

# Review of compliance

<b>Brighton Housing Trust Sackville Gardens</b>	
<b>Region:</b>	South East
<b>Location address:</b>	57 Sackville Gardens Hove East Sussex BN3 4GJ
<b>Type of service:</b>	Care home service without nursing
<b>Date of Publication:</b>	January 2012
<b>Overview of the service:</b>	<p>Sackville Gardens provides accommodation and care for up to 5 service users who have or have had mental health issues. The unit also provides outreach support for a number of unstaffed accommodation projects in the local area.</p> <p>Sackville Gardens is operated by Brighton Housing Trust, from whom the nominated individual is Wendy Taylor.</p>

	The registered manager for Sackville Gardens is Ms Romanie Palmer.
--	--

# Summary of our findings for the essential standards of quality and safety

## Our current overall judgement

**Sackville Gardens was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety.**

The summary below describes why we carried out this review, what we found and any action required.

### Why we carried out this review

We carried out this review as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews.

### How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, carried out a visit on 20 December 2011, observed how people were being cared for, talked to staff and reviewed information from stakeholders.

### What people told us

People are involved in determining their treatment plans and feel listened to.

They feel safe and well supported, and that support plans and reviews have been helpful in improving their quality of life.

Survey comments sampled included "I like the people here and staff are friendly, food is good".

### What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Sackville Gardens was meeting them

#### **Outcome 01: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run**

People were involved in the decisions about the care provided. Care was based on their individual needs and preferences. People who used the service were treated with respect.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

#### **Outcome 04: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights**

The planning and delivery of care was meeting the needs of people being supported and ensuring their welfare and safety.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

**Outcome 07: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights**

People living at Sackville Gardens felt safe. Staff were trained and able to respond appropriately to any actual or suspected abuse that occurred.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

**Outcome 14: Staff should be properly trained and supervised, and have the chance to develop and improve their skills**

The service had systems in place to ensure staff received the necessary training and support to care for people who use the service. Staff had regular supervision and appraisals to support them in their role.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

**Outcome 16: The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care**

The provider has ensured that people who use the service were safe. The quality of care provision was monitored and improvements were made when concerns were raised.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

**Other information**

Please see previous reports for more information about previous reviews.

**What we found  
for each essential standard of quality  
and safety we reviewed**

The following pages detail our findings and our regulatory judgement for each essential standard and outcome that we reviewed, linked to specific regulated activities where appropriate.

We will have reached one of the following judgements for each essential standard.

**Compliant** means that people who use services are experiencing the outcomes relating to the essential standard.

A **minor concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard.

A **moderate concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and there is an impact on their health and wellbeing because of this.

A **major concern** means that people who use services are not experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and are not protected from unsafe or inappropriate care, treatment and support.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary improvements are made. Where there are a number of concerns, we may look at them together to decide the level of action to take.

More information about each of the outcomes can be found in the *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*

## Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

### What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- \* Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
- \* Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
- \* Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
- \* Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

### What we found

#### Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

#### Our findings

##### What people who use the service experienced and told us

People are involved in determining their treatment plans and feel listened to.

Comments from people in a Brighton Housing Trust survey from people living at Sackville Gardens included "staff are polite and very friendly".

##### Other evidence

The ethos of the organisation places emphasis on privacy and dignity issues, such as advocacy, empowerment, positive risk taking, and protecting people's rights.

It was the view of the registered manager Ms Romanie Palmer that these principles had continued to be observed at Sackville Gardens.

Support plans which we sampled supported this view.

##### Our judgement

People were involved in the decisions about the care provided. Care was based on their individual needs and preferences. People who used the service were treated with respect.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

## Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

### What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

\* Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

### What we found

#### Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

#### Our findings

##### What people who use the service experienced and told us

One person we spoke to told us that they felt safe living at Sackville Gardens, and that staff support has assisted them to be able to communicate better.

In a 2011 survey of their views carried out by Brighton Housing Trust comments included that support plans and reviews "gets things done", and "I like the people here and staff are friendly, food is good".

People told us that staff listen to their opinions.

##### Other evidence

People we spoke to during our visit told us about activities they were involved in and how they were being supported by the staff team.

For example, one person was being supported each day to take exercise which was assisting them to keep their weight stable and maintain their health.

Activities which support peoples' social and communication skills are seen as important. For example, coffee groups on Sunday mornings have included people from satellite projects – and there is an opportunity to discuss current affairs and other issues.

Staff we spoke to told us that independent living skills are encouraged, so for example everyone cooks a meal at least once per week with staff support, and make

suggestions for the communal menu.

We sampled two sets of plans, and found that relevant documentation such as risk assessments, Care Programme Approach reviews, resident reviews and primary worker summaries were being regularly updated.

Care plans were in place based on the individual needs. For example, one person's care plan advised how they were to be supported with their cooking skills, personal finances, health and weight, hygiene and medication.

In their survey forms people indicated that they found the support sessions productive, and the support plans helpful.

We spoke to a support worker at a day centre attended by a resident at Sackville Gardens, who told us "he seems to be thriving living at Sackville Gardens. The review I attended at Sackville Gardens was well run and thoughtful – it reflected (the resident's) views".

### **Our judgement**

The planning and delivery of care was meeting the needs of people being supported and ensuring their welfare and safety.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

## Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

### What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

\* Are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are respected and upheld.

### What we found

#### Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

#### Our findings

##### What people who use the service experienced and told us

People said in surveys and during our visit that they felt safe and well supported.

Two people indicated in their survey responses that they were familiar with the safeguarding arrangements which were in place, and a third person indicated that they didn't know how the safeguarding arrangements worked.

##### Other evidence

Policies and procedures are in place for people to be safeguarded, and staff attend training in protecting vulnerable adults.

The service has continued to raise safeguarding alerts when appropriate.

A member of the local mental health team who we spoke to told us that the service had handled some difficult safeguarding issues well, and had taken care to ensure that the service user's views were represented during the safeguarding process.

##### Our judgement

People living at Sackville Gardens felt safe. Staff were trained and able to respond appropriately to any actual or suspected abuse that occurred.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

## Outcome 14: Supporting staff

### What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

\* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by competent staff.

### What we found

#### Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 14: Supporting staff

#### Our findings

##### What people who use the service experienced and told us

In a 2011 survey of their views carried out by Brighton Housing Trust comments included "staff are amiable".

##### Other evidence

Arrangements are in place for staff to undertake mandatory training, and the manager Ms Palmer advised us that clearer records for when staff need to refresh their mandatory training are being put in place.

An audit of staff training needs was recently carried out, which gave staff the opportunity to request training that would support them in the work they were doing. Training arranged subsequently for the individual included courses in dual diagnosis, assertiveness, presentation skills and computer spreadsheets.

A member of staff we spoke to said they had requested and attended training in supervision skills which had been helpful.

We sampled the record of training completed, and this included courses in cognitive behaviour principles, professional boundaries, group work skills, and psychiatric medication.

Ms Palmer said that a staff conference arranged by the company had helped staff understand how other projects were working and to share ideas.

A member of staff told us that 1-1 supervision takes place monthly, and a supervision record sampled indicated that topics covered included training needs and development issues.

**Our judgement**

The service had systems in place to ensure staff received the necessary training and support to care for people who use the service. Staff had regular supervision and appraisals to support them in their role.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

## Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

### What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

\* Benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support, due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

### What we found

#### Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

#### Our findings

##### What people who use the service experienced and told us

People had expressed broadly positive views on the quality of service provision in the survey feedback questionnaires which we sampled.

##### Other evidence

There was evidence that the service has continued to develop with a view to better meeting the needs of the people accommodated.

For example the service had been developing their outreach support to include support with medication, benefits and finance, and the move-on accommodation they access had enabled clients to move to more independent accommodation while working with the same support staff.

Ms Palmer thought that changes to maintenance arrangements might give clients work opportunities in maintenance tasks.

Improvements to the environment have included new carpeting in the main hallway.

We noted that due to paint peeling the wall surfaces in the laundry room are not impermeable, which is important for maintaining a hygienic environment. Ms Palmer advised us that it is part of the planned maintenance schedule that the wall surfaces be made impermeable and therefore fully cleanable again.

Policies and procedures recently updated have included medication procedures, and

arrangements to provide regular checks on medication records are in place.

Ms Palmer said that trips out have been successful – and that inviting people from other outreach houses on the trips had helped provide more interaction for people.

**Our judgement**

The provider has ensured that people who use the service were safe. The quality of care provision was monitored and improvements were made when concerns were raised.

Overall, we found that Sackville Gardens was meeting this essential standard.

# What is a review of compliance?

By law, providers of certain adult social care and health care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has written guidance about what people who use services should experience when providers are meeting essential standards, called *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*.

CQC licenses services if they meet essential standards and will constantly monitor whether they continue to do so. We formally review services when we receive information that is of concern and as a result decide we need to check whether a service is still meeting one or more of the essential standards. We also formally review them at least every two years to check whether a service is meeting all of the essential standards in each of their locations. Our reviews include checking all available information and intelligence we hold about a provider. We may seek further information by contacting people who use services, public representative groups and organisations such as other regulators. We may also ask for further information from the provider and carry out a visit with direct observations of care.

When making our judgements about whether services are meeting essential standards, we decide whether we need to take further regulatory action. This might include discussions with the provider about how they could improve. We only use this approach where issues can be resolved quickly, easily and where there is no immediate risk of serious harm to people.

Where we have concerns that providers are not meeting essential standards, or where we judge that they are not going to keep meeting them, we may also set improvement actions or compliance actions, or take enforcement action:

**Improvement actions:** These are actions a provider should take so that they **maintain** continuous compliance with essential standards. Where a provider is complying with essential standards, but we are concerned that they will not be able to maintain this, we ask them to send us a report describing the improvements they will make to enable them to do so.

**Compliance actions:** These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. Where a provider is not meeting the essential standards but people are not at immediate risk of serious harm, we ask them to send us a report that says what they will do to make sure they comply. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action to make sure that essential standards are met.

**Enforcement action:** These are actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers are set out in the law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

## Information for the reader

<b>Document purpose</b>	Review of compliance report
<b>Author</b>	Care Quality Commission
<b>Audience</b>	The general public
<b>Further copies from</b>	03000 616161 / <a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk">www.cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Copyright</b>	Copyright © (2010) Care Quality Commission (CQC). This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part, free of charge, in any format or medium provided that it is not used for commercial gain. This consent is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and on proviso that it is not used in a derogatory manner or misleading context. The material should be acknowledged as CQC copyright, with the title and date of publication of the document specified.

## Care Quality Commission

<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk">www.cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Telephone</b>	03000 616161
<b>Email address</b>	<a href="mailto:enquiries@cqc.org.uk">enquiries@cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Postal address</b>	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA