

## Patient Led Audits of the Care Environment

A Healthwatch report of the scores achieved  
by local Trusts between 2013 - 2018



**Brighton and Sussex  
University Hospitals**  
NHS Trust



**Sussex Partnership**  
NHS Foundation Trust

Published: August 2019

# Contents

Item	Title	Page(s)
1	About us	3
2	Acknowledgements	3
3	Executive summary	4 - 6
4	Overview of Healthwatch recommendations for BSUH & SPFT	7 - 8
5	Partner comments	9
6	Findings from PLACE and Healthwatch involvement	10
7	Results from 2018	11
	BSUH results	11 - 16
	- Scores achieved by the six BSUH sites	12 - 14
	- BSUH compared with National PLACE scores	15
	- BSUH: trends since 2013	15 - 16
	SPFT results	17 - 22
	- Scores achieved by two local SPFT sites	17 - 20
	- SPFT compared with National PLACE scores	21
	- SPFT: trends since 2013	21 - 22
	List of Annexes	23
A	Locations of wards, clinics or departments visited during PLACE 2018	23
B	National average PLACE scores 2013-2018 (%)	24
C	Percentage scores achieved by BSUH sites 2013-2018	25
D	List of tables	26
	Contact information	27

## About us

Healthwatch Brighton and Hove is the independent champion for people who use health and social care services in Brighton and Hove.

Our job is to make sure that those who run local health and care services understand and act on what really matters to people. We listen to what people like about services and what could be improved. We share what people tell us with those with the power to make change happen. We encourage services to involve people in decisions that affect them. We also help people find the information they need about services in their area.

## Acknowledgements

Healthwatch Brighton and Hove would like to thank the following volunteers who have supported this project:

Mike Doodson  
Nick Goslett  
Sylvia New  
Sue Seymour  
Lynne Shields  
Maureen Smalldridge  
Louise Spry  
Roger Squier

We would also like to thank Terece Walters, Karon Goodman, Emil Pacan, Caroline Davies, Philip Holmes and all the staff of the Brighton and Sussex University Hospital Trust; and Craig Mooney, Gavin Ford, Chris MacDonald and all the staff at the Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust for facilitating our visits.

Report author: Alan Boyd

## Executive summary

The Patient Led Audit of the Care Environment (“PLACE”) programme is a voluntary scheme that was introduced by the NHS in April 2013. It provides an annual appraisal of the non-clinical aspects of NHS and independent or private healthcare settings e.g. it uses six standards to quantify the environment’s cleanliness, food and hydration provision, the extent to which the provision of care with privacy and dignity is supported, and whether the premises are equipped to meet the needs of people with dementia or with a disability. PLACE is now operated by NHS Digital who are also responsible for collating individual Trust scores. In recent years Healthwatch Brighton and Hove has supported two local Trusts to complete their PLACE assessments: Brighton Sussex Universities Hospital Trust (BSUH) and the Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT).

Following the [publication](#) of the 2018 PLACE scores Healthwatch undertook some analysis of the historic results to gain a better picture of what these revealed. As PLACE happens once a year the scores provide only a snapshot of our two Trusts. This means that the scores and findings need to be taken in context i.e. both Trusts are continually taking action to improve their hospitals all year round meaning that some of the scores are not always representative of the current position. Nevertheless the historic scores show how both Trusts have improved over the years, and how some scores have fluctuated. Where possible Healthwatch has identified any trends and provided recommendations. Healthwatch hopes that this analysis will be useful to both Trusts and support them to direct resources to certain areas, such as improving ‘privacy, dignity and wellbeing’.

It is important to highlight that Healthwatch has not produced any of the raw PLACE data and in fact we do not have access to this.

**At national level**, across England average site PLACE scores improved on 2017 across all of the six standards that were assessed. The largest increases were seen for the dementia standard (up 2.2%) and disability standard (up 1.6%). Overall, the highest national average domain score was for the cleanliness standard, at 98.5% (see Annex B for more details).

**At local level**, the 2018 PLACE results for BSUH and SPFT are discussed separately below, but the headlines are as follows:

BSUH	SPFT
<p>The overall scores achieved by the BSUH Trust in 2018 were lower than those achieved in 2017. They were also lower than the national averages across all six standards, although sometimes the difference was marginal. However, individual site scores varied considerably with some posting significant increases.</p> <p>As in previous years BSUH Trust received a very high average score for ‘cleanliness’ (96%); whilst ‘dementia’ and ‘privacy, dignity and wellbeing’ attracted lower scores (63% and 66% respectively).</p>	<p>The overall scores achieved by the SPFT Trust were largely similar to those achieved in 2017.</p> <p>In four standards SPFT scored higher than the national averages. The remaining scores for ‘cleanliness’ and ‘food and hydration’ were very close to the national averages.</p> <p>Mill View hospital recorded significant increases in their scores for ‘dementia’ and ‘disability’. However, Rutland Gardens recorded significant falls of over 30% in their scores for ‘privacy, dignity &amp; wellbeing’ and ‘disability’.</p>

## BSUH PLACE results

Between 2013 - 2017 the Trust improved its scores across a number of standards particularly for 'cleanliness' and 'maintenance, condition and appearance' (see Annex C). In 2018, scores for some standards fell unexpectedly and the Trust moved swiftly to implement a range of measures to improve things including the creation of the Food Improvement Group and publication of its dementia strategy.

