

# Kibble Safe Centre Secure Accommodation Service

Goudie Street  
Paisley  
PA3 2LG

Telephone: 01418 890 044

**Type of inspection:**  
Unannounced

**Completed on:**  
6 December 2024

**Service provided by:**  
Kibble Education and Care Centre

**Service provider number:**  
SP2004007042

**Service no:**  
CS2007144296

## About the service

Kibble Safe Centre is a secure accommodation service in Paisley which provides care and support to a maximum of 18 young people aged from 11 to 18 years.

Young people live in one of three houses, each caring for a maximum of six young people. Each house has single en suite bedrooms, has well-furnished and decorated communal areas and a secure garden.

Young people have access to a swimming pool, outdoor recreational area and gym. Onsite services include Mirin Academy (a school accessed by all young people living in the safe centre, a wide range of specialist intervention services, a campus cop (Police Scotland) and independent advocacy from 'Who Cares'. Young people have access to visiting animals and some are able to attend 'Skills Academy' (a resource providing training for future employment).

## About the inspection

This was an unannounced inspection which took place over 5 days/evenings between Tuesday 26 November and Wednesday 4 December 2024. Following the inspection, verbal feedback was given on Wednesday 4 and Friday 6 December 2024. The inspection was carried out by four inspectors 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 young people using the service, parents and grandparents
- spoke with staff and management
- observed practice and daily life
- reviewed documents
- spoke with visiting professionals.

We also received MS questionnaire responses from 13 young people living at the service, three parents, 20 staff and eight external professionals who were part of the young people's team of support.

During our inspection year 2024-2025 we are taking a closer look at how secure accommodation services maintain and promote young people's safety and rights, if the restrictive practice of seclusion is used. This includes examining culture, policy, practice and outcomes. Any areas for improvement will be highlighted in this report

The Care Inspectorate is a member of <https://www.nationalpreventivemechanism.org.uk> - a group of organisations designated to monitor the treatment and conditions of those people who have been deprived of their liberty. This includes children and young people in secure care.

## Key messages

- There was an embedded culture of relational care which was the foundation of the stability and predictability that allowed young people to thrive.
- Onsite provision to meet young people's physical and mental wellbeing was exceptional with young people really benefitting from the range of support that was available to them.
- The service listened and responded to young people's views and wishes. Independent advocates, and staff, advocated strongly and passionately for young people, with really positive outcomes.
- Arrangements to ensure young people maintained strong links with people who were important to them were individual, welcoming and creative.
- Leadership was very strong. Senior managers worked collaboratively with a range of external organisations to champion the needs and rights of young people.
- Quality assurance of restrictive practices should improve to ensure documented audit trails of checks and safeguards.

## 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?	4 - 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?

4 - Good

We evaluated quality indicator 7.1 as very good as significant strengths supported positive outcomes for young people, and quality indicator 7.2 as good, where several strengths impacted positively on outcomes for children and young people and clearly outweighed areas for improvement.

Keeping young people safe and protected from harm was effectively and consistently prioritised. Where young people didn't feel safe, staff recognised and responded to this through their knowledge and understanding of the young people they cared for. Good collaboration across key agencies ensured risk was understood and managed, while keeping young people at the centre.

Staff were aware and alert to the potential of bullying and the power dynamic within the group. The strength of relationships, and the culture within the houses focused on protecting young people's vulnerabilities, while being supported by staff they trusted to manage this.

There were very good examples of people advocating strongly and passionately for young people, with really positive outcomes. Access to Independent advocacy had increased and was readily available. Staff also had young people's needs and views at the centre of discussion and decisions and involved them wherever possible. In both the care and education setting young people were made aware of their rights and were part of ongoing discussion about their future. There were many very good examples of how the 'our voice' meetings had listened and responded to young people's views and wishes. This ensured that they were central to decisions which affected their lives.

There were comprehensive procedures and processes in place to ensure that staff understood their responsibilities in relation to safeguarding and how they could support young people, and be supported themselves. Relevant agencies were involved and informed, with an emphasis on ensuring that young people got the right support from the right people.

There was a significant focus and culture of relational care, with the aim of this providing stability and predictability for young people. We heard from young people that they found it difficult when key staff had to be moved to other houses (to meet the wider needs of the service) as this had an impact on their planned activities. The service assured us that such moves were infrequent and always to ensure the right care and support was in place.

Young people consistently described really positive relationships that were warm, respectful and fun. Hugs and physical comfort were naturally offered, and asked for, by young people. Many young people told us they had trusting relationships that gave them confidence to express their views and share their experiences. Fun and playfulness were evident with a positive culture of telling the young people how much they were cared for and loved. A young person told us 'That (staff) take time to speak to me and listen to me even when I can be really upset. I know they care and love me'.

Young people benefitted from the high level of importance that was given to improving the environment. Continued attention was given to making the houses as homely and individual as they could be, whilst being mindful of the need for safety and security. Particular focus on reducing noise across both the care and education supported young people who could find this difficult. Young people personalised their rooms to make them a safe and comfortable space.

