

Swanswell Kidderminster







Quality Report

109- 111 Coventry Street
Kidderminster
Worcestershire
Tel: 0300 308 8200
Website: www.swanswell.org

Date of inspection visit: 23rd and 24th October 2018
Date of publication: 14/12/2018

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this location. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected and a review of all information available to CQC including information given to us from patients, the public and other organisations

Ratings

Overall rating for this location		Good	
Are services safe?		Good	
Are services effective?		Good	
Are services caring?		Good	
Are services responsive?		Good	
Are services well-led?		Good	

Mental Health Act responsibilities and Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards

We include our assessment of the provider's compliance with the Mental Capacity Act and, where relevant, Mental Health Act in our overall inspection of the service.

We do not give a rating for Mental Capacity Act or Mental Health Act, however we do use our findings to determine the overall rating for the service.

Further information about findings in relation to the Mental Capacity Act and Mental Health Act can be found later in this report.

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We rated Swanswell Kidderminster as good because:

- The service kept people safe from avoidable harm by ensuring there were sufficient staff with the right training, supervision, knowledge and skills. Risk assessments were thoroughly completed and care was planned around the client's individual needs. Staff had good awareness of safeguarding issues, they followed the service's lone working policy, incidents were reported, and lessons learnt were cascaded to staff.
- Staff used best practice and national guidance to complete comprehensive assessments, which enabled the development of personalised and holistic recovery plans detailing the appropriate treatment and care.
- Staff worked closely together and with external partners to ensure clients' received effective and consistent care and treatment, and monitored outcomes regularly.
- Clients told us staff treated them respectfully and with dignity, and they were involved in their own care. They felt they were listened to and both clients and carers were provided with relevant information and support to manage their recovery. The service invited feedback which was shared at a local and national level.
- The service responded to clients quickly and managed their caseload effectively to ensure they could provide care when the client required it. The service was meeting its targets and dealt with complaints effectively.
- The service supported clients to access work, education and mutual aid to enhance their recovery and was accessible to those people protected under the disability and discrimination legislations.
- There were good governance arrangements in place and experienced managers and staff monitored the quality of the service they provided through the use of audits, client feedback, incidents and complaints and key performance indicators. Staff were positive about the service and their managers.
- The service encouraged innovation and had implemented quality improvements across the service to enhance the service they provided to their clients.

Summary of findings

Our judgements about each of the main services

Service	Rating	Summary of each main service
Substance misuse services	Good 	

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Background to Swanswell Kidderminster	6
Our inspection team	6
Why we carried out this inspection	6
How we carried out this inspection	6
What people who use the service say	7
The five questions we ask about services and what we found	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards	12
Overview of ratings	12
Outstanding practice	23
Areas for improvement	23

Good 

Swanswell Kidderminster

Services we looked at

Substance misuse services

Summary of this inspection

Background to Swanswell Kidderminster

Swanswell became part of the Cranstoun group in December 2016. It is a national charity and has been supporting people who misuse substances since 1970. It became the provider of services in Kidderminster in April 2015, as part of the county-wide service in Worcestershire. Swanswell Kidderminster is located in the centre of Kidderminster and offers a service to people in Kidderminster and the surrounding area, known as the Wyre Forest.

The service offers: health promotion, needle exchange, testing for blood borne viruses, vaccinations for hepatitis B, prescribing substitute medication for opiate dependence, community home detoxification, GP shared care, action planning, care co-ordination and key working, group work, referral and assessment for residential rehabilitation and detoxification, supporting alcohol and substance users involved in the criminal justice system, harm reduction and abstinence-based treatment, debt and housing advice, and health engagement and life skills.

The service is funded by local commissioners and provides a free service to those who use it. There is a

registered manager for the county service who had oversight over the three area locations: Worcester, Redditch and Kidderminster. Each location, including Kidderminster, is led by a team leader. Swanswell Kidderminster offer a service 9am – 5pm Monday to Friday and open until 7pm on a Wednesday. The service offered home visits based on individual need and had a shared care agreement with the majority of the GP surgeries in the Wyre Forest area. Some county-wide specialist roles were delivered in a range of settings by family workers, a blood borne virus nurse, an alcohol nurse, young people's workers, a peer mentor and volunteer co-ordinator, non-medical prescribers and criminal justice workers. This report looks at the running of services in Kidderminster.

The service provides diagnostic and screening procedures and treatment of disease, disorder or injury as regulated activities.

The service was last inspected in September 2016, but was not rated. Care Quality Commission has rated substance misuse services since Summer 2018.

Our inspection team

Team leader: Lucy Galt, CQC Inspector.

The team that inspected the service comprised two other CQC inspectors.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our ongoing comprehensive mental health inspection programme.

How we carried out this inspection

To fully understand the experience of people who use services, we always ask the following five questions of every service and provider:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?

- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

Before the inspection visit, we reviewed information that we held about the location.

Summary of this inspection

During the inspection visit, the inspection team:

- visited the service, looked at the quality of the environment and observed how staff were caring for clients;
- spoke with eight clients who were using the service;
- spoke with the registered manager and manager of the team;
- spoke with eleven other staff members; including substance misuse workers, senior practitioner, criminal justice workers, nurses and peer support and volunteer co-ordinator;
- received feedback about the service from two commissioners;
- attended and observed one hand over meeting;
- looked at six care and treatment records of clients;
- looked at a range of policies, procedures and other documents relating to the running of the service.

What people who use the service say

Clients we spoke with were complimentary about the service. They felt staff listened and supported them with their substance misuse. They said that they were provided with sufficient information and could attend appointments when they needed them.

Summary of this inspection

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

We rated safe as good because:

- We saw that staffing was sufficient to provide clients with safe care and treatment. Staff were supported by specialists who worked across Worcestershire, enabling the service to offer a range of expertise to minimise harm and risk to clients, while maximising their recovery.
- Managers ensured staff received the relevant training for their role and monitored a training matrix to confirm they were up to date with their requirements.
- Staff were aware of the lone working policy and how to keep themselves safe.
- Staff completed and updated risk assessments, ensuring the service highlighted and managed any risks appropriately, including risks to children and vulnerable people.
- Staff knew how to protect clients from abuse and the service worked well with other agencies to do so. Staff discussed safeguarding issues within the multidisciplinary team and good practice was shared across the service as lessons learnt.
- Staff followed best practice when storing, giving and recording medicines. Staff followed the prescription and security policies.
- Staff were aware of what and when they needed to report incidents and staff and managers received appropriate feedback. Incidents were reviewed by senior managers and lessons learnt were cascaded to staff regularly. When things went wrong, staff apologised and gave clients honest information and suitable support.

Good



Are services effective?

We rated effective as good because:

- Staff completed thorough and comprehensive assessments of their clients which led to holistic recovery plans based on their needs. Recovery plans were personalised, comprehensive and understood by staff.
- Staff provided treatments and care for clients based on national guidance and best practice. This included psycho-social interventions, medicines prescribing, physical health screening and testing, that ensured clients received an appropriate service.
- Managers monitored client treatment outcomes regularly, and provided information to the national drug and treatment monitoring service.

Good



Summary of this inspection

- The service had a good mix of skilled staff that was well supported by clinicians and other professionals in the countywide service.
- Managers made sure staff had the skills needed to provide high-quality care. They supported staff with performance reviews, supervision, opportunities to update and further develop their skills.
- The service worked effectively with other statutory agencies. It had shared care protocols in place to support effective working with GPs and pharmacies. The service also worked well with other agencies and health care providers to ensure clients had all their needs met.
- Staff were able to recognise when a client lacked capacity, and were aware of where to seek guidance and support regarding this.

Are services caring?

We rated caring as good because:

- Staff treated clients with compassion and kindness. They respected clients' privacy and dignity, and supported their individual needs and supported them to manage their care, treatment and recovery.
- We saw that staff were discreet, respectful and responsive, providing clients with help, emotional support and advice at the time they needed it. Clients felt listened to and staff sought their views. Clients said staff had supported them to reduce their substance misuse and maintain their recovery.
- Staff provided clients with choices regarding treatment options and gave information to aid decision making.
- Staff encouraged client and carer feedback. Service user representatives spoke with clients as peers and collated feedback on the service to inform the local and national service user forums.
- The service provided a family and carers service where family members could receive support from staff and could also provide feedback on the service they received.

However,

- We could not ascertain whether clients had received a copy of their plan, however we could see that staff had involved clients in their care plan and goal setting.

Good



Are services responsive?

We rated responsive as good because:

Good



Summary of this inspection

- People could access the service closest to their home when they needed it. Waiting times from referral to treatment and arrangements to access the service, treat and discharge client's were in line with good practice.
- Staff responded to all referrals to the service quickly and triaged them appropriately. The team was flexible and offered clients choice with their appointment times and where they wanted to be seen. Clients did not have to wait for an assessment or allocation of substance misuse workers.
- Staff followed the service's engagement policy when clients did not attend for their appointments to ensure they were safe.
- The service worked effectively with other agencies and teams, and ensured clients were supported during transfers of care and discharge from the service.
- Staff supported clients with activities outside the service, such as work and education and signposted to mutual aid organisations to support recovery.
- Facilities were accessible and supported privacy, dignity and confidentiality. Information was available to clients whose first language was not English or had communication difficulties.
- The service operated an effective complaints procedure. Any learning was shared and discussed within supervision and team meetings.

Are services well-led?

We rated well-led as good because:

- Managers were suitably skilled, knowledgeable and experienced to effectively lead and manage staff, ensuring they received the right training, supervision and information to provide good quality care to their clients.
- Staff told us they were aware of the service's vision and values and felt respected, supported and valued by senior managers. The service promoted a positive culture, morale was high and staff were recognised for good work by managers. Staff had opportunity to reflect on their practice and make improvements by regularly attending team meetings, supervision and training.
- Staff monitored the quality of the service through the use of key performance indicators, audits and staff and patient feedback. Senior managers monitored and scrutinised results in regular manager meetings. Managers regularly discussed targets and outcomes with senior leaders within the organisation and with Public Health England who commissioned their service.

Good



Summary of this inspection

- There was a clear framework of how information would be cascaded down from the board to all staff. Staff received feedback on complaints, incidents and changes being made to the service and lessons learnt had been embedded within the service.
- Senior staff met with external partners to discuss shared issues, thematic reviews and to provide information sharing.
- The service encouraged creativity and innovation. Staff gave examples of quality improvement initiatives they had implemented such as a local needle litter scheme and regular staff and client quality events.

Detailed findings from this inspection

Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards

People were supported to make decisions where appropriate and when they lacked capacity, decisions were made in their best interest, recognising the importance of the person's wishes, feelings, culture and history. When staff had concerns about a person's capacity, they followed the escalation process and were able to discuss specific cases with the senior practitioners and managers.

Staff ensured clients consented to care and treatment, this was assessed, recorded and reviewed in a timely manner.

Overview of ratings

Our ratings for this location are:

	Safe	Effective	Caring	Responsive	Well-led	Overall
Substance misuse services	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Overall	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good

Notes

Substance misuse services

Safe	Good 
Effective	Good 
Caring	Good 
Responsive	Good 
Well-led	Good 

Are substance misuse services safe?

Good 

Safe and clean environment

There were six rooms available to see clients including two group rooms. There was also a separate needle exchange space. The premises were safe, clean, well equipped, well furnished, well maintained and fit for purpose. Rooms were not adequately sound proofed however, the service mitigated against this by providing a radio outside of the rooms. This meant any conversations were muffled and could not be understood outside of interview rooms.

We saw that staff adhered to infection control principles, including hand washing. Hand sanitizers were available across the site. Clinical waste was appropriately stored and managed.

The site had up to date health and safety assessments, including a fire risk assessment and related fire safety plans, weekly building inspection checklists, health and safety report, first aider certificates, electrical safety testing and a water sampling report.

Safe staffing

There was sufficient staff on duty to meet the identified needs of the client group. Staffing for this site consisted of nine whole time equivalent substance misuse workers, one team leader, and one administration worker. Other staff worked county wide across the three Worcestershire sites. They included staff from the criminal justice team, young persons team, peer support and volunteer mentor,

volunteers, non-medical prescribers, blood borne virus nurse, family team, alcohol nurse and service users representatives. There were no vacancies when we inspected.

The service used agency staff when required to cover sickness and vacant posts. One agency worker had been covering a staff vacancy and which had since been recruited too. The agency worker continued to work at the service until the new recruit had successfully completed their induction programme.

Managers maintained the service by ensuring enough staff were always available to see clients.

The service provided mandatory training in key skills to all staff and made sure everyone completed it. The manager kept a training matrix and any gaps in training were identified by the training department and staff were booked onto relevant training courses or provided with an e – learning package to ensure they were up to date. Staff were up to date with their training requirements at 100% when we inspected.

All staff attended mandatory health and safety training which was completed every three years. Staff had awareness of the lone working policy and attended mandatory lone working training. Alarms were available in the interview rooms. Staff also had access to an individual alarm they could carry on their person and activate when required. The vast majority of clients were seen on the premises or at GP surgeries.

Staff also attended professional boundaries and confidentiality training, including de-escalation techniques, all with a view to keeping them safe.

Substance misuse services

All staff completed mandatory Mental Capacity Act training every three years. Staff were up to date with this training.

Assessing and managing risk to patients and staff

We reviewed six client case files. Staff completed and updated risk assessments for each patient and used these to understand and manage risks individually. They had good awareness of the potential risks vulnerable people and children could be exposed to and acted appropriately. For example, providing home visits when children lived with people undergoing treatment for substance misuse.

Staff responded appropriately to warning signs and deterioration in clients health. They liaised with other services, such as acute hospitals and GPs. Staff were flexible and a duty worker was available to see clients promptly if their health deteriorated.

Clients were made aware of the risks of continued substance misuse and harm minimisation, and safety planning was an integral part of recovery plans. Staff ensured that clients received advice and information about this and staff told us how they responded to changing risks posed by clients. For example, discussions of how to keep safe when clients were screened for a blood borne virus.

Safeguarding

Staff knew how to protect clients from abuse and the service worked well with other agencies to do so. Staff had training on how to recognise and report abuse and they knew how to apply it.

The service worked closely with other partners of the multi-agency safeguarding hub as part of the family front door service. Staff attended the multi-agency risk assessment conference when required.

Staff had the opportunity to discuss complex safeguarding cases and concerns with senior staff and the safeguarding lead during complex care reviews, and also with their manager during case management. Any examples of good safeguarding practice were shared through the lessons learnt bulletin. Senior staff monitored staff adherence and knowledge of safeguarding through case file audits.

All staff received safeguarding training for children and adults and gave examples of when they had made referrals to other agencies and applied their safeguarding knowledge in practice.

