

Morecambe Same Day Health Centre

Inspection report

1 Hanover Street
Morecambe
Lancashire
LA4 5LY
Tel: 01524518620
<http://www.pdsmedical.co.uk/>






Date of inspection visit: 22 May 2018
Date of publication: 20/07/2018

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

Ratings

Overall rating for this location

Good 

Are services safe?	Good 
Are services effective?	Good 
Are services caring?	Good 
Are services responsive?	Good 
Are services well-led?	Good 

Overall summary

This service is rated as Good overall. (Previous inspection under a different provider October 2014 – Good)

The key questions are rated as:

Are services safe? – Good

Are services effective? – Good

Are services caring? – Good

Are services responsive? – Good

Are services well-led? – Good

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Morecambe Same Day Health Centre on 22 May 2018 as part of our inspection programme.

At this inspection we found:

- The service had good systems to manage risk so that safety incidents were less likely to happen. When they did happen, the service learned from them and improved their processes.

- The service routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care it provided. It ensured that care and treatment was delivered according to evidence- based guidelines.
- Staff involved and treated people with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.
- Patients were able to access care and treatment from the service within an appropriate timescale for their needs.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels of the organisation.

The areas where the provider **should** make improvements are:

- Make information about how to complain available to patients in the waiting area.
- Continue to look for ways to improve performance relating to sending clinical details to a patient's GP before 8am next working day.
- Continue to work towards completing appraisals for all staff.

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

Our inspection team

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

Background to Morecambe Same Day Health Centre

PDS Medical is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide urgent care same day consultations to patients in the local area from one location:

- Morecambe Same Day Health Centre, 1 Hanover Street, Morecambe, LA4 5LY.

We visited this location during our inspection.

PDS Medical is registered with the CQC to deliver the following regulated activities from Morecambe Same Day Health Centre: treatment for disease, disorder or injury; and diagnostic and screening services.

The service was originally commissioned to provide an 8am-6.30pm, seven day-a-week service due to a reduced number of GPs available in the local area, which is indicated by the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (2010) to be amongst the fifth most disadvantaged area of the country. It offers nurse-led appointments from 8am to 8pm seven days a week, as well as extended access appointments with a GP from 6.30pm to 8pm Monday to Friday, 8am to 2.30pm on Saturday and 8am to 2pm on Sunday. All appointments are 15 minutes in duration.

Patients can access the service via the 111 telephone service or via their own GP practice who hold a number of 'on-the-day' appointments for their patients. Each GP

practice had the option to divert 1% of their minor illness patients per day to the service. This allows GPs to have more time for in-depth appointments for their chronic disease management patients.

The service is based in a large single storey building shared with other services including GP and Out-of-Hours (OOHs) services. They have appropriate access for patients with limited mobility. There are radiology facilities available at the service.

The service is commissioned by Morecambe Bay Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to provide same day healthcare appointments to approximately 140,000 registered patients in the CCG. The geographical area covered by the service includes Morecambe, Lancaster and Carnforth and a range of urban and rural areas. It is a mixed population, with parts of Morecambe and Lancaster being considered areas of high deprivation. In general, people living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. Approximately 28% of the population is made up of university students.

The service employs two advanced nurse practitioners, four practice nurses, three healthcare assistants, one emergency care practitioner and two reception staff. There is also a service manager and assistant service manager, as well as a central management team and a board of directors at PDS Medical. GPs work in the service on a sessional arrangement.

Are services safe?

We rated the service as good for providing safe services.

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 safety policies, including Control of Substances Hazardous to Health and Health & Safety policies, which were regularly reviewed and communicated to staff. Staff received safety information from the provider as part of their induction and refresher training. The provider had systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. Policies were regularly reviewed and were accessible to all staff. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance.
- The service worked with other agencies to support patients and protect them from neglect and abuse, such as police, paramedics and social services. 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. 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.
- 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 system in place for dealing with surges in demand.
- There was an effective induction system for temporary 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 such as, for example, sepsis. In line with available guidance, patients were prioritised appropriately for care and treatment, in accordance with their clinical need. Systems were in place to manage people who experienced long waits.
- Staff told patients when to seek further help. They advised patients what to do if their condition got worse.
- When there were changes to services or staff the service assessed and monitored the impact on safety.

