

Stepping Stones Care Homes (Phoenix House) Limited

Phoenix House

Inspection report

218-220 Kettering Road
Northampton
Northamptonshire
NN1 4BN

Tel: 01604626272

Date of inspection visit:
07 March 2017

Date of publication:
19 May 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

Phoenix House is registered to provide accommodation and personal care for up to 15 people, some of whom may have a mental health diagnosis. There were 8 people living at the home at the time of this inspection. At the last inspection, in February 2015, the service was rated Good. At this inspection we found that the service remained Good.

People continued to receive safe care. Staff were appropriately recruited and there were enough staff to provide care and support to meet people's needs. People were consistently protected from the risk of harm and received their prescribed medicines safely.

The care that people received continued to be effective. Staff had access to the support, supervision, training and on-going professional development that they required to carry out their roles. People were supported to maintain good health and nutrition.

People developed positive relationships with the staff who were caring and treated people with respect, kindness and courtesy. People had detailed personalised plans of care in place to enable staff to provide consistent care and support in line with people's personal preferences. People knew how to raise a concern or make a complaint and the provider had implemented effective systems to manage any complaints that they may receive.

The service had a positive ethos and an open culture. The registered manager was a positive role model in the home. People and other professionals told us that they had confidence in the manager's ability to provide consistently high quality managerial oversight and leadership to the home.

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 ●

The service remains 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 ●

This service was well-led.

A registered manager was in post.

There were systems in place to monitor the quality and safety of the service and actions were completed in a timely manner.

Records relating to people's care records, staff files and training were accurate and up to date.

People were supported and encouraged to provide feedback about the service and it was used to drive continuous improvement.

Phoenix House

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 that was completed by one inspector on 7 March 2017 and was unannounced.

Before the inspection, the provider 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. The provider returned the PIR and we took this into account when we made judgements in this report.

We also reviewed other information that we held about the service such as notifications, which are events which happened in the service that the provider is required to tell us about, and information that had been sent to us by other agencies. This included the local authority who commissioned services from the provider.

During our inspection we spoke with four people who used the service and five members of staff including the registered manager. We looked at records and charts relating to four people and three staff recruitment records. We looked at other information related to the running of and the quality of the service. This included quality assurance audits, training information for care staff, staff duty rotas, meeting minutes and arrangements for managing complaints.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People received care from a dedicated and caring team of staff. Recruitment processes ensured that staff were suitable for their role and staffing levels were responsive to people's needs. People told us that staff were available when they needed them and that they never had to wait to receive the support they needed. One person said "The staff were really quick to help me when I had a fall in my room; I pressed the call bell and they were here in seconds." Our observations supported these views and we saw that staff responded to people's requests for care in a timely way.

Risks to people had been assessed and we saw that staff were vigilant and worked successfully to provide care and support in a way that kept people safe. The provider had a clear safeguarding procedure and staff were knowledgeable about the steps to take if they were concerned. One member of staff told us "I would raise any concerns with the manager or directors; I know they would get dealt with straight away but I also know the procedure to report concerns outside of the company." Safeguarding notifications had been raised when required and investigations had been completed in a timely manner.

People told us that they always received their prescribed medicines and the medicines management systems in place were clear and consistently followed. The provider had recently changed the pharmacy that dispenses medication to the home. We saw that this system had improved the efficiency of the medicine management system and that people consistently received their medicines when they should.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People received care from staff that were knowledgeable and had received the training and support they needed. Staff training was relevant to their role and equipped them with the skills they needed to care for people living at the home. For example, staff had received specialist mental health training and were supported by the clinical lead to put what they had learnt into practice. All staff had regular supervision and appraisal; one staff member said that "my supervisor who is the [registered] manager is great, because I am quite new to the team she makes me feel fully involved, part of the team and part of the decision making processes."

People were encouraged to make decisions about their care and their day to day routines and preferences. Staff had a good understanding of service users' rights regarding choice. Detailed assessments had been conducted to determine people's ability to make specific decisions and where appropriate Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) authorisations had been obtained from the local authority. One person told us "The staff always ask me what my plans are for the day, whether I need any support and what activities I would like to be involved in, they never try to pressure me and if I feel like not doing much that is okay as well."

People were supported to maintain a healthy balanced diet and those at risk of not eating and drinking enough received the support they required to maintain their nutritional intake. People had regular access to healthcare professionals and staff were vigilant to any changes in people's health where prompt and appropriate referrals were made to healthcare and social care professionals.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People developed positive relationships with staff and were treated with compassion and respect. One person told us "The staff have been great; everybody wants to support you." Another person told us "The staff are always understanding and supportive. Sometimes I have bad days and don't always say the kindest things to people but the staff never treat me any different and they don't hold it against me; they know me well and I feel safe because of that."

