



The **Regulation** and
Quality Improvement
Authority

RQIA

**Mental Health and Learning
Disability**

**Patient Experience
Interviews Report**

Lissan 1 Ward,

Holywell Hospital

**Northern Health and Social
Care Trust**

23 May 2014



informing and improving health and social care
www.rqia.org.uk

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose of the inspection	3
1.2	Methods/process	4
2.0	Ward Profile	5
3.0	Outcomes of interviews, direct observation and staff and patient interactions	6
4.0	Conclusion	9
	Signature Page	10
	Appendix 1: Patient Experience Interview Questionnaire.	11

1.0 Introduction

The Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (RQIA) is the independent body responsible for regulating and inspecting the quality and availability of Northern Ireland's health and social care services. RQIA was established under the Health and Personal Social Services (Quality, Improvement and Regulation) (Northern Ireland) Order 2003, to drive improvements for everyone using health and social care services. The work undertaken by the Mental Health and Learning Disability team (MHLDD) is fundamentally underpinned by a human rights framework and the Human Rights Act (1998). Additionally, RQIA is designated as one of the four Northern Ireland bodies that form part of the UK's National Preventive Mechanism (NPM). RQIA undertake a programme of regular visits to places of detention in order to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, upholding the organisation's commitment to the United Nations Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture (OPCAT).

1.1 Purpose of the visit

Patient Experience Interviews (PEIs) form an integral component of the RQIA inspection programme.

Aims

- To monitor the care and treatment of individuals detained under the Mental Health (Northern Ireland) Order 1986, taking specific cognisance of the individual's perception of their care;
- To monitor the care and treatment of any individual inpatients in MHLDD facilities, taking specific cognisance of the individual's perception of their care;
- To make relevant recommendations where required to improve the patient experience with line with the standards detailed in The Quality Standards for Health and Social Care (DHSSPSNI, 2006).

Objectives-

- To engage and consult with patients and their advocates;
- To ensure that patients are afforded due respect for individual human rights;
- To monitor the context and environment within which care is provided;
- To monitor the quality and availability of care;
- To make appropriate recommendations for improvement and to highlight any issues of concern in line with the escalation policy;

- To provide feedback on concerns/issues raised
- To inform the annual inspection processes.

1.2 Methods/Process

Prior to the inspection RQIA forwarded notification of the visit to the Trust; this allowed the patients and the ward an opportunity to prepare for the interviews.

On this occasion four patients wished to meet with the inspector to participate in the patient experience interviews. The inspector completed a direct observation of the ward using guidance from the Quality of Interaction Schedule (QUIS). Verbal feedback was provided to the ward manager at the conclusion of the visit.

There are no recommendations made following the patient experience interviews.

A copy of the interview questions is included at Appendix 1.

2.0 Ward profile

Trust/Name of Ward	Northern Health and Social Care Trust, Lissan 1 ward.
Name of hospital/facility	Holywell Hospital Lissan 1 Psychiatric Intensive Care Unit
Address	Steeple Road Antrim BT41 2RJ
Telephone number	02894465211
Person-in-charge on day of visit	Ms Wilma Thom Ward Manager
Email address	Wilma.thom@northerntrust.hscni.net
Number of patients and occupancy level on days of visit	Beds 9 Occupancy levels 9
Number of detained patients on day of inspection	9
Number of patients who met with the inspector	4
Date and type of last inspection	Announced inspection 6 December 2013
Name of inspector	Alan Guthrie

Lissan 1 is a psychiatric intensive care unit (PICU) located on the Holywell hospital site. The ward has nine beds and provides care and treatment for male patients. On the day of the inspection all of the patients were detained in accordance with the Mental Health (Northern Ireland) Order 1986.

The ward is supported by a multi-disciplinary team that includes a consultant psychiatrist, nursing staff, a social worker, occupational therapy and advocacy services.

3.0 Outcomes of interviews, direct observation and staff and patient interactions

Number of patients interviewed

Four patients chose to meet with the inspector of the day of the visit. All four patients had been detained in accordance with the Mental Health Order (Northern Ireland) 1986.

Specific issues raised by patients/representatives

Patients were asked if they wished to discuss any particular aspect or concern about their care and treatment. Patients detailed no specific issues they wished to discuss.

Direct Observations

Ward environment

On the day of the inspection the ward was clean and clutter free. The main entrance door to the ward was locked and the area was monitored by CCTV. Access to the ward was gained via a buzzer system. The ward's office was situated beside the ward's main foyer. The office could be accessed from the foyer and from a door adjoining the central ward area where patients were located. Doors to the central ward area were locked. Information detailing the ethos of the ward and the reason why doors were locked was displayed in a number of areas throughout the ward.

Information in relation to who was on duty, advocacy, patient rights and how to make a complaint was available in the ward's office and in patient areas.

Patients could access a large outside area situated at the back of the ward. The area had recently been renovated and it was clean and modern. The area provided patients with the opportunity to participate in five-a-side football.

Staff and patient interactions

During the inspection the inspector noted that staff were moving throughout the ward and communication between staff and patients was open and on a first name basis. Patients presented as at ease within their surroundings and the atmosphere within the ward was calm. The inspector noted that staff were respectful and courteous and encouraged patients to engage in discussion regarding their experience of the ward.

Outcomes from interviews

Responses to questions 1-1d

Three of the four patients who met with the inspector detailed that they knew why they were in hospital and understood what they were allowed and not allowed to do. One patient stated they knew why they were in hospital but did not know what they were allowed and not allowed to do. Further discussion with the patient revealed that the patient had been informed of the reasons why they were in hospital and the restrictions on the ward to ensure patient safety and wellbeing. The patient stated that they did not agree with this assessment of their circumstances.

The patients informed the inspector that they understood the purpose and role of the Mental Health Review Tribunal.

Responses to questions 2- 2c

Three patients relayed that they had been given the opportunity to be involved in their care and support and had been able to involve their families. One patient reported that they felt they had not been given this opportunity. However, the patient reflected that staff had involved them in decisions regarding their care and treatment. The patient did not provide an answer regarding the involvement of their family.

Each of the patients informed the inspector that nursing and medical staff had spoken with them regarding their health and medication.

Responses to questions 3 & 3a

Two patients stated that they understood the role of the ward's advocate and the purpose of the advocacy service. One patient did not provide an answer and one patient detailed that they did not know what an advocate was. The inspector discussed the patient's response with the ward manager. The manager explained that the patient information booklet detailed the role of the advocate and provided contact information for patients. Posters regarding the advocacy service were also available in the ward's foyer and within the visitors room. The ward manager agreed to discuss the role and purpose of the ward's advocate with the patient.

Responses to questions 4-4b

Three of the patients interviewed informed the inspector that they had not experienced being restrained during their admission. One patient had previously been restrained. The patient reflected that staff "had been fine" during the use of restraint and they had explained the reasons why restraint had been used. The patient reported that they had not been hurt and staff attitude had been "okay".

Responses to questions 5-5c

Two patients detailed they had experienced being placed in a room on their own (seclusion). Both patients stated that the reason for being put into the room had been explained to them.

Responses to question 6

Two patients informed the inspector that they felt safe on the ward. One patient reported that they did not feel safe "...because of what I think and how I feel" the patient explained that although they felt this way the ward "...was a place to get help". One patient detailed that they did not feel safe "...because everyone is against me". The patient stated that they felt "no one is on my side". The patient could not recount any specific incidents to support their feelings.

Responses to questions 7-7b

One patient reported that no items had been removed from them on admission. Two patients had had their phones removed and the reason for this had been explained to them. Both patients relayed they could access their phones upon request to staff and could also access a ward phone as required. One patient could not remember what item(s) had been removed but they could remember staff telling them the reason why the item(s) were being retained by the ward. The patient stated they had no concerns regarding access to their personal property.

Responses to questions 8 & 8a

Patients detailed no difficulty in being able to access the ward's garden and courtyard area. Three patients explained that they were currently ward based and they were not allowed time off the ward. The patients reported that staff had explained the reasons for this to them and that their circumstances remained subject to ongoing daily review. One patient relayed that they could go for a walk with staff, one patient was unsure if they could go for a walk and one patient was adamant that they couldn't go for a walk, at present, as they had attempted to abscond on several occasions.

Responses to questions 9 -9b

Patients expressed no concerns regarding their ability to speak with staff if something was wrong or making them unhappy. Two patients had never had to do this. Two patients detailed that they had reported issues to staff. Both patients relayed they had not been happy with how their concern had been dealt with. One patient explained that their issue related to a medication request and they had been informed that the doctor had assessed the request as inappropriate to the patient's treatment needs. The second patient did not disclose to the inspector the detail of the concern they had reported. Both patients stated that they had been informed about the ward's and Trust's complaints procedure.

Responses to question 10

Two patients reflected that they were satisfied with care and treatment they had received. One patient commented that the care and treatment in the ward was “Good enough... it’s okay”. Two patients were not satisfied with their treatment. Both patients reflected that they did not want to be detained and they should be allowed to leave the ward.

Additional areas discussed during the visit

There were no additional issues discussed.

4.0 Conclusions

The inspector met with four of the nine patients who were on Lissan 1. All of the patients interviewed had been detained in accordance with the Mental Health (Northern Ireland) Order 1986.

Patients relayed understanding as to why they were in hospital and expressed appropriate knowledge and insight regarding the ward’s ethos. During the inspection the inspector noted that the ward remained calm and patient and staff relationships were relaxed and respectful.

From the observations of the ward on the day of the Patient Experience Interviews, the inspectors’ impression of the overall treatment and care on the ward was found to be in keeping with the five standards of respect, attitude, behaviour, communication privacy and dignity as referenced in the Department of health, Social Services and Public Safety; Improving the Patients & Client Experience, November 2008. Staff demonstrated respect in all contacts with patients. Staff demonstrated positive attitudes towards patients. Staff demonstrated professional and considerate behaviour towards patients. Staff communicated in a way that was sensitive to the needs and preferences of patients. Staff protected the privacy and dignity of patients.

The inspector would like to thank the patients and staff for their cooperation throughout the interview processes.



The **Regulation** and
Quality Improvement
Authority

No requirements or recommendations resulted from the Patient Experience Interviews of **Lissan 1, Holywell Hospital** which was undertaken on **23 May 2014** and I agree with the content of the report.

Please provide any additional comments or observations you may wish to make below:

[]

NAME OF REGISTERED MANAGER COMPLETING	[JOSEPH JOBY]
NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON / IDENTIFIED RESPONSIBLE PERSON APPROVING	[LARRY O'NEILL - INTERIM CE]

Approved by:	Date
Alan Guthrie	2 July 2014

Appendix 1 –

Patient Experience Interview Questionnaire