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 systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- Clinicians made appropriate and timely referrals in line with protocols and up-to-date evidence-based guidance.

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

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

- The systems and arrangements for managing medicines, including medical gases, emergency medicines and equipment, and vaccines, minimised risks. The service kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use. Arrangements were also in place to ensure medicines, and medical gas cylinders carried in vehicles, were stored appropriately.
- The service carried out regular medicine audits 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. The service had audited antimicrobial prescribing. There was evidence of actions taken to support good antimicrobial stewardship.
- Processes were in place for checking medicines and staff kept accurate records of medicines.
- Patients' health was monitored in relation to the use of medicines and followed up on appropriately. Patients were involved in regular reviews of their medicines.
- Palliative care patients were able to receive prompt access to pain relief and other medication required to control their symptoms.

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.
- There was a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts.

- Joint reviews of incidents were carried out with partner organisations, including the local A&E department, the local GP out-of-hours service, and the NHS 111 service and urgent care services.

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 and incidents. Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.
- There were 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. For example, the systems for triaging patients were improved following a significant event. The service included examples and learning from significant events in a monthly staff bulletin which went to all staff across PDS Medical to increase opportunities for learning to be shared.
- The service learned from external safety events and patient safety alerts. The service had an effective mechanism in place to disseminate alerts to all members of the team including sessional and agency staff.

Are services effective?

We rated the service as good for providing effective services.

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 needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance supported by clear clinical pathways and protocols.

- Clinical staff had access to guidelines from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and used this information to help ensure that people's needs were met. The provider monitored that these guidelines were followed.
- Patients' needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- Care and treatment was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Arrangements were in place to deal with repeat patients. There was a system in place to identify frequent callers and patients with particular needs, for example, palliative care patients, and care plans/guidance/protocols were in place to provide the appropriate support. We saw no evidence of discrimination when staff made care and treatment decisions.
- When staff were not able to make a direct appointment on behalf of the patient clear referral processes were in place. These were agreed with senior staff and a clear explanation was given to the patient or person calling on their behalf.
- Technology and equipment were used to improve treatment and to support patients' independence.
- Staff assessed and managed patients' pain where appropriate.

Monitoring care and treatment

The service had a comprehensive programme of quality improvement activity and routinely received the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided. For example, there was a system of peer review in place

whereby each clinician's clinical practice was reviewed by a colleague and feedback was given. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.

- Although the service had to provide performance information to the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) for the Same Day Health Centre, no targets were set. The service monitored its performance by measuring itself against targets set in other areas where the provider operated services. The service was mostly meeting these targets and had processes in place to review performance should targets be missed. For example:
 - NHS number and date of birth coverage, target 95% - in the 12 months between April 2017 and March 2018 the service had met this target every month for NHS number coverage, scoring 100% and, every month but one, for date-of-birth coverage, scoring between 93% and 98%.
 - Waiting times between arrival and start of consultation or appointment time and start of consultation, target under 20 minutes - in the 12 months between April 2017 and March 2018 the service had an average of 17 minutes waiting time.
 - Clinical details to be sent to GP before 8am next working day, target 95% - in the 12 months between April 2017 and March 2018 the service had met this target only once, scoring between 86% and 95% and averaging 92%.
- The service made improvements through the use of completed audits. Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was clear evidence of action to resolve concerns and improve quality. The provider had a programme of clinical audit which took place across all services. Audits we saw on the day had only been through one cycle at present, but we saw from the audit programme that a second cycle was due to be carried out later in the year.

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 covered such topics as infection control and fire safety.

Are services effective?

- The provider ensured that all staff worked within their scope of practice and had access to clinical support when required.
- 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.
- The provider provided staff with ongoing support. This included one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and support for revalidation, however, some staff appraisals had not been completed in the past 12 months. The provider could demonstrate how it ensured the competence of staff employed in advanced roles by audit of their clinical decision making, including non-medical prescribing.
- There was a clear approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.

Coordinating care and treatment

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

- We saw records that showed that all appropriate staff, including those in different teams, services and organisations, were involved in assessing, planning and delivering care and treatment.
- Patients received coordinated and person-centred care. This included when they moved between services, when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Care and treatment for patients in vulnerable circumstances was coordinated with other services, such as ambulance crews or GPs. Staff communicated promptly with patients' registered GPs so that they were aware of the need for further action. Staff also referred patients back to their own GP to ensure continuity of care, where necessary. There were established pathways for staff to follow to ensure callers were referred to other services for support as required.
- Patient information was shared appropriately, and the information needed to plan and deliver care and treatment was available to relevant staff in a timely and accessible way.

- The service had formalised systems with the NHS 111 service with specific referral protocols for patients referred to the service. An electronic record of all consultations was sent to patients' own GPs.
- The service ensured that care was delivered in a coordinated way and took into account the needs of different patients, including those who may be vulnerable because of their circumstances.
- There were clear and effective arrangements for booking appointments, transfers to other services, and dispatching ambulances for people that require them. Staff were empowered to make direct referrals and/or appointments for patients with other services.

Helping 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.

- The service identified patients who may be in need of extra support, such as those with a learning disability.
- Where appropriate, staff gave people advice so they could self-care. Systems were available to facilitate this.
- Risk factors, where identified, were highlighted to patients and their normal care providers so additional support could be given.
- 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.

- Clinicians understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making.
- Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.
- The provider monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.

Are services caring?

We rated the service as good for caring.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- 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. There were arrangements and systems in place to support staff to respond to people with specific health care needs such as end-of-life care and those who had mental health needs. This included training on dementia awareness.
- Of the 42 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received 41 were positive about the service experienced and one was mixed. This was in line with the results of the NHS Friends and Family Test and other feedback received by the service.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients be involved in decisions about their care and were aware of the Accessible Information Standard (a requirement to make sure that patients and their carers can access and understand the information they are given):

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas, including in languages other than English, informing patients this service was available.

Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them. Information leaflets were available in easy read formats, to help patients be involved in decisions about their care.

- 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.
- For patients with learning disabilities or complex social needs family, carers or social workers, were appropriately involved.
- Staff communicated with people in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids and easy read materials were available.
- Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services. They helped them ask questions about their care and treatment.

Privacy and dignity

The service respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff respected confidentiality at all times.
- Staff understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making.
- 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 responsive to people's needs?

We rated the service as good for providing responsive services.

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- The provider understood the needs of its population and tailored services in response to those needs. The service had been set up in response to the high demand for appointments on local GPs. The provider engaged with commissioners to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the provider stepped in to keep the out-of-hours GP service in the area running when the previous provider could no longer operate the service.
- The service had a system in place that alerted staff to any specific safety or clinical needs of a person using the service. This included alerts about a person being on the end-of-life pathway or a child protection register. Care pathways were appropriate for patients with specific needs, for example, those at the end-of-their life, babies, children and young people.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.
- The service provided a minor illness and injuries service so that patients do not need to book an appointment with their own GP. This freed up GP and nurse appointments for the practices in the local area, many of whom were experiencing high demand for appointments.
- The service provided IV therapy to outpatients from the local acute trust.
- The service had a system in place to follow up patients who did not attend.
- Staff confirmed that the service did not discriminate regarding patients' age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity status, race, religion or belief. The facilities were suitable to meet the needs of patients with impaired physical ability.

Timely access to the service

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

- Patients were able to access care and treatment at a time to suit them. The service operated seven days a

week from 8am to 8pm for nurse appointments. GP appointments were from 6.30pm to 2am Monday to Friday, 8am to 2.30pm on Saturday and 8am to 2pm on Sunday. All appointments were 15 minutes in duration.