Staff access to essential information

Staff kept detailed records of clients' care and treatment. Records were clear, up-to-date and easily available to all staff providing care.

The service had an information sharing agreement with the neighbouring mental health trust, so they had awareness of the needs of clients and in a timely manner.

Medicines management

Staff followed best practice when storing, giving, and recording medicines. Staff regularly reviewed the effects of medications on each patient's physical health.

An effective system was in place regarding the storage and processing of prescriptions. Staff followed the prescription and security policies. Prescriptions were processed by the team administrator and checked and signed by the prescriber. Unused prescriptions were stored in a safe and are signed out as per the policy. Only people involved in the prescribing process or senior staff had access to the safe. The clinical team leader and clinical lead have oversight of the process and the supervision of prescribers to ensure staff are undertaking the correct procedures.

The service kept naloxone in stock to dispense to clients, or for use within the building. Staff recorded when they issued, used or trained clients how to use it. Naloxone is a medication used to block the effects of opioids, especially in overdose. All the dosages we saw were within their expiry dates and appropriately stored. All staff had received training in teaching clients how to use naloxone.

Nurses in the service administered hepatitis B vaccines. The medicine adrenaline was available for injection should clients have an extreme reaction to the vaccine.

Where medicines were stored, we saw that staff checked the room and fridge temperatures to ensure they remained within range to maintain their efficacy.

Staff provided clients locked boxes to store their medication in at home, if this was required. This meant children, or others, would not be at risk of taking medicines. Staff ensured clients knew how to use them, and clients with children were often visited at home so staff could assess any risk.

Track record on safety

The service reported 14 deaths in the 12 months up to May 2018. These deaths consisted of people who had received some care or treatment from the service however may not

Substance misuse services

be related to their use of substances. All deaths were reported to Care Quality Commission and were reviewed through the service incident investigation process. Any actions or recommendations were reviewed at a senior level.

Reporting incidents and learning from when things go wrong

The service managed patient safety incidents well. Staff recognised incidents and reported them appropriately. Managers investigated incidents and shared lessons learned with the whole team and the wider service. When things went wrong, staff apologised and gave clients honest information and suitable support.

Staff received feedback when they had reported an incident, and the outcome of incidents was discussed in team meetings and in supervision. Staff received a service wide quarterly lessons learnt bulletin highlighting key learning points and actions to implement into wider practice. The lessons learnt bulletins are discussed in the clinical governance meetings.

Staff gave us examples of improvements that had happened in the service following incidents and lessons learnt. One example was the need to follow up any clients with a telephone call if they did not attend. Staff had averted a serious incident by making a phone call to a client who had missed an appointment. When senior staff reviewed the incident, this was recognised as good practice and disseminated throughout the service.

Are substance misuse services effective? (for example, treatment is effective)

Good 

Assessment of needs and planning of care

We reviewed six client case files. Staff had completed comprehensive assessments of the clients drug/ alcohol use, injecting history, previous access to treatment and their motivation to change. Staff used specialised and recognised assessment tools.

Recovery plans were personalised, comprehensive and understood by all the staff. Staff ensured that they included the persons views, their strengths and weaknesses and a full range of their problems and needs. They would be

reviewed regularly and often started with small steps with a view to build on these during future sessions. Clients we spoke with knew who their key worker was and who to contact when required.

Staff had developed risk management plans that included a plan for unexpected exit from treatment. These were evident in client's case files.

Best practice in treatment and care

Staff provided treatments and care for clients based on national guidance and best practice. Staff supported clients with their physical health and encouraged them to live healthier lives.

The service used evidence-based psycho-social interventions such as motivational interviewing, solution focused therapy, Cognitive Behavioural Therapy based interventions and structured relapse prevention. Staff saw clients in one to one sessions and groups. Volunteers facilitated a twice weekly 'Tea and Time' group, however there were no other structured groups happening when we inspected.

Staff supported clients with housing, education, training and employment. Clients spoke positively of the help the service gave them, either directly, or in helping them to access partner agencies. They also enabled clients to access mutual support organisations.

Clients in the service were prescribed medicines recommended by national guidance (Methadone and buprenorphine for the management of opioid dependence, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) 2007; DH, 2007; NICE, 2011). Staff told us an electrocardiogram (ECG) would be arranged for clients taking over 100ml of methadone. The ECG monitored potential heart abnormalities due to their dose of medicine. This was in accordance with national guidance (DH, 2007; Guidance for the use of substitute prescribing in the treatment of opioid dependence in primary care, Royal College of General Practitioners, 2011).

Staff prescribed medicines to clients to assist with their abstinence from alcohol. This was in accordance with national guidance (NICE, 2011). Clients could be offered a community alcohol detoxification, if deemed safe by the staff to do so. Staff used recommended alcohol audit tools such as SADQ and AUDIT and ensured physical health monitoring was completed before they commenced

Substance misuse services

alcohol detoxification. The alcohol specialist nurse provided home detoxification if deemed appropriate following a thorough risk assessment of the clients environment, physical health and family/carer support. Staff could organise an admission for an in-patient detoxification if required and the risks were high.

