and procedures in place with regards to the safe management and administration of medicines. Staff told us, and their training records showed that they had received training to help them support people safely with their medication needs. Although there were processes in place to assist people with their medicines if needed, staff told us that generally, people were supported and encouraged to manage their own medicines whenever possible.

There were robust risk assessments in place to help make sure people could safely manage their medicines. The people using this service at the time of our inspection showed us that their medicines were stored safely and securely in their own private room and confirmed that they had their own key to their medication cabinet.

Staff training records showed that staff had received training with regards to moving and handling people, risk assessment processes, accident reporting and health and safety. In addition they had also undertaken training about safeguarding vulnerable adults.

The provider had policies and procedures with regards to all of these matters. The staff we spoke to told us that they were expected to keep up to date with these and that the procedures were regularly discussed in supervision and staff meetings. This helped to check that staff understood the protocols and were kept up to date with any changes.

Emergency procedures had been reviewed and updated following any incidents. The service was located in a known high flood risk area. Following flooding events in 2015, the procedures had been reviewed and updated to reflect 'lessons learned' and ensure people who used the service and the staff that worked there were safe.

We saw that there were other appropriate emergency evacuation procedures in place, regular fire drills had

been completed and all fire-fighting equipment had been serviced and maintained. All lifting and mobility equipment within the service appeared in good condition and had been regularly tested and serviced. All electrical equipment had been tested to ensure its effective and safe operation.

The registered manager told us that the organisation had a Health and Safety Committee. Their roles included the review and production of an analysis of any accident and incident reports. Within Jubilee House there were health and safety representatives, who met regularly to discuss safety at the service and report back to the Health and Safety Committee.

There was an operations manager employed at the service. They were responsible for the maintenance and safety of the premises. We reviewed a sample of the maintenance and safety records for Jubilee House. We found that the service had a programme in place for the routine servicing of equipment and had carried out risk assessments to help ensure the environment and property were safe and well maintained.

At the time of our inspection there were a sufficient number of staff on duty to meet the needs of the people who used this service. No one raised any issues with us about the staffing levels and people told us that the staff were "very attentive." People told us that staff attended to them when they needed them and no one had to wait for assistance. The staff we spoke to during our visit thought that there were "enough" of them to meet the needs of the people using the service. One member of staff said; "I really like working here. I am able to spend time getting to know the people who use this service." Another member of staff told us; "There are always enough staff around. People don't have to wait for us to help them. That is the satisfying part of the job. I am not rushing round from one person to another I can spend meaningful time with them all."

The registered manager told us that the needs, requirements and dependency levels of each person were taken into account prior to their visit to the centre. This information was also taken into account when assessing the staffing levels at the service and adjustments were made accordingly.

We looked at the staff recruitment processes in place at the service, including a review of staff recruitment records. We found that prospective staff had completed application forms and attended for an interview with the registered manager, prior to being selected for the job. We found that robust checks had been made on prospective employees to help ensure only suitable people were selected to work at Jubilee House.

On the day of our visit the service was clean, tidy and fresh smelling. The people we spoke to during our visit told us that Jubilee House was "always lovely and clean." Staff at the home had participated in training about the prevention and control of infection. There were robust and service appropriate policies and procedures in place for the prevention and control of infection. We saw staff demonstrating good infection control practices, such as hand washing and the use of protective clothing when needed.

The registered manager had carried out infection control and prevention audits. Where shortfalls had been identified, an action plan had been developed to help ensure these matters were addressed in a timely manner.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

One person who used this service told us; "The majority of staff here are long serving and I think they have been chosen very carefully. They (staff) always ask me what I need and what I want to concentrate on at each of my stays here."

Another person commented: "The staff are brilliant. They know what they are doing and they always ask me what I want or need during my stay. I have been coming here for a number of years now and everything is always ready and waiting for me in my room. This includes the equipment and adaptations I need to maintain my independence."

We were also told by a person who used this service; "The staff are excellent, I can't fault them. They understand and support my needs. The food is also amazing. I am being supported with a healthy eating programme, but you know, I can choose whatever I like."

People told us and we observed that care and support was provided by well trained and well supported staff. We reviewed the staff training matrix, compared this with staff training records and spoke to the staff on duty. The documents accurately recorded the training staff had undertaken. The records showed staff had completed a range of appropriate training including the safeguarding of adults, moving and handling, infection control and first aid at work training. The registered nurses had received additional training in a variety of topics including the Mental Capacity Act, falls prevention, catheterisation and diversity and inclusion training.

We looked at a sample of staff supervision records and spoke to staff about the support they received from the managers. We found that staff met with the registered manager frequently in order to discuss their work, performance and development as well as any personal matters that had a direct impact on their work. Although these were formal meetings, staff told us that they could speak to the manager or other senior staff at anytime if there were issues or concerns.

There were good communication processes in place to help make sure all staff involved with people's care and support were kept up to date with any change in need or abilities. The care plans of people who used the service were checked at each shift handover. This helped to make sure that staff coming on duty were given current information regarding the people they were supporting.

One member of staff told us, "We are provided with relevant training. We are able to access training in a variety of ways. For example some of the courses are on-line and some are face to face. I am very happy working here. I feel valued and well supported. I feel I have the skills and knowledge to carry out my role safely. In addition I have access to the therapists who are also employed here if I need expert advice on a particular issue."

We spoke to a member of staff who had recently returned to work at the service after a number of years. They took us through their training and induction record folder. This member of staff spoke about their

training and support with enthusiasm. They told us; "Even though I have worked here before, I still received induction training. The training has been tailored to my needs and I worked alongside a very experienced member of staff until I felt confident about my role and responsibilities. Part of my induction has included attending lectures and spending time with the therapists. This has helped me to understand the treatment and rehabilitation programmes provided to the people I support during their stay."

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). The MCA provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The Act requires that, as far as possible, people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and be the least restrictive as possible.

Although Jubilee House provided nursing care as part of the services offered, people who lacked capacity did not normally meet the criteria to access this service. The service provided rehabilitation programmes for people who were able to make and understand complex decisions about their lifestyles. However, three senior members of staff had received training with regards to the MCA 2005. The registered manager had working knowledge of the Act and told us that the organisation was looking to formalise MCA training for all staff.

People who used the service were involved and consulted about the content and development of their personal rehabilitation and treatment programmes. However, they were still able to choose whether to participate in the programme or not. People who used this service did not have their liberty restricted.

People who used the service spoke to us about the standard and choice of food provided. People told us that they were supported with any special dietary requirements. One person told us: "The food is very, very good. They are big portions and always lots of choice. I can have a drink whenever I like and there is always fresh water in my room." Another person said; "I have to ask for half portions, the servings are enormous. They do understand my needs and if I don't like the menu I can ask for something else."

Meals were prepared in the kitchen and served in the restaurant on the premises. We looked at the menus and options available. In addition to the wide range of food and drink on offer, all meals included nutritional content labels, which provided information on energy, calories, fat, carbohydrate, sugars, protein and salt content. This information helped people make informed choices about the food they ate.

Jubilee House was a purpose built rehabilitation centre. It provided support for a diverse range of needs including post-surgery and those with neurological, muscular-skeletal and degenerative conditions. Facilities at the service included a fully equipped gymnasium and sports hall, indoor swimming pool, jacuzzi, sauna and hydrotherapy pool. Social and leisure facilities included a restaurant, bar and lounge with TV and DVD, pool table and extensive gardens.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People who used this service told us that the staff were "very caring" and that they were treated with "respect and dignity." People told us that they felt "listened to" and their wishes were "respected."

One person using the service said; "The staff here are very, very caring. They ask me what problems I want to work and concentrate on at each visit. This service is amazing and should be available to everyone."

Another person told us; Staff are very understanding of my needs. These rooms are in high demand; they take you when they can. I am very lucky. The staff always greet me with a smile on my arrival and are always ready to help."

A third person said; "I have a support plan in place for my stay here. There are areas of my mobility I want to work on. Everything in the plan has been discussed with me and explained."

We observed staff interacting with people who used this service; we noted that there was a good rapport. The atmosphere was relaxed and friendly. Staff had time to talk to people, deal with queries and provide explanations.

The service advised people on the availability of a wide range of advocacy and support services, including services for people with mental health needs, physical disabilities, specific health requirements and with regards to the promotion of healthy lifestyles. Advocacy services were advertised around the building. The registered manager told us that people were supported to access such services if required.

All staff had received training to help them understand and recognise the importance of confidentiality, both in their induction and as part of their ongoing professional training. This was reinforced in the staff handbook and in the provider's code of conduct. Staff gave us examples of how they maintained confidentiality, including the secure storage of personal data and finding private areas for discussions about personal care and support needs with people who used the service. We observed that staff meetings and staff handovers were carried out in private in the office.

Staff had received training in diversity and inclusion, in person centred care and end of life care. Staff told us how much they valued their position at the service and that they had the time to spend with people who used the service. One member of staff said; "It's good to see that people's wellbeing improves during their stay and great to see them leaving with a smile on their face."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

We spoke to all of the people who were using this service at the time of our inspection.

One person said; "The staff always check with me first what I need and how much help I need. They do this every time I stay here. They respect that I want to do some things for myself. I meet with the nurses and therapists and they ask me what problems I want to concentrate on at each visit. They work out an intensive and personal programme for me to try and keep me going and improve my mobility for when I go back home."

Another person told us: "I have improved leaps and bounds since I first started to use this service. Staff are excellent and I cannot fault them. They always check and discuss my care and support needs every time I come to stay. There are plenty of things to do too. I am able to go out into the grounds, there are quiz nights, a bar, snooker and other games if I want to socialise and join in."

The third person we spoke to commented; "I am very lucky to have access to this service. I have been coming here for a number of years. I have a support plan that has been discussed with me so I know what I have agreed to. My aim this week is to improve my mobility so that I can learn to walk again without a stick."