People were relaxed in the company of staff and clearly felt comfortable in their presence. We observed that staff knew people well and engaged people in meaningful conversation. People's choices in relation to their daily routines and activities were listened to; staff treated people as individuals, listened to them and respected their wishes. Staff were observed speaking to people in a kind manner and offering people choices in their daily lives, for example if they wanted any snacks and what support did they need to prepare and cook their evening meals.

People were treated with dignity and respect. We saw that people were asked discreetly if they required any support. Staff were aware if people became anxious or unsettled and provided people with support in a dignified manner. Staff approached people calmly, made eye contact and had a positive approach to supporting people. One person told us "Some days I need more support than others, but I don't feel like I am bothering the staff."

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People received care that met their individual needs. A range of assessments had been completed for each person. People home and where appropriate their relatives and other health and social care professionals were involved in developing their detailed care plans.. Staff knew people very well; their backgrounds and what care and support they needed. One staff member said "We really take the time to get to know each person, to understand their life story; this is really helpful in helping them settle and feel at home here". One person told us that "The staff were great when I moved in, I spent some time visiting first to get used to the surroundings and it has been great since then."

People were supported to follow their interests and take part in social activities. For example one person told us about the arts and crafts they are supported to do. There was a gym situated in the garden that people told us they used to carry out their exercises. Another person told us about a group cooking session which took place weekly where three or four people were supported to cook for the rest of the people living at the home. Some people undertook volunteer work in the community and others were supported to look for paid employment.

People and their relatives knew how to make a complaint if they needed and were confident that their concerns would be carefully considered however none of them had needed to make a formal complaint. One person told us "I've never really needed to make a complaint; if I am not happy with something I talk to the manager and she puts it right." We saw that there was a clear complaints policy in place. Records were maintained of all the issues that had been raised with the manager detailed actions that had been taken.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

People benefited from receiving care from a team of people who were committed to providing the best possible care and support they could which was consistent and could be relied upon. People knew who the registered manager was and were confident in talking to them about their care and support needs. Staff felt well supported and said that they would not hesitate to speak to the registered manager if they needed to.

Staff were focussed on the outcomes for the people that used the service and staff worked well as a team to ensure that each person's needs were met. All of the staff we spoke with were committed to providing a high standard of personalised care, support and rehabilitation. One member of staff told us "This is a really good company to work for; we provide person-centred care, everyone is treated as an individual."

Staff felt listened to and were in regular contact with the management. Staff told us that they were involved with the development of people's care plans. The management team were receptive to staff ideas and suggestions and made the appropriate changes when necessary. Meetings were held with staff which enabled them to share good practice and keep up to date with any changes or developments within the company. Staff were individually recognised for their care and commitment through employee of the month recognition which was voted for by people who use the service and staff; the registered manager presented a monetary voucher to the staff in recognition of their work. This helped to embed the culture and ethos of the service that was to 'promote independence through supporting people'.

Quality assurance systems were in place to help drive improvements. These included a number of internal checks and audits as well as a provider audit. These helped to highlight areas where the service was performing well and the areas which required development.

Systems were in place to encourage people, visitors and staff to provide feedback about the home and the quality of care people received. In addition to the monthly meetings people had about their care, people were invited to 'community' meetings to discuss general issues regarding the home. This included an introduction to new people that had moved in, fire safety procedures and opportunities for people to raise any new concerns.

Annual satisfaction questionnaires were completed by people who used the service and their relatives if people consented to this. Feedback included "Brilliant care and treatment, most staff are fabulous" and "I love Phoenix House and staff and would happily live here forever."

The management and staff strived to provide people with the care and support they needed to live their lives as independently as they chose. People were fully involved in developing the service. For example, a revised welcome booklet was in the process of being developed with full contribution from people who used the service.

Records relating to the day-to-day management of the home were up-to-date and accurate. Care records accurately reflected the level of care people received. Records relating to staff recruitment and training were

fit for purpose. Training records showed that new staff had completed their induction and staff that had been employed for twelve months or more were scheduled to attend 'refresher' training. Staff were encouraged to gain further qualifications, registered nurses were supported to revalidate their professional qualification and specialised training was provided.

There were policies and procedures in place which covered all aspects relevant to operating the home which included safeguarding, whistleblowing and recruitment procedures. Staff had access to the policies and procedures whenever they were required and were expected to read and understand them as part of their role.