From the point of admission young people were fully engaged in their own care and support. There were a wide variety of informal and formal ways of gathering views which effectively contributed to individual support and service improvement. We saw good examples of where young people had been involved in their 'support' plans and had contributed to what would work for them, and what they needed from the people around them. Consideration needed to be given to ensuring information wasn't overly repetitive, or goals overly complex, and that strategies of support were specific. The service continued to promote 'promise focussed' language, ensuring that institutional and impersonal terms were not used in discussion or recording.

Young people experienced a highly integrated approach to their physical and mental health wellbeing. The service continued to have a high level of multi-disciplinary healthcare provision onsite with a team who were very well equipped to meet a wide range of complex needs. There were extremely positive examples of unmet healthcare needs being met and making significant improvement to young people's wellbeing.

Connections between young people and their family and friends were nurtured. We heard that family and friends were welcomed, and there was a highly individualised approach to visits and family time. There were some excellent examples that ensured young people's relationships remained strong. Family feedback was good, though a number of families shared how difficult it was to phone individual houses to speak to their children.

Parents and young people described opportunities to engage and succeed in education which were significant, which they had not experienced before and which developed their self- confidence, skills and qualifications. For those able to leave the secure provision skills academy offered practical training. In response to the changing age of young people there were ongoing plans to develop skills academy onsite. This would provide opportunities for young people who could not leave the safe centre to develop skills for life.

Young people were supported to share their views about the food (which were very mixed). Outwith mealtimes there were many examples of food being used to celebrate, have fun and develop new skills. Families told us of visits where the whole family had joined together for meals and how important this was to all of them.

There was a clear structure of leadership within the organisation which provided direction, support and mentoring. This meant that staff were clear about the values of the organisation. Discussion and observation demonstrated a strong culture of young people being at the forefront of all discussion and decisions (current and future).

Managers were highly visible, approachable and had good oversight of the day-to-day functioning of all of the houses in safe centre. This gave staff and young people a confidence that managers understood their needs and were responsive to these.

Young people's support was consistently informed by assessment and discussion across various teams and multi-disciplinary professionals. Staff were thoughtful in their approach to the management of risk and where possible tried to support young people without the use of restraint. The service demonstrated an impressive commitment to the continued reduction of restraint and evidenced significant progress.

Significant improvement was needed to ensure a structured approach to quality assurance of incidents and restraint, which would demonstrate reflection, and learning and development. Examination of incident reports, and quality assurance of these, did not always demonstrate the justification for restraint or

searches, and did not provide enough information about how and when young people were supported when away from the group. Recording raised a number of questions which should have been queried during the quality assurance process to demonstrate young people's rights had been upheld. **(See area for improvement 1.)**

Senior managers were aspirational and forward-thinking. They worked collaboratively with a range of external organisations to champion the wider needs and rights of young people and influence the way forward at service, sector and national levels.

Managers had a very good understanding of the individual skills and interests of each staff member. There were a number of ways in which staffing needs were assessed, however these may be overly reliant on the knowledge of senior staff, and could be improved by a more joined up/ connected staffing needs assessment.

There was a learning culture which was constantly evolving to ensure staff could meet the changing needs of young people. There were impressive learning and development opportunities for staff at all levels, and posts. A trainee programme provided great opportunities for learning and development and had proved effective in recruiting good staff. Staff supervision met the expectations set by the organisation, however, new staff would benefit from earlier formal supervision to ensure their ongoing professional development.

Despite the sector challenges, the service was doing well to maintain high levels of staff who were well recruited. Staff recruitment was in line with safer recruitment guidance, and we saw that young people took a meaningful part in the process of interviewing candidates. A comprehensive induction process ensured staff were well supported to understand their role and how they would support young people.

Individual house and service development plans identified the vision for the service and how this would be met. Plans reflected the values of Kibble and their commitment to improvement and meeting the needs of young people both currently and in the future. Senior managers continued to work collaboratively with a range of external organisations to champion the needs and rights of all young people.

## Areas for improvement

1. To ensure young people are protected and not subjected to unnecessary restrictive practice, the service should ensure effective oversight of recording and quality assurance of restrictive practice.

This should include but is not limited to clearly defining expected standards of documentation, use of language and expected outcomes from incident review processes, and to ensure quality assurance of restrictive practice includes an effective and documented audit trail of checks and safeguards.

This is to ensure that care and support is consistent with the Health and Social Care Standards (HSCS) which state that:

'I benefit from a culture of continuous improvement, with the organisation having robust and transparent quality assurances process' (HSCS 4.19).

2. n/a

## Complaints

There have been no complaints upheld since the last inspection. Details of any older upheld complaints are published at [www.careinspectorate.com](http://www.careinspectorate.com).

## Detailed evaluations

How well do we support children and young people's rights and wellbeing?	4 - 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	4 - 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](http://www.careinspectorate.com)

## Contact us

Care Inspectorate  
Compass House  
11 Riverside Drive  
Dundee  
DD1 4NY

[enquiries@careinspectorate.com](mailto: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.