We reviewed the records of the people using this service at the time of our inspection. They confirmed what we had been told during our conversations with them. People were accessing the rehabilitation services to help improve their mobility. Their goals and aspirations had been clearly reviewed and documented. Rehabilitation programmes had been developed by the therapists employed at the centre, which took into account people's abilities and wishes. Levels of risks had been assessed and strategies were in place to help ensure that the people who used this service were supported safely and their need to remain independent respected.

The registered manager told us; "The feedback we receive from our clients is positive, we make a huge impact on their lives, in supporting them to maximise their rehabilitation potential."

A member of the nursing staff told us that most of the people that used this service did not usually require the services of a doctor. However, there were plans in place to help ensure people transitioned smoothly between services when necessary. One of the local GP surgeries were contactable (and attended) should someone become ill during their stay. The nurse also told us that in a medical emergency, paramedics would be called and the person transferred to the local hospital if necessary. We saw that nursing and personal care assessments had been completed. These documents identified and recorded the type and level of help and support people needed. The nurse told us that a copy of these documents would accompany a person if they needed to be admitted to hospital. This type of information helped to ensure people experienced a smooth transition from one service to another in emergency circumstances.

People told us and we found that care, treatment and support plans had been developed with the person and were truly centred around their needs, expectations and personal requirements.

People who used the service told us about the social and leisure activities that were available if they wished to join in. This included walks, quiz nights, snooker and other games as well as a bar facility. We observed in the reception area, that there was information about local churches and faith groups, local tourist attractions, bus timetables and local taxi companies.

The service had a complaints, comments and compliments policy in place. No one we spoke to had ever made a complaint about the service. We checked the information we held about the service and looked at the records kept by the registered manager. We could find no evidence of complaints ever being made. We found a very thick file of thank you letters and compliment cards from satisfied service users or their families.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

People who used Jubilee House told us that the service listened and acted upon any comments they made.

One person told us; "I am asked at every visit for my views on my stay. They always ask me how I have got on with my rehabilitation plan and if everything has been alright." Another person said; "I am asked to complete a satisfaction survey at the end of every visit. They do listen and act upon suggestions." This person gave us examples of changes and improvements that had been made following their comments. One example related to changes that had been made to doors so that wheelchair users could close them more easily.

The service had a registered manager who had been registered for just over two years. The registered manager was fully aware of their responsibilities as an employee of the Fire Fighters Charity. They were positive about the inspection process, valued the feedback given and saw it as an opportunity to further develop the service. The registered manager completed the PIR prior to our inspection. They told us that this document had; "Allowed me to think about my service provision, and the evidence available to support the five key areas of inspection. It served as a quality document and a reflective tool."

The registered manager worked alongside staff on a regular basis in order to monitor performance and offer feedback where needed.

We found a culture of openness and transparency, combined with a dedication to providing the best possible care and support to people accessing the services. All of the staff we spoke to or observed carrying out their work were approachable, knowledgeable, professional and keen to talk about their work. Everyone was committed to the ongoing development of the service.

The organisational 'Clinical and Social Care Governance' policy reflected best practice and guidance issued by organisations such as the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) and the Royal College of Nursing.

Staff members took the initiative of identifying their own training needs, including attending lectures and therapy sessions designed for people who used the service. One member of staff told us that this training had "really helped" them to understand all aspects of the service provided at Jubilee House Therapy Centre.

There was mutual respect between the registered manager and staff with a strong sense of teamwork. Shifts were covered on a rotational basis so everyone gained experience of how the service ran, day and night.

The staff that we spoke to during our visit told us that the manager was very supportive. They told us that the registered manager "listened and acted" upon what was said or asked of her. The management style was described by one member of staff as "supportive and approachable."

The organisation's vision was to support people from the fire and rescue service, placing them at the heart of everything the service did. The stated vision of the service was "To make a positive difference by

supporting people in the fire and rescue community when they are in need. We will work together to enhance their quality of life and change things for the better." We found that the organisational visions and values were respected and promoted at Jubilee House Therapy Centre. The comments from the people we spoke to during our inspection of this service supported these statements.

We looked at the service evaluation that had been carried out by the provider in June 2016. There had been a 51% return rate of surveys from people who had used this service. People had been asked to rate their views and experience of the service based on the ratings of "outstanding", "good", "requires improvement" and "inadequate." Questions in the survey included asking people about accessing the services, the welcome they received on arrival, the environment, catering, treatment and the rehabilitation programme. In all sections people who used this service had awarded a rating of "outstanding". There were specific, additional questions for people who had used the services of Jubilee House in particular. These questions related to the standard of nursing services and the one to one psychological support service. People who used this service had rated these areas of their care as "outstanding" also.

The provider placed a lot of emphasis on 'service user voice'. People who used the service told us that the provider listened to and acted upon their comments about their experiences of using the facilities at Jubilee House Therapy Centre, in order to bring about improvements. People told us that they were always asked to complete a satisfaction survey at the end of their stay. They also felt confident that should they have had any issues during their stay, they were able to raise them with staff. People felt certain that issues would be dealt with straight away and effectively.