In 2018, a number of the six sites which constitute the BSUH Trust achieved high PLACE scores notably for their 'cleanliness' and 'condition, maintenance and appearance and their successes are to be applauded':

- The Sussex Orthopaedic Centre increased their scores across five standards.
- The Royal Alexandra Children's Hospital (RACH) increased their scores across three standards.
- The RSCH and the Sussex Eye Hospital either maintained or slightly increased their scores across two standards.

Healthwatch shares the BSUH senior team's disappointment in the overall PLACE scores achieved in 2018. We agree that these scores do not reflect the hard work that has gone in to improving the environments of all six sites. In 2018, the PLACE scores achieved across the six sites varied considerably, and the lower than expected scores achieved by the Princess Royal hospital has unfortunately affected the overall BSUH averages. Once again, the Trust has already started work to tackle any shortfalls.

Despite the disappointing PLACE scores, in January the BSUH Trust was deservedly taken out of special measures with the CQC rating the Trust as 'Good' overall and 'Outstanding' for being caring. Healthwatch has also seen for itself how the Trust has taken steps to improve the physical environments of our local hospitals over the last year. Healthwatch works in close partnership with BSUH, and through our dedicated monthly Environmental Care Audits have provided the Trust with over 200 patient-focussed recommendations that have resulted in numerous improvements being made (our latest report "*Environmental audits of the Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals Trust: April 2018- March 2019*" can be found on our website).

## Ongoing improvements

Healthwatch was concerned by the reduction in some of the 2018 BSUH scores, notably those achieved for the 'food & hydration' standard which was down 11% on 2017, and the 'dementia' standard which was down 10%; and also the year-on-year downward trend recorded by the score for 'privacy, dignity and well-being'. In light of this Healthwatch raised its concerns with the Trust and has been reassured by the programme of activities that the Trust has implemented to tackle these areas (more detail below).

## SPFT PLACE results

Between 2013 - 2017 the Trust improved its scores across all of the standards assessed. SPFT's overall 2018 PLACE scores are to be applauded and their success is mirrored by the findings of their latest CQC report. The 2018 PLACE results reflect the outcomes of twenty individual site assessments, with the majority of these posting very good results.

Healthwatch would like to acknowledge the impressive improvements achieved by Mill View Hospital in their scores for the 'condition, appearance and maintenance', 'food and hydration', 'dementia' and 'disability' standards - all of which increased in 2018.

Although SPFT's overall score for the 'food and hydration' standard remained good we note that there has been a small year-on-year reduction since 2015; and the current score is the lowest ever achieved by SPFT.

Healthwatch is however concerned by some of the poor results recorded by Rutland Gardens, which is one of two sites that we helped to assess. The scores for the 'privacy, dignity and well-being' and 'disability' standards have both dropped by over 30% when compared to 2017, and were the lowest scores out of the twenty SPFT sites visited for PLACE 2018. These are significant and worrying decreases and Healthwatch has already raised these with SPFT who have indicated that they are investigating the reasons for these falls.

# Overview of Healthwatch recommendations

## Brighton Sussex Universities Hospital Trust (BSUH)

### Cleanliness (national average score: 98.5%, BSUH score 96%)

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1  | We recommend that the Trust conducts an audit to identify 'best practice' standards which are helping to achieve strong results at five of its six sites.   |
| 1a | Using this data we recommend that the Trust determines how these standards can be applied to help improve cleanliness at the Princes Royal Hospital (PRH) and bring this site's score back to the level seen in 2017. |

### Food & hydration (national average score: 90%; BSUH score 84%)

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 2  | We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others.                           |
| 2a | Using this data we recommend that the Trust utilises the Food Improvement Group (FIG) to develop an action plan to raise standards in these specific areas.     |
| 2b | In addition, the FIG could be tasked with developing an action plan to help ensure that future PLACE scores improve and achieve levels previously seen in 2017. |

### Privacy, Dignity, Wellbeing (national average score: 84%; BSUH score 66%)

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 3  | We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others.                             |
| 3a | We also recommend that the Trust identify learning which helped the Sussex Orthopaedic Centre to achieve a 15.5% increase in their score over the last year.      |
| 3b | Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies a task force and/or an action plan to further improve privacy, dignity and wellbeing across all six sites. |

### Condition, Appearance, Maintenance (national average: 94%; BSUH score 86%)

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 4  | We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others.                   |
| 4a | We recommend that the Trust conducts an audit to identify 'best practice' standards which are helping to achieve good results at five of its six sites. |
| 4b | Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve the condition, appearance and maintenance of the PRH site.     |

### Dementia (national average score: 79%; BSUH score 63%)

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 5  | We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others.              |
| 5a | Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve how dementia patients are cared for across all six sites. |

### Disability (national average score: 84%; BSUH score 73%)

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 6  | We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others.                                      |
| 6a | We also recommend that the Trust identify learning which helped the Sussex Orthopaedic Centre and Children's Hospital achieve increases in their scores over the last year |
| 6b | Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve how disabled patients are cared for across sites with poor PLACE scores.          |

## Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT).

