

Roodlane Medical Limited

Roodlane Medical Limited – Victoria, part of HCA Healthcare UK Primary Care Services

Inspection report

Victoria Station
Main Concourse
London
SW1V 1JT
Tel: 0345 437 0691
Website: www.roodlane.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 11 December 2018
Date of publication: 30/01/2019

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 11/12/18 to ask the service the following key questions; Are services safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led?

Our findings were:

Are services safe?

We found that this service was providing safe care in accordance with the relevant regulations

Are services effective?

We found that this service was providing effective care in accordance with the relevant regulations

Are services caring?

We found that this service was providing caring services in accordance with the relevant regulations

Are services responsive?

We found that this service was providing responsive care in accordance with the relevant regulations

Are services well-led?

We found that this service was providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the service was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

Roodlane Medical (Victoria) provides GP services. The service is registered with CQC under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 in respect of some, but not all, of the private medical services it provides.

Summary of findings

There are some exemptions from regulation by CQC which relate to particular types of service and these are set out in Schedule 2 of The Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

At Roodlane Medical (Victoria) services are provided to some patients under arrangements made by their employer. These types of arrangements are exempt by law from CQC regulation. Therefore, at Roodlane Medical (Victoria), we were only able to inspect the services which are not arranged for patients by their employers.

The lead clinician is the registered manager. A registered manager is a person who is registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

Eight people provided feedback about the service which was entirely positive.

Our key findings were:

- The practice provided care in a way that kept patients safe and protected them from avoidable harm.
- Patients received effective care and treatment that met their needs.
- Staff dealt with patients with kindness and respect and involved them in decisions about their care.
- The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. Patients could access care and treatment in a timely way.
- The way the practice was led and managed promoted the delivery of high-quality, person-centre care.

There were areas where the provider could make improvements and should:

- Continue to develop clinical audit to improve patient outcomes.

Professor Steve Field CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

Are services effective?

Are services caring?

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Are services well-led?

Roodlane Medical Limited – Victoria, part of HCA Healthcare UK Primary Care Services

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

Roodlane Medical (Victoria) is run by Roodlane Medical Limited, part of HCA Healthcare UK Primary Care Services. The service is based at Victoria Station, Main Concourse, London, SW1V 1JT. In addition to the Victoria location, Roodlane Medical Limited provides private GP services from eight other London locations and one location in Birmingham.

The Roodlane Medical (Victoria) was visited for this inspection. The location is a multidisciplinary primary care site, equipped to carry out GP appointments, health screenings and vaccination services. Most patients have the service arranged through their employers, but some pay directly for their care and treatment.

Female and male doctors work at the practice supported by a nurse and two non-clinical staff. The HCA Healthcare corporate team provide additional support to the whole team. Consulting hours are 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 6pm alternate Saturdays. Nurse appointments are available 9am to 5pm Monday to Thursday.

Our inspection team was led by a CQC lead inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser.

Before the inspection we reviewed notifications received from and about the service, and a standard information questionnaire completed by the service.

During the inspection, we interviewed staff, made observations, reviewed documents and reviewed a sample of patients consultation records.

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

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

These questions therefore formed the framework for the areas we looked at during the inspection.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safety systems and processes

The service had clear systems to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.

- The provider conducted safety risk assessments. It had appropriate safety policies, which were regularly reviewed and communicated to staff. Staff received safety information from the service as part of their induction and refresher training. The service had systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. Policies were regularly reviewed and were accessible to all staff, locums. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance.
- The service had systems in place to assure that an adult accompanying a child had parental authority.
- The service worked with other agencies to support patients and protect them from neglect and abuse. Staff took steps to protect patients from abuse, neglect, harassment, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The provider carried out staff checks at the time of recruitment and on an ongoing basis where appropriate. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- All staff received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. (Clinicians were trained in safeguarding children to a minimum of level 3). They knew how to identify and report concerns. Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a DBS check.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control and a legionella risk assessment had been carried out. (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- The provider ensured that facilities and equipment were safe and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions. There were systems for safely managing healthcare waste.

Risks to patients

There were systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed.
- There was an effective induction system for all staff tailored to their role.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention. They knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections, for example sepsis.
- All staff had completed annual basic life support training. There was oxygen, a defibrillator and a supply of emergency medicines.
- When there were changes to services or staff the service assessed and monitored the impact on safety.
- There were appropriate indemnity arrangements in place to cover all potential liabilities that may arise.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

- Individual care records were written and managed in a way that kept patients safe. The care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to relevant staff in an accessible way.
- The service had arrangements to check the identity of patients.
- The service had a system in place to retain medical records in line with DHSC guidance in the event that they cease trading.
- Clinicians made appropriate and timely referrals in line with protocols and up to date evidence-based guidance.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

The service had reliable systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

- The systems and arrangements for managing medicines, including vaccines, controlled drugs, emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks. The service kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use.
- The service carried out regular medicines audit to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing.

Are services safe?

- Staff prescribed, administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with legal requirements and current national guidance. Processes were in place for checking medicines and staff kept accurate records of medicines. Where there is a different approach taken from national guidance there is a clear rationale for this that protects patient safety
- Processes were in place for checking medicines and staff kept accurate records of medicines.
- There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The service learned and shared lessons identified themes and took action to improve safety in the service. There had been three incidents reported in the last 12 months all of which had been investigated, action taken to prevent recurrence and discussed in staff meetings to share learning.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The provider encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The service had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

Track record on safety

The service had a good safety record.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.
- The service monitored and reviewed activity. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture that led to safety improvements.

Lessons learned and improvements made

The service learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- There was a system for recording and acting on significant events. Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The service gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology
- They kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.
- The service acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. The service had an effective mechanism in place to disseminate alerts to all members of the team including sessional staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

The provider had systems to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence based practice. We saw evidence that clinicians assessed and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance (relevant to their service).

- The provider assessed needs and delivered care in line with relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.
- Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. Where appropriate this included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- Clinicians had enough information to make or confirm a diagnosis.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Staff assessed and managed patients' pain where appropriate.

Monitoring care and treatment

The service had initiated a number of audits in the previous year. For example, an audit of the safe prescribing of high risk medicines, an audit of safe yellow fever vaccine administration, an audit of the safe prescribing of prescription requests and a patient notes audit. All the audits we reviewed were one cycle audits demonstrating quality assurance. There were no two cycle audits demonstrating improved outcomes for patients. The provider agreed that this was an area for further development.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.

- All staff were appropriately qualified. The provider had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This included corporate induction, local induction and role specific training.
- Relevant professionals (medical and nursing) were registered with the General Medical Council (GMC)/Nursing and Midwifery Council and were up to date with revalidation

- The provider understood the learning needs of staff and provided protected time and training to meet them. Up to date records of skills, qualifications and training were maintained. Staff were encouraged and given opportunities to develop.
- There was an annual training plan which detailed topics and levels required for different members of staff. Training was arranged and monitored by a central team. Training included safeguarding, infection control, basic life support, fire safety and information governance.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

Staff worked together, and worked well with other organisations, to deliver effective care and treatment.

- Patients were asked whether details of their consultation could be shared with their NHS GP, and the decision was recorded in the patient notes. If patients agreed, we were told that a letter was sent to their registered GP. Clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities to share information under specific circumstances where the patient or other people were at risk.
- Where patients required a referral this was generally arranged directly through a private provider or details were supplied to the patient's NHS GP. GPs reviewed test results within one working day. Details were shared with patients through an online system; GPs phoned patients directly for all urgent results. Referrals to secondary care could be made on the same day as a GP consultation.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

Staff were consistent and proactive in empowering patients, and supporting them to manage their own health and maximise their independence.

- Where appropriate, staff gave people advice so they could self-care.
- Risk factors were identified, highlighted to patients and where appropriate highlighted to their normal care provider for additional support. For example, those at risk of developing a long-term condition.
- Where patients needs could not be met by the service, staff redirected them to the appropriate service for their needs.

Consent to care and treatment

The service obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making. All clinical staff had received training in the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- Staff supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.
- The service monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- Feedback from patients was positive about the way staff treat people
- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs. They displayed an understanding and non-judgmental attitude to all patients.
- The service gave patients timely support and information.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about care and treatment.

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.
- Patients told us through comment cards, that they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them.
- Following consultations, patients were sent a survey to gain their feedback. Patient feedback showed they were satisfied with the service received.

Privacy and Dignity

The service respected patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff recognised the importance of people's dignity and respect.
- Staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The service organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.

