

Review of compliance

<p>Mercia Care Homes Limited Sefton Park</p>	
<p>Region:</p>	<p>South West</p>
<p>Location address:</p>	<p>Sefton Park 10 Royal Crescent Weston-super-Mare Somerset BS23 2AX</p>
<p>Type of service:</p>	<p>Residential substance misuse treatment and/or rehabilitation service</p> <p>Care home service without nursing</p>
<p>Date of Publication:</p>	<p>December 2011</p>
<p>Overview of the service:</p>	<p>Sefton Park is registered to provide accommodation and personal care for up to 28 adults. The service provides residential treatment, counselling and support for alcoholism and other addictions.</p>

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

Our current overall judgement

Sefton Park 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 7 October 2011, observed how people were being cared for, looked at records of people who use services, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

People told us that they felt that Sefton Park was a supportive place to stay. One person said, "All the staff are very supportive you can go to them at any time". People said staff spent time with them and counselled them in a way that was respectful and supportive. One person told us, "Sefton Park is comfortable, welcoming and safe". People told us that nearly all staff were always polite and respectful to them. A number of people told us there was one member of staff who was not always polite or respectful.

People felt safe at Sefton Park and they were supported in their treatment and recovery by staff who understood how to keep them safe from the risks of abuse.

People were being supported in their treatment and recovery by staff with a good knowledge of their range of needs. The staff had done a lot of training to help them understand what care and support people needed for successful treatment for addictions.

People were asked their views of the care and support they received. This information was used as part of the process of monitoring and improving the quality of service and outcomes for people.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Sefton Park 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 are well treated and well supported by the staff who are helping them in their recovery and treatment. People are supported to take responsibility for successfully completing their treatment and recovery.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park was meeting this essential standard.

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

People are receiving suitable care and treatment to help them in their recovery from their addictions. Each person also benefits because they have an informative care plan to guide the staff to help them receive effective treatment.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park was meeting this essential standard.

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

People feel safe living at Sefton Park. They are protected from the risk of abuse by procedures to guide the staff in the way they treat people. People are further protected because staff undertake training to understand the subject of safeguarding vulnerable adults.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park was meeting this essential standard.

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

People are cared for by a staff team who are effectively supervised and who are competent to them through their treatment and recovery.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park 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 quality of the service people received is checked and monitored. People are enabled to give their views of the quality of service. There are systems in place to learn from incident and events involving people at Sefton Park.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park 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

We saw that staff talked to people in a respectful and polite manner. We observed people go into the office when they wanted to talk to staff. Staff responded to people's requests and spent time with them. People told us nearly all staff were always polite and respectful to them. A number of people told us there was a member of staff who was not always polite or respectful in their attitude. We made the manager aware of what we had been told. We asked them to address the concerns raised about this staff member.

People told us there was an 'induction group' organised for people who had recently come to Sefton Park. We were told that the group was to help them ease into life at Sefton Park and into their treatment programme. We were also told that there was a 'buddy' system of support for new people who received treatment. People who were in treatment for some time, were asked to support new people to help them to get used to Sefton Park.

People had their own service user's forum and this group was seen as one way to take up matters of importance with the staff. The forum helped people to be able to influence how the service is run.

People told us that they were expected to carry out house activities and chores such as

cleaning or washing up, as part of their programmes of treatment. This was a simple example of people being involved in how the service was run.

We were told that the philosophy of Sefton Park was that "it was run as a therapeutic community". When people had been at Sefton Park for some time and it was felt they were ready, they were given the role of group leader or deputy leader. People told us that these roles involved helping to run groups and to facilitate the smooth, day to day running of the home.

Other evidence

We did not use any other evidence for this outcome area.

Our judgement

People are well treated and well supported by the staff who are helping them in their recovery and treatment. People are supported to take responsibility for successfully completing their treatment and recovery.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park 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

People were positive about their treatment and how the staff helped them in their recovery from their addictions. We were told, "Sefton Park is the best thing that has ever happened to me it has literally saved my life". "Sefton Park is a loving warm environment. I know the staff have their boundaries, but they are there so that when I go out into society I don't break boundaries". "The manager and the staff have made me feel very comfortable and relaxed". "Being here has helped me understand the past, so I could be aware of it and make a better life for myself". These comments conveyed people's needs were being effectively met.

People told us they were allocated a counsellor from the team of counsellors who worked at Sefton Park. They told us their counsellor's role was to offer support and counselling as part of their programme of treatment.