Privacy, dignity and wellbeing (national average score 84%; SPFT score 89%; Mill view score: 94.5%; Rutland Gardens score: 61.5%)

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1a | We recommend that the Trust identify learning and 'best practice' which helped the majority of SPFT sites achieve high scores.                                  |
| 1b | Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies a task force and/or an action plan to further improve privacy, dignity and wellbeing at Rutland Gardens. |

Condition, appearance, maintenance (national average: 94%; SPFT score: 95%; Mill View score: 99%; Rutland Gardens score: 89%)

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 2  | We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify the specific areas which led to the decrease in the score at Rutland Gardens.     |
| 2a | We also recommend that the Trust identify learning and 'best practice' which helped the majority of other SPFT sites achieve high scores.             |
| 2b | Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve the condition, appearance and maintenance of Rutland Gardens |

Disability (national average score: 84%; SPFT score: 86%; Mill View score: 96.5%; Rutland Gardens score: 59%)

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 3  | We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify the specific areas which led to the decrease in the score at Rutland Gardens. |
| 3a | We also recommend that the Trust identify learning and 'best practice' which helped the majority of other SPFT sites achieve high scores.         |
| 3b | Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve how disabled patients are cared for at Rutland Gardens.  |

## Partner comments

### **Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust**

We would like to thank Healthwatch for the ongoing work undertaken by a dedicated team of Healthwatch volunteers who, on a monthly basis, conduct 'mini-PLACE' audits in various areas of the Trust. These audits lead to recommendations and an action plan, which is re-audited at a later date. This work has been the catalyst for positive change.

The findings of the 2018 PLACE audit were disappointing and the Trust is taking action to address the recommendations in this report. Whilst acknowledging that some of the environmental concerns, particularly around privacy and dignity (e.g. not having a private room to have conversations with patients and families), cannot be fully addressed until the new hospital building is complete on the RSCH site, in April 2021.

Since the 2018 PLACE visits in spring 2018, some considerable improvements have been made and the CQC in September 2018 noted "*staff keep themselves, equipment and the premises clean*" and that there was a "*strong, visible person-centred culture*". They also noted that there is no dementia strategy and this will now be published in summer 2019. Some investment has already happened to improve the dementia environment.

The Trust has a Food Improvement Group, which works on a number of measures to improve the patients' experience of mealtimes. The new patient food provider commenced on April 2<sup>nd</sup> 2019 and we are confident that this will address some of the concerns that are evident in the PLACE scores.

The Trust ensures that these issues are reported at the Patient Experience Panel, which is co-chaired by the Chief Officer of Healthwatch Brighton and Hove and the Nurse Director of BSUH. Healthwatch also sit on our Patient Experience and Engagement Quality Governance Group. This joint working is fundamental to the successful implementation of patient centred improvements.

We look forward to working with Healthwatch and its dedicated volunteers during 2019.

**Clare Williams, Interim Chief Nurse**

**Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust** welcomes this report and is pleased that its continuous effort to improve the patient environment is recognised.

We are surprised and disappointed with the score for Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing at Rutland Gardens and will investigate why this is the case, as nothing has changed at the site over the last year.

As always, we appreciate and are grateful for the help and support we receive from Healthwatch and its volunteers. We look forward to working with you again in 2019.

**Gavin Ford, Head of Facilities**

# Findings from PLACE 2018

## Overview of PLACE

PLACE aims to promote the principles established by the [NHS Constitution](#) that focus on areas that matter to patients, families and carers:

- Putting patients first;
- Capturing active feedback from the public, patients and staff;
- Adhering to basics of quality care;
- Ensuring services are provided in environments that are fit for purpose.

In 2018, both Brighton Sussex Universities Hospital Trust (BSUH) and the Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT) took part in PLACE, and were supported by Healthwatch when completing their assessments.

The PLACE assessment tool provides a framework for assessing quality against common guidelines and standards. The environment is assessed using a number of question forms depending on the services provided by the facility. These can be viewed [here](#).

The six standards that are used to quantify how good the environment is are as follows:

1. cleanliness;
2. food and hydration provision;
3. the extent to which the provision of care with privacy and dignity is supported;
4. overall condition, appearance and maintenance;
5. whether the premises are equipped to meet the needs of people living with dementia and,
6. whether the premises are equipped to meet the needs of people living with a disability.

A total score as a percentage is produced for each domain at site and organisation level, as well as a national and a regional result.

## Healthwatch involvement in PLACE 2018

PLACE encourages the involvement of patients, the public, and both national and local organisations that have an interest in healthcare in assessing providers. Assessments are therefore undertaken by teams made up of hospital staff and members of the public (or patient assessors). All assessment teams must include a minimum of two patient assessors, making up at least 50% of the team. As in previous years, Healthwatch volunteers provided invaluable support in undertaking a number of PLACE visits at the Brighton Sussex Universities Hospital Trust (BSUH) and the Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT) (see Annex A for a list of the sites visited and assessed during PLACE 2018).

## Results from PLACE 2018

At national level, across England average site PLACE scores slightly improved on those achieved in 2017. This increase occurred across all of the six standards that were used to assess 'quality' environments. The largest increases were seen for the 'dementia' (up 2.2 percentage points) and 'disability' (up 1.6 percentage points) standards. These increases may reflect increased investment in and understanding of these newer PLACE domains (dementia was introduced in 2015 and disability in 2016). Overall, the highest national average domain score was for 'cleanliness', at 98.5%. The PLACE results for BSUH and SPFT are discussed separately below.

### Brighton Sussex Universities Hospital Trust (BSUH)

In summary, the overall average scores for the BSUH Trust in 2018 were lower than those achieved in 2017 and lower than national averages across all six standards, although for 'cleanliness' the difference was only marginal (see Table 3). However, there were also some increases seen in individual site scores (see Table 2).

As in previous years the BSUH Trust received its highest average score for 'cleanliness' (96%); whilst 'dementia' and 'privacy, dignity and wellbeing' continue to be the standards which attracted the lowest average scores (63% and 66% respectively).

**Table 1: The 2018 BSUH PLACE scores were as follows**

BSUH	Cleanliness	Food & Hydration	Privacy, Dignity	Condition, Appearance	Dementia	Disability
	96%	84%	66%	86%	63%	73%

All numbers have been rounded to the nearest 0.5

The changes in the scores for the BSUH Trust from 2017 to 2018 were as follows:

- Food & Hydration down 11%
- Dementia down 10%
- Disability down 8%
- Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing down 7%
- Condition, Appearance and Maintenance down 5%
- Cleanliness down 3%

### How scores were calculated

The scores awarded to the BSUH Trust were the averages of those achieved across the six hospital sites<sup>1</sup>:

1. Royal Sussex County Hospital (RSCH)
2. Royal Alexandra Children's Hospital (RACH)
3. Sussex Eye Hospital
4. Newhaven Polyclinic
5. Sussex Orthopaedic Centre
6. The Princess Royal (PRH)

As can be seen in Table 2 below the scores across the six BSUH Trust sites varied considerably and the under or over-performance by some sites has affected the overall BSUH averages.

<sup>1</sup> Healthwatch Brighton and Hove are most interested in the scores awarded by the first four sites which fall directly within our geographical/operational remit.

## Assessment of the BSUH PLACE results in 2018

Healthwatch has undertaken an analysis of the 2018 BSUH average and individual site PLACE scores as follows:

- A. We compared the scores achieved by each of the six sites that make up the BSUH Trust against each other (see Table 2).
- B. We compared the overall average BSUH scores against national averages (see Table 3)
- C. We looked at how the overall average BSUH scores have changed since 2013 when PLACE was first introduced (see Table 4).

### A. Individual 2018 PLACE scores achieved by the six BSUH sites

Table 2 below shows the individual scores achieved in 2018 by each of the six sites that constitute the BSUH Trust. The table also shows how the scores have changed since 2017 across five sites (please note that Newhaven Polyclinic did not form part of PLACE 2017 and scores are not available for that year. Please also note that Table 12 shows historic site scores for BSUH from 2013-2018).

In 2018, the following PLACE scores - and any changes from 2017 - were observed; and in light of these findings Healthwatch has made recommendations for the Trust to consider as shown in the blue boxes.

#### Overall scores across the six standards

- The Sussex Orthopaedic Centre achieved improved scores across five standards.
- The RACH improved their scores in three standards and saw decreases in two others.
- The RSCH and the Eye Hospital both saw decreases in scores across four standards, but maintained or achieved improved scores in two others.
- The Princess Royal Hospital saw decreases in scores across all six standards (varying from -8.5% to -18%).
- Newhaven Polyclinic scored below national averages across all six standards (2017 scores were not available to compare against).
- Healthwatch congratulations those sites which achieved improved scores in 2018.

#### BSUH 'cleanliness' scores (national average score: 98.5%)

- The RACH achieved a perfect score for 'cleanliness' (100%).
- The RSCH, Eye Hospital, Sussex Orthopaedic Centre and Newhaven Polyclinic sites all achieved near perfect scores (99% or 98%).
- Healthwatch congratulations these sites on their excellent scores.
- Only the PRH saw a decrease of 11% (which affected the overall BSUH average).

**1** We recommend that the Trust conducts an audit to identify 'best practice' standards which are helping to achieve strong results at five of its six sites.

**1a** Using this data we recommend that the Trust determines how these standards can be applied to help further improve cleanliness at the PRH, and bring this site's score back to the level seen in 2017.

#### BSUH 'food & hydration' scores (national average score: 90%)

- Five sites saw decreases in their food scores (varying from -9% to -14.5%).
- Newhaven Polyclinic scored 83% (the site was not scored in 2017).

**2** We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others.

**2a** Using this data we recommend that the Trust utilises the BSUH Food Improvement Group (FIG) to develop an action to raise standards in these specific areas.

**2b** In addition, the FIG could be tasked with developing an action plan to help ensure that future PLACE scores improve and attain levels seen in 2017.

### BSUH 'privacy, dignity & wellbeing' scores (national average score: 84%)

- The Sussex Orthopaedic Centre was the only site to see an increase in their score for 'privacy, dignity and wellbeing' (a 15.5% increase). Healthwatch congratulates the Centre on their excellent score.
- The remaining four sites all saw decreases (varying from -4% to -13%).
- At 56%, Newhaven Polyclinic was the worst performing site (28% lower than the national average)

3	We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which individual wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others
3a	We also recommend that the Trust identify learning which helped the Sussex Orthopaedic Centre achieve a 15.5% increase in their score over the last year.
3b	Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies a task force and/or an action plan to further improve 'privacy, dignity and wellbeing' across all six sites.

### BSUH 'condition, appearance & maintenance' scores (national average: 94%)

- Three sites saw increases in their scores (varying from +2.5 to +10%).
- The RSCH matched their 2017 score of 91%.
- Newhaven Polyclinic performed well with a score of 90%
- Healthwatch congratulates these sites on their excellent scores.
- Only the PRH saw a decrease in their score which was significant (down 18% to 73%) and this affected the overall BSUH average.

4	We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others
4a	We recommend that the Trust conducts an audit to identify 'best practice' standards which are helping to achieve good results at five of its six sites.
4b	Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve the condition, appearance and maintenance of the PRH site.

### BSUH 'dementia' scores (national average score: 79%)

- Only four sites have scores which can be compared.
- Three sites saw decreases in their scores (varying from -8% to -10.5%).
- Only the Sussex Orthopaedic Centre saw an increase of +6.5%
- Newhaven Polyclinic scored 66% (16% lower than the national average).

5	We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others.
5a	Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to improve how dementia patients are cared for across all six sites.

### BSUH 'disability' scores (national average score: 84%)

- The Sussex Orthopaedic Centre and RACH increased their scores (8.5% and 5% respectively). Healthwatch congratulates these sites on their excellent scores.
- The remaining three sites all saw decreases (varying from -5.5% to -11%).

6	We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify which wards, departments or sites scored more poorly than others.
6a	We also recommend that the Trust identify learning which helped the Sussex Orthopaedic Centre and RACH achieve increases in their scores over the last year
6b	Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve how disabled patients are cared for across sites with poorer scores.

Table 2: Individual 2017 & 2018 PLACE scores achieved by the six BSUH sites, including any variations from 2017 to 2018

	Cleanliness		Food		Privacy, dignity, wellbeing		Condition appearance, maintenance		Dementia		Disability*	
	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018
Royal Sussex County Hospital	99	99 (no change)	95.5	83.5 (-12)	70	63 (-13)	91	91 (no change)	73.5	62 (-11.5)	82	71 (-11)
Sussex Eye Hospital	99	99 (no change)	93	80 (-13)	62	54 (-8)	87	89.5 (+2.5)	59	51 (-8)	66	60.5 (-5.5)
Royal Alexandra Children's Hospital	98	100 (+2)	96.5	82 (-14.5)	86	82 (-4)	86.5	96.5 (+10)	-	-	77	82 (+5)
Newhaven	-	98	-	83	-	56	-	90	-	66	-	73.5
Princess Royal	99	88 (-11)	95	86 (-9)	76	67.5 (-8.5)	91	73 (-18)	73	64.5 (-8.5)	82	73 (-9)
Sussex Orthopaedic	96.5	99 (+2.5)	92	81.5 (-10.5)	60	75.5 (+15.5)	92	95 (+3)	64.5	71 (+6.5)	72	80.5 (+8.5)
<i>BSUH average</i>	99	96 (-3%)	95	84 (-11%)	73	66 (-7%)	91	86 (-5%)	73	63 (-10%)	81	73 (-8%)
<i>National average</i>	98	98.5	89.5	90	83.5	84	94	94	77	79	82.5	84

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

## B. BSUH overall scores compared with National PLACE scores

Healthwatch compared the overall average BSUH PLACE scores against those achieved nationally. The scores achieved in 2018 were lower than the national averages in all 6 standards. In some cases this variation was significant (i.e. ‘privacy, dignity and wellbeing’; ‘condition, appearance and maintenance’; ‘dementia’ and ‘disability’). The BSUH Trust scores for ‘cleanliness’ and ‘food and hydration’ came closest to the national averages.

Table 3: BSUH average scores compared with National PLACE average scores (2018) (%)

	Cleanliness	Food & Hydration	Privacy, Dignity	Condition, Appearance	Dementia	Disability
BSUH	96%	84%	66%	86%	63%	73%
National averages	98.50%	90%	84%	94%	79%	84%

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

## C. BSUH: trends in overall PLACE scores since 2013

Healthwatch examined the overall average BSUH PLACE scores achieved across each of the six standards since 2013, when PLACE was first introduced. This analysis revealed the following:

### Cleanliness

- BSUH has consistently scored well in this standard since 2013 (with scores varying from 96% to 99.5%).
- Although the ‘cleanliness’ score decreased by 3% in 2018, the score of 96% was still excellent and only 2% down on the national average. It also placed BSUH in the same high performing category as a large number of other NHS organisations.
- The overall BSUH PLACE 2018 score for ‘cleanliness’ was undoubtedly affected by the unexpected poor performance of the PRH which saw an -11% decrease in their score (down to 88%).
- Healthwatch has conducted monthly environmental audits, sometimes called “mini-PLACE”, at four of the six BSUH sites since 2016: the RSCH, RACH, Eye Hospital and Newhaven Polyclinic. Over the last year these audits have identified varying standards of cleanliness across some wards and our findings have been reported back to senior staff. Steps have subsequently been taken to improve cleanliness including a programme of ‘deep cleans’. It was therefore encouraging that PLACE 2018 reported high standards of ‘cleanliness’ overall for the Trust.

### Food & hydration

- The overall BSUH PLACE score for ‘food and hydration’ decreased by 11% compared to 2017. The score is now at similar levels to those achieved in both 2013 and 2016.
- High scores were achieved by the Trust in 2014, 2015 and 2017 (95% - 96%) and it seems that a deterioration in standards may only recently have occurred since late 2017 / early 2018.
- Healthwatch Brighton and Hove sits on the BSUH Food Improvement Group (FIG) which has been tasked with improving food and hydration across its sites, as well as making this more cost effective. The Trust has recently appointed a new catering provider and early feedback has been very positive; and it is hoped that this will result in an improved PLACE score in 2019.

### Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing

- The overall BSUH PLACE score for ‘privacy, dignity and wellbeing’ has dropped every year since 2013, and is now 19% points lower than the 2013 score of 87% - which was the highest score that the Trust had ever achieved in this category.
- Healthwatch has raised this with the Trust who are taking active steps to address this downward pattern.

### Condition, Appearance and Maintenance

- The overall PLACE score achieved by BSUH in this standard has fluctuated since 2013 from 77% to 91%, with an average of 84%. The overall BSUH PLACE 2018 score of 86% is 5% lower than that achieved in 2017.
- Undoubtedly, the BSUH Trust’s average score for 2018 will have been affected by the poor result achieved by the PRH which saw a decrease of -18%. This is disappointing given that three of the six BSUH sites saw increases in their scores (varying from +2.5 to +10%), and that the RSCH site matched their 2017 score of 91%.
- Healthwatch wishes to congratulate the RSCH site in particular for achieving such a positive PLACE score in this standard despite the substantial redevelopment works that are currently taking place.

### Dementia and Disability

- The scores achieved for the ‘dementia’ and ‘disability’ standards both decreased in 2018. Prior to this the Trust had been achieving year on year increases since these measures were first introduced in 2015 and 2016 respectively.
- The Trust has recently published a new dementia strategy to help address any concerns. Some investment has already happened to improve the dementia environment.

**Table 4: BSUH overall PLACE scores: 2013-2018 (%)**

	Cleanliness %	Food and hydration %	Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing %	Condition, Appearance and Maintenance %	Dementia %	Disability %
2013	97	83.5	87	81		
2014	97.5	96	84	87		
2015	99.5	96	80	77	58	
2016	98.5	86	76	84	55	67
2017	99	95	73	91	73	81
2018	96	84	66	86	63	73

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

## Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT).

In summary, the overall average scores achieved by SPFT were largely similar to those achieved in 2017. In four standards SPFT scored higher than the national average. The remaining two scores for ‘cleanliness’ and ‘food and hydration’ were very close to the national averages (see Table 7).

As in previous years, SPFT scored highly for ‘cleanliness’ (98%), ‘condition, appearance and maintenance’ (95%) and ‘dementia’ (91%). All of the remaining scores were 86% and above. Of particular note is the 8% increase seen in the area of ‘dementia’ with the score increasing from 83% in 2017 to 91% in 2018.

**Table 5: The 2018 SPFT PLACE scores were as follows**

SPFT	Cleanliness	Food & Hydration	Privacy, Dignity	Condition, Appearance	Dementia	Disability
	98%	88%	89%	95%	91%	86%

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

The changes in the scores for the SPFT from 2017 to 2018 were as follows:

- Food & Hydration down 1%
- Cleanliness down 0.5%
- Disability no change
- Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing no change
- Condition, Appearance and Maintenance no change
- Dementia up 8%

### How scores were calculated

The scores awarded to the SPFT Trust were the averages of those achieved across the twenty sites which were visited as part of PLACE. These cover a large geographical area across Sussex and Hampshire. Healthwatch Brighton and Hove assisted in two site visits which fell within our catchment area: Rutland Gardens and Mill View Hospital and some of our analysis of the published data focuses on these two sites only.

### Assessment of the SPFT PLACE results, 2018

Healthwatch has undertaken an analysis of the 2018 SPFT Trust overall and individual site PLACE scores as follows:

- A. We examined the PLACE scores of the two sites that Healthwatch helped to assess (see Table 6)
- B. We compared the overall average SPFT scores against national averages (see Table 7)
- C. We looked at how the overall average SPFT scores have changed since 2013 when PLACE was first introduced (see Table 8).

#### A. PLACE scores achieved by two SPFT sites

Table 6 below shows the scores achieved in 2018 by each of the two sites that Healthwatch assisted in assessing as part of PLACE 2018. The table also shows how the scores have changed since 2017 across these sites. Please note that a total of twenty sites across the SPFT Trust were assessed as part of PLACE, but our data analysis in this section only relates to two sites: Mill View hospital and Rutland Gardens.

In 2018, the following PLACE scores - and any changes from 2017 - were observed for Mill View hospital and Rutland Gardens, and in light of these findings Healthwatch has made recommendations for the Trust to consider as shown in the blue boxes.

**Overall scores across the six standards**

- Mill View hospital achieved improved scores across four standards, and achieved similar levels to those seen in 2017 for the remaining two standards.
- Rutland Gardens maintained their 100% perfect score for ‘cleanliness’. However, they also saw decreases across three other standards. Two of these decreases were over 30%.

**SPFT ‘cleanliness’ scores (national average score: 98.5%)**

- Mill View hospital saw only a moderate 0.5% decrease in their score for ‘cleanliness’ but at 99% this was still higher than the national average.
- Rutland Gardens maintained their 100% perfect score for ‘cleanliness’.
- Healthwatch congratulations both sites for these excellent results.

**SPFT ‘food and hydration’ scores (national average score: 90%)**

- Mill View hospital saw an 8% increase in their score (up to 89%) which was very close to the national average. Healthwatch congratulates Mill View for this excellent improvement.
- ‘Food and hydration’ was not assessed at Rutland Gardens.

**SPFT ‘privacy, dignity and wellbeing’ scores (national average score: 84%)**

- Mill View hospital saw only a moderate 1.5% decrease in their score for ‘privacy, dignity and wellbeing’ and their score of 94.5% was over 10% higher than the national average.
- Rutland Gardens recorded a worrying 31.5% drop in their score, down from 93% to 61.5%. This was also the lowest score of the twenty SPFT sites which were assessed in 2018 as part of PLACE.

<b>1a</b>	We recommend that the Trust identify learning and ‘best practice’ which helped the majority of SPFT sites achieve high scores.
<b>1b</b>	Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies a task force and/or an action plan to further improve ‘privacy, dignity and wellbeing’ at Rutland Gardens.

**SPFT ‘condition, appearance, maintenance’ scores (national average: 94%)**

- Mill View hospital saw a 5% increase in their score (up to 99%) which was also 5% higher than the national average. Healthwatch congratulates Mill View for this excellent improvement.
- Rutland Gardens recorded a 9.5% drop in their score down from 98.5% to 89%; although this was still very close the national average. This was however the second lowest score of the twenty SPFT sites which were assessed in 2018 as part of PLACE.

<b>2</b>	We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify the specific areas which led to the decrease in the score at Rutland Gardens.
<b>2a</b>	We also recommend that the Trust identify learning and ‘best practice’ which helped the majority of other SPFT sites achieve high scores.
<b>2b</b>	Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve the condition, appearance and maintenance of Rutland Gardens.

**SPFT ‘dementia’ scores (national average score: 79%)**

- Mill View hospital saw a 10% increase in their score (up to 96%) which was an impressive 17% higher than the national average. Healthwatch congratulates Mill View for this excellent improvement.
- ‘Dementia’ was not assessed at Rutland Gardens.

**SPFT ‘disability’ scores (national average score: 84%)**

- Mill View hospital saw a 13.5% increase in their score (up to 96.5%) which was an impressive 12.5% higher than the national average. Healthwatch congratulates Mill View for this excellent improvement.
- Rutland Gardens recorded a worrying 36% drop in their score, down from 95% to 59%. This was also the lowest score of the twenty SPFT sites which were assessed in 2018 as part of PLACE.

<b>3</b>	We recommend that the Trust examines the raw PLACE data to identify the specific areas which led to the decrease in the score at Rutland Gardens.
<b>3a</b>	We also recommend that the Trust identify learning and ‘best practice’ which helped the majority of other SPFT sites achieve high scores.
<b>3b</b>	Using this data we recommend that the Trust identifies an action plan to further improve how disabled patients are cared for at Rutland Gardens.

**Table 6: Individual 2017 & 2018 scores achieved by the two SPFT sites visited by Healthwatch Brighton and Hove, including any variations from 2017 to 2018**

	Cleanliness		Food & hydration		Privacy, dignity, wellbeing		Condition appearance, maintenance		Dementia		Disability*	
	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018
Mill View Hospital	99.5%	99% (-0.5%)	81%	89% (+8%)	96%	94.5% (-1.5%)	94%	99% (+5%)	86%	96% (+10%)	83%	96.5% (+13.5%)
Rutland Gardens	100%	100%	-	-	93%	61.5% (-31.5%)	98.5%	89% (-9.5%)	84%	-	95%	59% (-36%)
<i>SPFT average</i>	98.5	98 (-0.5)	89	88 (-1%)	89	89% (no change)	95	95% (no change)	83	91 (+8%)	86	86% (no change)
<i>National average</i>	98	98.5	89.5	90	83.5	84	94	94	77	79	82.5	84

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

## B. SPFT overall scores compared with National PLACE scores

Healthwatch has compared the overall average SPFT scores against those achieved nationally. The scores achieved by SPFT in 2018 are only marginally lower than the national averages in two standards (although the scores are still comparable); and higher in 4 standards.

Table 7: SPFT average scores compared with National PLACE average scores (2018) (%)

	Cleanliness	Food & Hydration	Privacy, Dignity	Condition, Appearance	Dementia	Disability
SPFT	98%	88%	89%	95%	91%	86%
National averages	98.5%	90%	84%	94%	79%	84%

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

## C. SPFT: trends in overall PLACE scores since 2013

Healthwatch compared the overall average SPFT PLACE scores achieved across each of the six standards since 2013, when PLACE was first introduced. This analysis revealed the following:

### Cleanliness

- SPFT has consistently scored well in this standard since 2013 (varying only slightly from 96.5% - 98.5%).
- Although the overall cleanliness score decreased by 0.5% in 2018, the score of 98% was still excellent and only 0.5% down on the national average.

### Food & hydration

- The score for 'food and hydration' decreased by 1% on 2017. There has been a small year-on-year reduction in the score since 2015, and the 2018 score was the lowest achieved by SPFT. Healthwatch hopes that this downward trend does not continue.

### Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing

- The score for 'privacy, dignity and wellbeing' has been increasing year-on-year from 2014-2017.
- The score achieved in 2018 matched the highest ever recorded score for SPFT of 89%.
- The 2018 score was 5% higher than the national average which was an excellent achievement.

### Condition, Appearance and Maintenance

- The score for this standard has been increasing year-on-year from 2013-2017.
- The score in 2018 matched the highest ever recorded score for SPFT of 95%.

### Dementia

- There has been an upward trend in the score achieved for this standard since 2015.
- The score achieved in 2018 was the highest ever recorded score for SPFT of 91%. This was an 8% increase on 2017.
- The 2018 score was 12% higher than the national average which was an excellent achievement.

### Disability

- The score achieved in this standard has been relatively consistent since 2016. For the last two years the score has remained at 86%.
- SPFT's highest score in this standard was achieved in 2015 (88%).

**Table 8: SPFT overall PLACE scores 2013 -2018 (%)**

	Cleanliness %	Food and hydration %	Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing %	Condition, Appearance and Maintenance %	Dementia %	Disability %
2013	96.5			85		
2014	97	89.5	85.5	89.5		
2015	98	91	88	91	82	
2016	96.5	89	87	94	78	88
2017	98.5	89	89	95	83	86
2018	98	88	89	95	91	86

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

# Annexes

## List of annexes

Annex A - Locations of wards, clinics or departments visited during PLACE 2018

Annex B - National average PLACE scores 2013-2018 (%)

Annex C - Percentage scores achieved by BSUH sites 2013-2018

Annex D - List of tables

## Annex A

### Locations of wards, clinics or departments visited during PLACE 2018

**Table 9: Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT): Healthwatch visits**

Date	Site	No of vols
Tuesday 1 May	Mill View Hospital, Hove	4
Thursday 3 May	Rutland Gardens, Hove	2

**Table 10: Brighton Sussex Universities Hospital Trust (BSUH): Healthwatch visits**

Date	Site (wards visited)	No of vols
Wednesday 2 May	Newhaven Polyclinic	2
Thursday 10 May	Sussex Eye Hospital, Brighton	2
Thursday 17 May	Royal Alexandra Children's Hospital	2
Wednesday 23 & Friday 25 May	Royal Sussex County Hospital:	4
	- Accident and Emergency	4
	- Urgent Care Centre	
	- Acute Admissions Unit	
	- Ambulatory Care Unit	
	- Clinical Decisions Unit	
	- Gynaecology Ward	
	- Post Natal Ward	
	- Labour Ward	
	- Emerald Unit (Dementia Care).	
	- Albion/Lewes Wards (Cardiac)	
	- Millennium (Cardiac)	
	- Bristol Ward (Elderly Care)	
	- Solomon/Donald Hall (Stroke)	
	- Main Outpatients Department	
	- Rheumatology Department	
	- Physiotherapy	
	- Nuclear Medicine	

## Annex B

Table 11: National average PLACE scores: 2013-2018 (%)

	Cleanliness %	Food and hydration %	Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing %	Condition, Appearance and Maintenance %	Dementia %	Disability %
2013	96			89		
2014	97	89	88	92		
2015	97.5	88.5	86	90	74.5	
2016	98	88	84	93	75	79
2017	98	89.5	83.5	94	77	82.5
2018	98.5	90	84	94	79	84

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

## Annex C

Table 12: Percentage scores achieved by BSUH sites: 2013-2018

Year	Site	Cleanliness %	Food and hydration %	Privacy, Dignity and Wellbeing %	Condition, Appearance and Maintenance %	Dementia %	Disability %
2013	RSCH	97	83.5	87	81	-	-
	RACH	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Eye	98	89	80	84	-	-
	Newhaven	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PRH	99.5	88	91	95	-	-
	Orthopaedic	100	90	87	92	-	-
2014	RSCH	97.5	96	84	87	-	-
	RACH	95	97	88	79	-	-
	Eye	87.5	95.5	70	71	-	-
	Newhaven	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PRH	96	99	85	85.5	-	-
	Orthopaedic	95.5	98	97	95	-	-
2015	RSCH	99.5	96	80	77	58	-
	RACH	100	97	97	94	76	-
	Eye	100	99	85	87	67	-
	Newhaven	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PRH	95.5	98	87	91.5	71	-
	Orthopaedic	98.5	96	86	92	71	-
2016	RSCH	99	86	76	84	55	67
	RACH	98	82	87	89	76	74
	Eye	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Newhaven	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PRH	96	92.5	81.5	86.5	58	65.5
	Orthopaedic	98.5	84	75.5	95	59	71
2017	RSCH	99	95.5	70	91	73.5	82
	RACH	98	96.5	86	86.5	-	77
	Eye	99	93	62	87	59	66
	Newhaven	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PRH	99	95	76	91	73	82
	Orthopaedic	96.5	92	60	92	64.5	72
2018	RSCH	98.5	83.5	63	91	62	71
	RACH	100	82	82	96.5	-	82
	Eye	99	80	54	90	51	60.5
	Newhaven	98	83	56	90	66	73.5
	PRH	88	86	67.5	73	64.5	73
	Orthopaedic	99	81.5	75.5	95	71	80.5

All numbers are rounded to the nearest 0.5

## Annex D

### List of tables

Table No.	Table title	Page of report
Table 1	2018 BSUH PLACE scores	11
Table 2	Individual 2017 & 2018 PLACE scores achieved by the six BSUH sites, including any variations from 2017 to 2018	14
Table 3	BSUH average scores compared with National PLACE average scores (2018) (%)	15
Table 4	BSUH overall PLACE scores: 2013-2018 (%)	16
Table 5	2018 SPFT PLACE scores	17
Table 6	Individual 2017 & 2018 scores achieved by the two SPFT sites visited by Healthwatch Brighton and Hove, including any variations from 2017 to 2018	20
Table 7	SPFT average scores compared with National PLACE average scores (2018) (%)	21
Table 8	SPFT overall PLACE scores 2013 -2018 (%)	22
Table 9	Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT): Healthwatch visits	23
Table 10	Brighton Sussex Universities Hospital Trust (BSUH): Healthwatch visits	23
Table 11	National average PLACE scores: 2013-2018	24
Table 12	Percentage scores achieved by BSUH sites: 2013-2018	25

## Contact information

Healthwatch Brighton and Hove Address:

Healthwatch Brighton and Hove  
Community Base  
113 Queens Road,  
Brighton  
BN1 3XG

Phone: 01273 234040

Email: [office@healthwatchbrightonandhove.co.uk](mailto:office@healthwatchbrightonandhove.co.uk)

Website: [www.healthwatchbrightonandhove.co.uk](http://www.healthwatchbrightonandhove.co.uk)

Share your experiences with health and social care services via our online feedback centre on [www.healthwatchbrightonandhove.co.uk](http://www.healthwatchbrightonandhove.co.uk)