- Patients could access the service via the NHS 111 service or by referral from a healthcare professional. Patients could be seen as a walk-in for minor injuries. Staff told us that patients who arrived without an appointment, but were not eligible for walk-in appointments, were assessed and asked to make an appointment if it was appropriate for them to do so.
- Patients were generally seen on a first come, first served basis, although the service had a system in place to facilitate prioritisation according to clinical need where more serious cases or young children, could be prioritised as they arrived. The reception staff had a list of emergency criteria they used to alert the clinical staff if a patient had an urgent need. The criteria included guidance on sepsis and the symptoms that would prompt an urgent response. The receptionists informed patients about anticipated waiting times.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately. Where people were waiting a long time for an assessment or treatment there were arrangements in place to manage the waiting list and to support people while they waited.
- Waiting times between arrival and consultation/ appointment time and consultation, target under 20 minutes - in the 12 months between April 2017 and March 2018 the service had an average of 17 minutes waiting time. In March 2018, 99.7% of patients who were treated were seen within four hours.
- Where patients' needs could not be met by the service, staff redirected them to the appropriate service for their needs. Referrals and transfers to other services were undertaken in a timely way.
- The appointment system was easy to use.

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.

- There was a leaflet for patients explaining how to make a complaint or raise concerns, however this not available in the waiting areas unless asked for. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

- The complaint policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance. There were 17 complaints received in the last year. We reviewed six of these complaints and found that they were satisfactorily handled in a timely way.
- Issues were investigated across relevant providers, and staff were able to feedback to other parts of the patient pathway where relevant, such as to the ambulance service or to NHS 111.

The service learned lessons from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, steps had been taken to improve patients' understanding of the appointment system following a complaint. This included the use of posters in the waiting area to explain when an appointment is required.

Are services well-led?

We rated the service as good for leadership.

Leadership capacity and capability

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

- Leaders had the experience, capacity and skills to deliver the service strategy and address risks to it.
- They 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.
- Senior management was accessible throughout the operational period, with an effective on-call system that staff were able to use.
- 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 patients, staff and external partners.
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.
- The strategy was in line with health and social priorities across the region. The provider planned the service to meet the needs of the local population.
- The provider monitored progress against delivery of the strategy.
- The provider ensured that staff who worked away from the main base felt engaged in the delivery of the provider's vision and values.

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 we spoke with 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. Not all staff had received an appraisal in the last year, however we saw that a programme of appraisal and dates had been set for this to be completed. 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 peer meeting for staff from the Same Day Health Centre to attend along with Out-of-Hours colleagues, however some staff told us they would prefer to have a nurse-led meeting which focussed more on the work they did at the Same Day Health Centre.
- 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 had received equality and diversity training. 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.

Are services well-led?

- Staff were clear on their roles and accountabilities including in respect of safeguarding and infection prevention and control.
- 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.

The provider had processes to manage current and future performance of the service. Performance of employed clinical staff could be demonstrated through audit of their consultations, prescribing and referral decisions. Leaders had oversight of MHRA alerts, incidents, and complaints. Leaders also had a good understanding of service performance against the national and local key performance indicators. Performance was regularly discussed at senior management and board level. Performance was shared with staff and the local CCG as part of contract monitoring arrangements.

Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was clear evidence of action to resolve concerns and improve quality.

The providers had plans in place and had trained staff for major incidents.

The provider implemented service developments and where efficiency changes were made this was with input from clinicians to understand their impact on the quality of care.

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 used information technology systems to monitor and improve the quality of care.
- 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.

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.

- A full and diverse range of patients, staff and external partners' views and concerns were encouraged, heard and acted on to shape services and culture. Feedback from patients was shared with staff across the service via the monthly newsletter.
- Staff were able to describe to us the systems in place to give feedback. We saw evidence of the most recent staff survey 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 systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the service. For example, the system of peer support in place allowed clinicians to continually improve their practice.
- 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.
- There were systems to support improvement and innovation work.