At the beginning of their treatment, and whenever else was necessary, clients who took methadone or buprenorphine would be required to pick up their medicine at their local chemist, and be observed taking it. Known as supervised consumption, this is best practice (DH, 2007). Staff would regularly check client's urine samples to ensure they remained abstinent from opioids; if they had not or risks had changed, supervised consumption could be re-activated.

Staff offered and delivered Blood Borne Virus (BBV) testing for hepatitis B and C and HIV. This was in accordance with best practice (DH 2007). They operated an 'opt out' system and were comparable to the national average for take up at 93% for all new presentations to the service. The service has a 100% target of all clients being offered a test. The service also offered clients hepatitis vaccinations and naloxone training and had recently implemented in conjunction with the local NHS acute hospital trust, the latest treatments in managing and treating hepatitis C.

Clients could attend for needle and syringe exchange as recommended by Department of Health drug misuse and dependence guidelines. The service had drop in sessions three times a week at the site, and local pharmacies operated a needle exchange system.

Staff supported clients to lead healthier lives through healthy living advice and harm reduction, and provided basic physical health assessments. The service worked closely with GPs through their shared care arrangements, and liaised with healthcare professionals and supported clients with their physical health needs when required. Staff offered a spirometer test for clients at risk of respiratory health problems.

Staff reviewed care and recovery plans regularly with the person using the service. The service recorded client outcomes using the treatment outcome profile (TOP). Staff measured outcomes when clients entered treatment and

every three months. An outcome measurement took place when the service discharged clients. The service also provided information to the national drug and treatment monitoring service (NDTMS).

The service used audits to identify areas of good practice and where they could make improvements. Staff followed national guidance and best practice, and monitored their results with other services within the Cranstoun group.

Skilled staff to deliver care

Managers made sure they had staff with the skills needed to provide high-quality care. They supported staff with appraisals, supervision, opportunities to update and further develop their skills.

The service employed a range of skilled staff, including team leader, senior practitioner, substance misuse workers, service user representatives and volunteers. A non-medical prescriber (NMP) saw clients within a clinic twice a week. In addition, the team received input from staff who worked countywide including a blood borne virus (BBV) nurse, a detoxification nurse, family workers, young persons' substance misuse worker, criminal justice team for young people and adults and a peer mentor and volunteer co-ordinator.

All staff, including volunteers, received a comprehensive induction and met regularly with their manager to support them until they felt completely comfortable and competent within their role.

All staff were provided with mandatory and essential training, and the service ensured that staff completed it and were up to date.

Managers identified the learning needs of staff and provided them with opportunities to develop their skills and knowledge. The managers of the services across Worcestershire had commenced leadership training with an outside organisation.

Every three months, staff received a performance review, clinical supervision, group supervision, observations by senior staff and an audit of a sample of their patient case files. Staff did not complete an annual appraisal as they had ongoing discussions about their performance and training needs during the three monthly performance reviews.

Substance misuse services

Managers dealt with poor performance from staff quickly and efficiently and supported them to help them improve by implementing action plans that were regularly reviewed. The team leader, senior practitioner and clinical lead were available to offer advice and support to staff and through supervision and case file audits were able to identify areas of good practice and where staff required extra support.

The service recruited volunteers and two were working at Kidderminster when we inspected. We saw they received a comprehensive training programme and received regular supervision.

Multi-disciplinary and inter-agency team work

Staff from different disciplines worked together as a team to benefit clients. They supported each other to make sure clients had no gaps in their care.

Managers allocated cases to staff following referral to the service. This meant that care coordinators were identified quickly and clients would know who they would be seeing each session and who to contact when required.

The service had fortnightly complex case reviews. Staff discussed complex cases with senior staff and any recommended interventions would be care planned. Each morning the service held a 'flash' meeting where they would plan the days work and any potential risks, safeguarding issues, prison releases or other pertinent items were discussed.

The service had effective protocols in place for the shared care of people who use their services. The majority of GP surgeries in the Wyre Forest area had committed to providing a shared care arrangement with the service. Four substance misuse workers from Swanswell provided clinics across the area within the GP practices. This enabled staff to liaise quickly and closely with GPs, practice nurses and other professionals and meant that clients could attend their local surgery for their drug/ alcohol sessions, which was often more convenient for them. Swanswell staff who worked within the GP surgeries told us they had built up good working relationships with shared care staff and had provided training sessions when requested. The service had a shared care lead who liaised regularly with the GP practices and provided audits to ensure quality was consistent and maintained.

There were close links with community services, social services, education, child and family services, criminal

justice services including probation and mental health teams. We saw reference within case files of working with other agencies to ensure coordinated pathways of care. The service liaised with specialists such as liver consultants, substance misuse midwives, and alcohol related brain injury experts.

Staff engaged in activities and initiatives to improve joint working and liaison. Staff attended appointments with other professionals when required and meet with the local mental health trust to improve their working relationships. The service discharged people when specialist care was no longer necessary and provided discharge letters to GPs in a timely manner.

Good practice in applying the Mental Capacity Act

Staff supported clients to make decisions about their care. Staff understood the service policy on the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and assessed and recorded capacity clearly.

Staff presumed their client's had capacity. People were supported to make decisions where appropriate and when they lacked capacity, decisions were made in their best interest, recognising the importance of the person's wishes, feelings, culture and history. When staff had concerns about a person's capacity, they followed the escalation process and were able to discuss specific cases with the senior practitioners and managers. We saw assessment of mental capacity within the clients files we reviewed.

Staff ensured clients consented to care and treatment, this was assessed, recorded and reviewed in a timely manner. We saw this in all the clients files we reviewed.

Are substance misuse services caring?

Good 

Kindness, privacy, dignity, respect, compassion and support

Staff treated clients with compassion and kindness. They respected clients' privacy and dignity, and supported their individual needs.

We observed staff and saw they were discreet, respectful and responsive, providing clients with help, emotional support and advice at the time they needed it.

Substance misuse services

Staff said they could raise concerns without fear of the consequences.

Staff supported clients to understand and manage their care and treatment and helped them access and engage with other services that could be beneficial to their recovery.

We spoke with eight clients who were using the service. All were positive about the service, and how staff had engaged them by listening, supporting and offering practical help. They linked their reduction in substance misuse and their recovery to the support staff had given them. Staff understood their individual needs and were flexible to accommodate their personal, cultural, social or religious needs.

Staff maintained the confidentiality of information about clients. We reviewed six client's files and saw that they had all signed a confidentiality agreement and they had understood it when staff explained it to them.

Involvement in care

Staff involved clients and those close to them in decisions about their care, treatment and changes to the service.

Staff communicated with clients so that they understood their care and treatment. Staff were experienced with working with people with substance misuse issues and found ways to effectively communicate with those that may have difficulties understanding the information.

The service empowered and supported people to access an advocacy service if they required it.

We saw in case files that staff involved clients in the setting of relevant goals and in the regular reviewing of progress. However, we could not always ascertain whether clients had received their own copy of the plan. Clients told us the service had provided them with useful guides and other information to support their recovery.

Staff engaged with clients, their families and their carers to ensure they understood their care options and we saw evidence of consent to treatment and sharing of information recorded in the case files.

The service asked for feedback through questionnaires, which were available in the waiting area. Two service user representatives worked across the three sites across Worcestershire to gain feedback from other clients, often when they are waiting for their appointments in the waiting

area. Service user representatives were still undergoing their own recovery so other clients saw them as peers and could talk openly to them about whether they were happy with their treatment. This information was fed back at local and national service user forums, which were attended by the service user representatives and the peer mentor and volunteer coordinator.

The service provided a family and carers service where family members could receive support from staff and could also provide feedback on the service they received. Staff involved family members as much as possible so they could offer support and encouragement to their relative.

Staff provided carers with information about how to access a carer's assessment and could be referred to the local authority for a carers assessment.

Are substance misuse services responsive to people's needs? (for example, to feedback?)

Good 

Access and discharge

People could access the service closest to their home when they needed it. Waiting times from referral to treatment and arrangements to access the service, treat and discharge clients were in line with good practice.

The service was available for anyone seeking help to reduce or recover from their substance misuse, mainly illicit drugs and alcohol. It was open Monday to Friday nine to five, and until seven on a Wednesday. They offered drop in sessions, needle exchange and a duty worker was available to see people quickly or take phone calls. They offered a telephone service on bank holidays and outreach services in GPs, community centres, schools and homes. The service operated a single point of contact to help increase accessibility for clients and could be flexible with appointment times and venues.

When we inspected, the caseload for the service was 391. An average caseload for a whole time equivalent substance misuse worker was 70. Staff said this was manageable. New referrals were allocated by the team leader and the complexity of their individual cases was taken into consideration. Caseloads were discussed with staff in

Substance misuse services

supervision and complex cases could be discussed within multidisciplinary reviews. They did not operate a waiting list and referrals were allocated as quickly as their risk assessment dictated.

When referrals were received, they were triaged the same day by the duty worker who used a risk rating (RAG) system to determine the clients initial level of care and urgency. Priority clients were seen within 24 - 48 hours and typically consisted of pregnant women, people released from the prison service, or people with high levels of mental and/or physical health needs. Red referrals were seen within seven days, amber referrals within 14 days and green within 21 days.

Staff planned for client's discharge and liaised with other agencies and care coordinators beforehand. Staff attended joint visits with future care providers to ensure a smooth transfer of care.

All potential discharges would be discussed with the senior practitioner beforehand. When people were not engaging with the service, staff followed the engagement policy to attempt to make contact with them before they would be discharged.

Staff supported clients during referrals and transfers between services, such as mutual aid agencies or physical or mental health teams.

The facilities promote recovery, comfort, dignity and confidentiality

There were six rooms available to see clients including two group rooms. There was also a separate needle exchange space. The premises were safe, clean, well equipped, well furnished, well maintained and fit for purpose. Rooms were not adequately sound proofed however, the service mitigated against this by providing a radio outside of the rooms. This meant any conversations were muffled and could not be understood outside of interview rooms.

The reception area was open plan, and private to only those who attended the service. Many clients received their treatment from Swanswell staff who provided sessions at their GP surgery.

Clients' engagement with the wider community

Staff supported clients with activities outside the service, such as work, education and family relationships. Staff liaised with other agencies and signposted clients to other

organisations when required, such as alcoholics anonymous (AA) and SMART recovery. They offered practical support such as help with paperwork completion and advice.

Meeting the needs of all people who use the service

The service was accessible to all who needed it and took account of clients' individual needs. Staff helped clients with communication, advocacy and cultural support.

The service understood the complexity of clients' needs and worked with vulnerable people who needed to be signposted to other services that would support their needs. For example, they had good links with charities and organisations that helped people experiencing domestic violence or homelessness. Staff gave examples of how they had supported people with learning disabilities and older people.

The service provided translators for people whose first language was not English. The Cranstoun group website had an accessibility option that included a text and display function for people with print disabilities, dyslexia, low literacy and mild visual impairments.

Clients we spoke with told us their appointments had not been cancelled or delayed. Staff told us this rarely happened and appointments would be rearranged if required, due to staff sickness for example.

Listening to and learning from concerns and complaints

The service treated concerns and complaints seriously, investigated them and learned lessons from the results, and shared these with all staff.

In the 12 months up to May 2018 the service received two complaints. One was not upheld, the other withdrawn.

Staff we spoke with knew how to manage complaints and ensured that clients could raise complaints without fear of discrimination or harassment.

The service had a clear complaints system to show how complaints were managed and lessons learnt and acted upon to improve the quality of the service. Formal complaints were discussed within clinical governance meetings and all complaints and identified themes were reviewed at board level. Staff received feedback from complaints across the service in the Team Brief and the quarterly lessons learnt bulletin.

Substance misuse services

Staff and managers resolved low level complaints informally although these would still be recorded so the service could identify any themes or trends.

Are substance misuse services well-led?

Good 

Leadership

Managers at all levels in the service had the right skills and abilities to run a service that provided high-quality sustainable care.

Managers had worked within the service for a number of years and had the necessary experience, skills and knowledge of working with the client group to provide clinical leadership to other staff.

The organisation had a clear definition of recovery and this was shared and understood by all staff. Their mission statement was 'To empower and support people to make positive changes.'

Leaders had a good understanding of the services they managed. They could explain clearly how the teams were working to provide high quality care.

Leaders were visible in the service and approachable for clients and staff.

Vision and strategy

The service developed a strategy for 2018 that encompassed the Cranstoun group vision, mission and values. Their vision was: 'We believe everyone should have the opportunity to live healthy, safe and happy lives.' Their values were: Ambition, Compassion, Innovation, Integrity and Inclusive.

The values were supported by policies and procedures, which set out the expectations of staff members. The vision and values were communicated to staff at induction then reinforced and assessed at performance reviews.

Staff had the opportunity to contribute to discussions about the service. Staff were able to discuss their ideas to make improvements to the service and we heard examples of when ideas had been implemented.

Managers could describe how they were working to deliver high quality care within the budgets available and regularly discussed and made plans with senior leaders within the organisation and with the local authority who commissioned their service.

Culture

Managers across the trust promoted a positive culture that supported and valued staff, creating a sense of common purpose based on shared values.

Staff told us they felt respected, supported and valued. They felt that the service recognised their contributions. The service promoted an employee recognition scheme and one staff member told us they had nominated staff from the Kidderminster team. They said they felt positive and proud about working for the service and their team.

Staff met regularly with their managers to discuss performance and training needs, which included career progression. Staff gave us examples of staff who had used the service for their own substance misuse in the past, then joined the organisation as volunteers and progressed within the company.

Staff could access an occupational health department and a telephone line which provided confidential supportive counselling.

Managers monitored staff morale and job satisfaction through regular supervision and meetings with staff. Staff said that they had seen improvements in client's outcomes and governance arrangements since the merger with Cranstoun, and staff felt more positive and excited about the future of the company, and any fears about potential changes had been allayed.

All staff complete mandatory equality and diversity training and managers monitored implementation in supervision, performance review processes and case file audits.

The service was accredited in Investors in Diversity: Level 2. This meant that they had taken a structured and planned approach to ensure that equality and diversity was embedded within the service.

Teams worked well together. We observed teams working well with each other and mutual respect was evident. Staff sought guidance and support from other disciplines within

Substance misuse services

the team when they needed it. The team had away days with the focus on improving the service and how individuals could contribute to this. Managers gave examples of managing staff performance when needed.

Governance

Since the merger with Cranstoun, governance policies, procedures and protocols had been reviewed and updated.

There was a clear framework of how information would be cascaded down from the board to all staff. Staff received essential information such as learning from incidents, complaints and changes to the service through team meetings, monthly team brief and supervision.

Senior staff attended the clinical governance implementation group to analyse lessons learnt and implement changes across the service to reduce risks of similar incidents occurring elsewhere.

Staff undertook audits, such as monthly case file audits, BBV testing and vaccinations and thematic audits, for example safeguarding. The audits were sufficient to provide assurance and staff acted on the results when needed.

Data and notifications were submitted to external bodies and internal departments as required.

Staff understood the arrangements for working with other teams, both within the provider and external, to meet the needs of the clients.

The service had a whistle blowing policy in place. No whistleblowing concerns had been received by Care Quality Commission between July 2017 and July 2018.

Management of risk, issues and performance

There was a clear quality assurance management and performance framework in place that were integrated across all organisational policies and procedures. The service met regularly with their senior leadership team and the local authority to scrutinise their performance against national and local key performance indicators. The service was meeting contractual requirements.

Clients with successful treatment outcomes who were retained at for 12 weeks or more or completed treatment

within 12 weeks was higher than the national average at: Opiates 97% compared to national average 85%, non-opiates 87% compared to 85% and alcohol and non-opiate 93% compared to 86%.

The service had effective systems for identifying risks, planning to eliminate or reduce them, and coping with both the expected and unexpected. These included risk registers, contingency plans and various policies, procedures and protocols.

Staff maintained and had access to the risk register at a local level which fed into the organisation risk register. Staff could escalate concerns when required and their concerns matched those on the risk register.

The service anticipated and planned for emergencies and policies and procedures were in place to ensure the continuity of the service during adverse conditions or other disruptions.

The service monitored its sickness and absence rates. Managers made reference to the service policies and procedures to support staff appropriately.

The service worked closely with their commissioning partners to ensure any cost improvements did not compromise client care.

Information management

Managers were able to collect data from the electronic systems staff used to record all client information. Staff had access to the equipment and information technology needed to do their work.

The electronic client case file system was comprehensive and included confidentiality of client records. Staff told us they found it easy to use, and was secure.

Managers had access to information to support them with their management role. This included information on the performance of the service, staffing and client care and was in an easily accessible format. Managers collected information to share with their senior leaders and commissioners which was collated in the Diagnostic Outcomes Monitoring Executive Summary (DOMES).

The service had developed information sharing protocols and processes with other services and agencies. They attending meetings and joint visits when required.

Substance misuse services

Confidentiality agreements were clearly explained to clients and carers in relation to information and data.

Engagement

Staff, clients and carers had access to up to date information about the work of the provider and the services they used. This was accessible through a staff intranet, team brief and a website dedicated to the service.

The service promoted itself to the public and raised awareness of the service they offered in a variety of locations such as supermarkets, gyms, libraries, hostels, universities and schools.

Clients and carers had opportunities to give feedback on the service they received in a manner that reflected their individual needs, such as face to face with a staff member or through questionnaires which could remain anonymous if they wished.

Senior staff engaged with a variety of external stakeholders to receive feedback, discuss their performance, promote the service, provide education and make links with other agencies/ providers to enhance the client pathway.

Senior staff attended a strategic oversight group every three months. This included all partner agencies such as social services, criminal justice, mental health, police and the job agency. Discussions revolved about shared issues or thematic reviews and information sharing.

Learning, continuous improvement and innovation

The service encouraged creativity and innovation to ensure up to date evidence based practice was implemented and embedded.

The service had recently developed an initiative with a local church in response to an increase in 'needle litter'. The scheme ensured that all clients who brought back their used or unwanted needles received a voucher for use in local shops. The scheme was still in its pilot stage when we inspected however staff said it was going well and there had been a decrease in needle litter around the area.

The service discusses quality improvements and staff were encouraged to make suggestions, and the service adopted ideas from other teams that have worked well.

The peer mentor and volunteer co-ordinator facilitated ROAD (recovery, orientated, audit, development) events. Staff and clients discussed the organisation's objectives: Put Swanswell's values at the heart of all activity and protect and promote health and wellbeing. The group discussed how they were meeting the objectives and how staff could improve the service. Action plans were developed and were due to be reviewed.

Outstanding practice and areas for improvement

Outstanding practice

The peer mentor and volunteer co-ordinator facilitated ROAD (Recovery, orientated, audit, development) events. Staff and clients discussed the organisation's objectives: Put Swanswell's values at the heart of all activity and Protect and promote health and wellbeing. The group discussed whether, and how, they were meeting them and how staff could improve and be better. Action plans were developed and were due to be reviewed.

The service had recently developed an initiative with the local church in response to an increase in 'needle litter'. The scheme ensured that all clients who brought back their used or unwanted needles received a voucher for use in local shops. The scheme was still in its pilot stage when we inspected although staff said it was going well and there had been a decrease in needle litter around the area.

Areas for improvement

Action the provider **SHOULD** take to improve

The service should consider how they can demonstrate whether they have offered clients a copy of their treatment plan.