- The provider understood the needs of their patients and improved services in response to those needs. For example, the provider had developed online services including a smart phone app and online portal, through which people were able to book appointments, access medical records and manage their account and payment methods.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.
- Reasonable adjustments had been made so that people in vulnerable circumstances could access and use services on an equal basis to others. For example, there was lift access to the clinic for people with mobility issues.

Timely access to the service

Patients were able to access care and treatment from the service within an appropriate timescale for their needs.

- Patients had timely access to initial assessment, test results, diagnosis and treatment.
- There was a central booking service for appointments and people were offered the first appointment at the location of their choice.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately. Telephone answering and waiting time in reception were monitored regularly to ensure a prompt service.

- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- Patients reported that the appointment system was easy to use.
- Referrals and transfers to other services were undertaken in a timely way. For example, where an urgent referral was necessary, patients were given the option to be referred to a private consultant or to be referred back to their NHS GP.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The service took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

- Information about how to make a complaint or raise concerns was available. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.
- The service informed patients of any further action that may be available to them should they not be satisfied with the response to their complaint.
- The service had complaint policy and procedures in place. The service learned lessons from individual concerns, complaints and also from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care. There had been three complaints received in the last 12 months, all of which had been investigated, acted on and discussed in staff meetings to share learning. For example, a patient complained about the cramped nature of the consultation room. The provider took the complainants views into account when refurbishing the clinic.

Are services well-led?

(for example, are they well-managed and do senior leaders listen, learn and take appropriate action?)

Our findings

Leadership capacity and capability;

Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.

- Leaders were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.
- The provider had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the service.

Vision and strategy

The service had a clear vision and credible strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

- There was a clear vision and set of values. The service had a realistic strategy and supporting business plans to achieve priorities.
- The service developed its vision, values and strategy jointly with staff and external partners
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.
- The service monitored progress against delivery of the strategy.

Culture

The service had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.

- Staff felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work for the service.
- The service focused on the needs of patients.
- Leaders and managers acted on behaviour and performance inconsistent with the vision and values.
- Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.

- Staff told us they were able to raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.
- There were processes for providing all staff with the development they need. This included appraisal and career development conversations. All staff received regular annual appraisals in the last year. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary. Clinical staff, including nurses, were considered valued members of the team. They were given protected time for professional time for professional development and evaluation of their clinical work.
- There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of all staff.
- The service actively promoted equality and diversity. It identified and addressed the causes of any workforce inequality. Staff felt they were treated equally.
- There were positive relationships between staff and teams.

Governance arrangements

There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

- Structures, processes and systems to support good governance and management were clearly set out, understood and effective. The governance and management of partnerships, joint working arrangements and shared services promoted interactive and co-ordinated person-centred care.
- Staff were clear on their roles and accountabilities.
- Leaders had established proper policies, procedures and activities to ensure safety and assured themselves that they were operating as intended.

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

- There was an effective, process to identify, understand, monitor and address current and future risks including risks to patient safety.

Are services well-led?

(for example, are they well-managed and do senior leaders listen, learn and take appropriate action?)

- The service had processes to manage current and future performance. Performance of clinical staff could be demonstrated through audit of their consultations, prescribing and referral decisions. Leaders had oversight of safety alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- The provider had plans in place and had trained staff for major incidents.

Appropriate and accurate information

The service acted on appropriate and accurate information.

- Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.
- Quality and sustainability were discussed in relevant meetings where all staff had sufficient access to information.
- The service used performance information which was reported and monitored and management and staff were held to account.
- The information used to monitor performance and the delivery of quality care was accurate and useful. There were plans to address any identified weaknesses.
- The service submitted data or notifications to external organisations as required.
- There were robust arrangements in line with data security standards for the availability, integrity and confidentiality of patient identifiable data, records and data management systems.
- Clinical audit had been initiated however there were no two cycle audits demonstrating improved patient outcomes.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The service involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

- The public's, patients', staff and external partners' views and concerns were encouraged, heard and acted on to shape services and culture. For example, patients views about the facilities available had been taken into account as part of a recent refurbishment of the premises.
- We saw evidence of feedback opportunities for staff and how the findings were fed back to staff. We also saw staff engagement in responding to these findings.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were evidence of systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement.
- The service made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints. Learning was shared and used to make improvements.
- Leaders and managers encouraged staff to take time out to review individual and team objectives, processes and performance.
- The provider had developed an innovative range of health screening programmes that utilised the latest health screening technologies such as mole scanning technology to screen patients for cancer.