

Kibble Levernbridge Care Home Service

81 Levern Bridge Road
GLASGOW
G53 7AB

Telephone: 0141 889 0044

Type of inspection:
Unannounced

Completed on:
1 September 2022

Service provided by:
Kibble Education and Care Centre

Service provider number:
SP2004007042

Service no:
CS2021000361

About the service

Kibble Levernbridge is a care home service situated in a residential area of Glasgow, close to local transport links, shops and community services. The service provides accommodation in two separate houses for up to four young people. Each house has two bedrooms, two communal bathrooms, a large sitting area and large kitchen area. There is garden at the back of both houses that offers space for relaxation and outdoor pursuits. At the time of our inspection, there were four young people living in the service.

About the inspection

This was an unannounced inspection which took place over four days between 16 August 2022 and 23 August 2022. The inspection was carried out by one inspector from the Care Inspectorate.

To prepare for the inspection, we reviewed information about this service. This included previous inspection findings, registration information, information submitted by the service and intelligence gathered since the last inspection.

In making our evaluations of the service, we:

- spoke with four young people using the service;
- spoke with staff and management;
- observed practice and daily life;
- reviewed documents; and
- spoke with visiting professionals.

Key messages

- Young people were living in welcoming and homely environments.
- Young people were developing the skills to live independently.
- The service responded to indicators of concern and kept young people safe from harm.
- Young people had access to the services that they needed.
- Academic attainment, employment and further training were a priority for young people living in the service.

From this inspection we evaluated this service as:

In evaluating quality, we use a six point scale where 1 is unsatisfactory and 6 is excellent

| | |
|--|---------------|
| How well do we support children and young people's rights and wellbeing? | 5 - Very Good |
|--|---------------|

Further details on the particular areas inspected are provided at the end of this report.

How well do we support children and young people's rights and wellbeing?

5 - Very Good

We evaluated this quality indicator as very good. We found major strengths in supporting positive outcomes for young people.

We found the young people were kept safe, physically and emotionally. The staff were knowledgeable about the young people and knew how they wanted to be supported. We saw close working relationships with advocacy, education and the specialist intervention service, which ensured young people got the right support at the right time.

We saw lots of warmth and compassion from staff. The houses were welcoming and the interactions between young people and those caring for them were friendly and full of understanding. This meant that young people enjoyed living in the service and wished to stay for as long as they needed the support.

Young people were respected. The managers led by example on this, and we heard that if young people needed something, the managers and staff were proactive in making sure it happened. This respect also meant that young people were advocated for. The role of Who Cares? Scotland was clear and they were regularly involved and familiar to the young people. Where barriers existed, managers sought to keep the needs and rights of the young person as a central focus.

The young people's health needs were met. They continued to have access to Kibble's specialist intervention team as well as the local CAMHS team. The care and support planning structures within Kibble ensured that young people had a comprehensive assessment of their needs and this knowledge led how they were supported.

Academic attainment and further learning were a priority for all of the young people. Staff ensured that young people were either learning or working. In some instances, young people were doing both. There was a structure to daily living that meant young people were up and doing things during the day and encouraged to relax in the evening.

Independence was helpfully promoted and the young people told us that they were being encouraged to get ready to live on their own. The service was encouraging young people to stay as long as they required, but we saw clear evidence of young people being supported to progress. What we did not see, was clear plans for the young people's futures and have asked the service to advocate on behalf of young people to ensure welfare assessments are completed in line with legislative guidance.

The service managers were supportive and empowering. Daytime staff told us that they felt very well supported and encouraged in their roles. The managers of those staff were present and modelled the expected standards of care. We found that nightshift workers were less well supported and not as enabled to develop their skills and understand the vision of the service. Going forward, we would wish to see the management structure aligned to have oversight of all staff working in the service.

The external managers were clear about their roles, particularly in relation to advocacy and championing the best outcomes for young people. They had oversight of the needs of each service and were able to offer resources where they were needed to ensure consistency for young people.

At the time of our inspection, the admission and matching processes had been well followed. However, we

heard from staff that matching was, at times, inconsistent. There were some historical examples where young people had been poorly matched to the service. Staff had their own solution to this and wished to be involved in the matching process.

There was a robust self-evaluation in place for the service and service development plans for each house. We found these plans thorough and strategically aligned but we found these did not reflect the individual needs of each staff team and house. Going forward, the service may wish to consider the role of staff in development plans to ensure they are rooted in the intended outcomes for young people living there.

A number of staff had left the service and a number of new staff had started working with the young people. Despite this, we found a majority of experienced staff in the service and those who had been recruited were very well qualified and skilled to undertake the role. Newer staff were receiving lots of mentoring and support prior to being given additional responsibility.

Young people felt at times that the staffing could be more stable and the arrival of new or unknown staff was unsettling. However, for the most part, they had the same people looking after them, which meant that they were being cared for by people who knew how to help them and trust could be built. This led to young people discussing the past with staff and being able to get the right supports. It also allowed staff the opportunity to help young people recover.

During the course of our inspection, the houses were always appropriately staffed with the right number of people. On occasions, there were more staff present, particularly during times where the risk had increased. The staff told us that in their role, there was a need to be autonomous and at times, make decisions in the midst of pressure. We met staff who were confident in doing this but also very conscious of ensuring everyone worked in the same way. This meant that young people were receiving consistent care and support even when the person supporting them changed.

At the time of our inspection, staff were still awaiting their therapeutic trauma-informed care training but the dates for this had been identified. We found staff already aware of trauma-informed interactions and this was reflected in the way they interacted and wrote about the young people. It meant that young people were getting care and support that was sensitive to their needs and experiences.

Complaints

There have been no complaints upheld since the last inspection. Details of any older upheld complaints are published at www.careinspectorate.com.

Detailed evaluations

| | |
|---|---------------|
| How well do we support children and young people's rights and wellbeing? | 5 - Very Good |
| 7.1 Children and young people are safe, feel loved and get the most out of life | 5 - Very Good |
| 7.2 Leaders and staff have the capacity and resources to meet and champion children and young people's needs and rights | 5 - Very Good |

To find out more

This inspection report is published by the Care Inspectorate. You can download this report and others from our website.

Care services in Scotland cannot operate unless they are registered with the Care Inspectorate. We inspect, award grades and help services to improve. We also investigate complaints about care services and can take action when things aren't good enough.

Please get in touch with us if you would like more information or have any concerns about a care service.

You can also read more about our work online at www.careinspectorate.com

Contact us

Care Inspectorate
Compass House
11 Riverside Drive
Dundee
DD1 4NY

enquiries@careinspectorate.com

0345 600 9527

Find us on Facebook

Twitter: @careinspect

Other languages and formats

This report is available in other languages and formats on request.

Tha am foillseachadh seo ri fhaighinn ann an cruthannan is cànan eile ma nithear iartras.

অনুরোধসাপেক্ষে এই প্রকাশনাটি অন্য ফরম্যাট এবং অন্যান্য ভাষায় পাওয়া যায়।

یہ اشاعت درخواست کرنے پر دیگر شکلوں اور دیگر زبانوں میں فراہم کی جاسکتی ہے۔

ਬੇਨਤੀ 'ਤੇ ਇਹ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਸ਼ਨ ਹੋਰ ਰੂਪਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰਨਾਂ ਭਾਸ਼ਾਵਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਹੈ।

هذه الوثيقة متوفرة بلغات ونماذج أخرى عند الطلب

本出版品有其他格式和其他語言備索。

Na życzenie niniejsza publikacja dostępna jest także w innych formatach oraz językach.