People told us there was a daily programme of therapeutic activities and therapy groups they attended as part of their programme of treatment and recovery. People told us that they were encouraged to be honest and to challenge the behaviours of other people, if they felt they were unacceptable.

We met one person leaving Sefton Park after successfully completing their treatment programme. We saw people go to a group to say goodbye to the person and to share all their positive experiences of them.

Other evidence

We read three care plan records to find out more about people's treatment and if their needs were met. The information we read in the care plans clearly set out what treatment each person required and how staff and the counsellors were to support them. We read information in the care plans that demonstrated staff had worked with people to find out what their needs were. We also read about what sort of counselling support and groups each person attended. We saw that parts of the care plans had been amended and changed regularly. This helped show people's needs were monitored and staff continued to help each person effectively in their recovery.

Our judgement

People are receiving suitable care and treatment to help them in their recovery from their addictions. Each person also benefits because they have an informative care plan to guide the staff to help them receive effective treatment.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park 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

Every person we met said that they felt safe living at Sefton Park. We heard staff talk to people in a polite and respectful way. The people who we met said staff treated them properly. People described staff as being, "calm", "serene" and "nurturing" and they said they could approach them at anytime.

Other evidence

The staff we met spoke knowledgably about the subject of abuse and what they must do to keep people safe. Staff told us that the subject of abuse and how to protect people at Sefton Park was discussed on a regular basis among the staff team.

We saw a copy of the procedure to guide staff to keep people safe from abuse. We saw that safeguarding procedure was kept in the office in the event of an allegation of abuse being made at Sefton Park. The procedure was up to date and contained clear guidance in the event of an allegation of abuse being reported to staff.

We saw in the training records that staff had been on training courses to understand the principle of safeguarding people from abuse. The staff had also done training on the Mental Capacity Act which covered the legal rights of people who may have impaired capacity.

Our judgement

People feel safe living at Sefton Park. They are protected from the risk of abuse by procedures to guide the staff in the way they treat people. People are further protected

because staff undertake training to understand the subject of safeguarding vulnerable adults.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park 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

All of the people who we spoke to told us the staff were supportive and understanding to them. People told us staff seemed to have a natural empathy for them and what they were going through in their recovery. This helped convey that people felt the staff were competent to meet their needs.

Other evidence

We saw staff training records which showed staff had completed recent training on a number of subjects related to alcoholism and addictions. We also saw staff had completed training about a number of different health and safety topics. This was evidence staff understood the needs of people who used the service.

The staff told us the manager met with them for one to one supervision meetings. We met a counsellor who told us that there was regular supervision for staff. The aim of the supervision was to help staff effectively support and understand people.

Our judgement

People are cared for by a staff team who are effectively supervised and who are competent to them through their treatment and recovery.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park 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 told us they were able to discuss with the staff what mattered to them at anytime. All of the people we met that the manager was very approachable and he would always make time for people if you wanted to speak to him. This helped show people felt able to make their views known to the manager.

Staff told us there were at least daily meetings to review and look in detail at significant incidents and occurrences involving patients at Sherwood Lodge. The staff explained that they tried to learn from incidents and looked at ways to improve outcomes for patients for the future. We also read information in patient's records that showed their psychiatrist, as well as other staff from the full team of staff involved in their care and treatment held meetings with staff from Sherwood Lodge. We could see from what we read the meetings involved discussing patients care and treatment as well as how to learn from incidents and occurrences that had occurred.

Other evidence

We looked at how the quality of the care and the service that people received was being monitored. We saw information from a quality monitoring exercise. We could see that people were asked their views of their treatment when they left Sefton Park. We saw an action plan that set out how to address the matters that people had brought up.

Staff told us there was a weekly meeting to review and look in detail at significant

incidents and occurrences involving people at Sefton Park. The staff explained that they tried to learn from incidents and looked at ways to improve outcomes for people for the future

Our judgement

The quality of the service people received is checked and monitored. People are enabled to give their views of the quality of service. There are systems in place to learn from incident and events involving people at Sefton Park.

Overall, we found that Sefton Park 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

Document purpose	Review of compliance report
Author	Care Quality Commission
Audience	The general public
Further copies from	03000 616161 / www.cqc.org.uk
Copyright	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

Website	www.cqc.org.uk
Telephone	03000 616161
Email address	enquiries@cqc.org.uk
Postal address	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA