

The Ridge Medical Practice

The Ridge Medical Practice

Inspection report

Westwood Park Diagnostic Treatment Centre
Swift Drive, Off Cooper Lane
Bradford
West Yorkshire
BD6 3NL
Tel: 01274 425632
Website: www.theridgemedicalpractice.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 13 September 2018
Date of publication: 12/11/2018

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 13 September 2018 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.

The Ridge Medical Practice is situated within the Westwood Park Diagnostic Treatment Centre, and provides musculoskeletal triage, assessment and treatment services in Bradford. The NHS commissioned service is known locally as The Bradford South & West Musculoskeletal Service and is led by GPs with enhanced training in musculoskeletal conditions.

The non-clinical partner 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.

Feedback about the service was provided by 42 completed patient comment cards. This feedback was all positive regarding the services they had received and noted the caring attitude of staff and the professional approach taken by clinicians.

Our key findings were:

- The service was offered on a referral basis and was accessible to people who chose to use it.

Summary of findings

- Treatment was safely managed and there were effective levels of patient support and aftercare.
- The service had systems in place to identify, investigate and learn from incidents relating to the safety of patients and staff members.
- There were systems, processes and practices in place to safeguard patients from abuse.
- Information for service users was comprehensive and accessible.
- Patient outcomes were evaluated, analysed and reviewed as part of quality improvement processes, including clinical audit.
- Staff had the relevant skills, knowledge and experience to deliver the care and treatment offered by the service.
- The service shared relevant information with others or referred on to other services when required.
- There was a clear leadership structure, with governance frameworks which supported the delivery of quality care.
- The service encouraged and valued feedback from service users.
- Communication between staff was effective.

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

The Ridge Medical Practice

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection of The Ridge Medical Practice on 13 September 2018. The inspection team consisted of a lead CQC inspector and GP Specialist Advisor.

As part of the preparation for the inspection, we reviewed information provided for us by the provider and specific guidance in relation to services provided. In addition, we reviewed the information we currently held on our records regarding this provider.

During the inspection we interviewed the clinical and non-clinical staff, reviewed documents and collected written feedback relating to the service provided by patients.

The Ridge Medical Practice provides services on a sessional basis at Westwood Park Diagnostic Treatment Centre, Swift Drive, Off Cooper Lane, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD6 3NL. Sessions are also offered at The Ridge Medical Practice, Cousen Road, Great Horton, Bradford, BD7 3JX. We did not visit the Cousen Road location during this inspection. Both locations include a reception and waiting area and accessible treatment rooms. There is limited parking available onsite, including designated provision for the disabled. The service is commissioned by the local NHS Trust through an APMS contract and is known locally as the Bradford South & West Musculoskeletal Service.

The service specialises in the triage, assessment and treatment of musculoskeletal conditions. The service sees

approximately 3,200 patients each year, all of whom are referred by their GP. Services were available to patients over the age of 12 years. This service is registered with CQC under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 in respect of the provision of the following regulated activities; treatment of disease, disorder or injury, surgical procedures and diagnostic and screening services.

The service is led by GPs with enhanced training and a special interest in musculoskeletal conditions. The administrative side of the service is managed by the extended care team, based within the main site of the Ridge Medical Practice at Cousen Road. The clinical team work in close partnership with Extended Scope Physiotherapists (ESPs). However, the ESPs provide treatment under a contract commissioned by the local NHS Trust and so were not reviewed as part of this inspection.

The service operates:

- Thursday at Westwood Park – 8am to 5pm
- Tuesday and Friday at Cousen Road- 8am to 1pm

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. 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. 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 induction system for 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.
- 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.

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 effective systems for verifying the identity of patients as well as children attending with an adult with parental responsibility, and for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- The service had a system in place to retain medical records in line with DHSC guidance
- 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, emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks. The service kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use.
- Staff prescribed 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.

Track record on safety

The service had a good safety record.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.

Are services safe?

- 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.
- 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. For example, there were two significant events reported during the previous year. One of these incidents concerned a medicine dose being misheard on a dictated letter. As a result, all clinicians adopted a system of quoting medicine doses on both words and figures to reduce the likelihood of a recurrence. We saw that all incidents were discussed at quarterly governance meetings.
- 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.
- 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.

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 needs 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 and made appropriate referrals to specialist pain management services.

Monitoring care and treatment

The service was involved in quality improvement activity.

- The service used information about care and treatment to make improvements. For example, through the use of completed clinical audits. Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. For example, we saw a completed audit cycle in the management of plantar fasciitis (a condition that causes pain in the foot). This led to additional treatment being offered by the provider to improve patient outcomes and reduce the need for referral into secondary care services.

Effective staffing

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

- All staff were appropriately qualified. We saw evidence that they had undertaken enhanced training to support their role.
- Relevant professionals were registered with the General Medical Council (GMC) 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.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- Patients received coordinated and person-centred care. Staff referred to, and communicated effectively with, other services when appropriate. For example, all new referrals into the service were triaged and assigned to the most appropriate clinician for care.
- Before providing treatment, doctors at the service ensured they had adequate knowledge of the patient's health, any relevant test results and their medicines history.
- All patients were asked for consent to share details of their consultation and any medicines prescribed with their registered GP on each occasion they used the service.
- The provider had risk assessed the treatments they offered. We saw evidence of letters sent to the patients' registered GP in line with GMC guidance.
- Patient information was shared appropriately (this included when patients moved to other professional services), and the information needed to plan and deliver care and treatment was available to relevant staff in a timely and accessible way.

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.
- 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.
- 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 treated 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. Staff were available to support patients that needed assistance with interpretation or access to easy read materials.
- 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.

Privacy and Dignity

The service respected patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff recognised the importance of people's dignity and respect and all consultations took place in private.
- Staff told us that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could be offered 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. This was achieved by undertaking an annual patient survey and self-auditing the performance of the service. For example, the service regularly reviewed feedback about individual clinicians and fed this into their appraisals. Discharge rates and referral rates to other services, for example specialist pain management clinics were also regularly reviewed and discussed in provider meetings.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.

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.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately. However, a minority of patients had said in the provider's feedback questionnaire that clinics sometimes ran late.

- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- Patients reported that 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.

- 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 and complaints and also from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care. Two complaints had been made during the previous year. We reviewed the response and saw that this had been satisfactory. In one complaint we reviewed, we saw that an internal process had not been followed that had led to the complaint. We saw that this had been reviewed with the person involved to prevent a recurrence.

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 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. All staff received regular annual appraisals in the last year. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary. Clinical staff, were considered valued members of the team. They were given protected 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 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.
- 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 was clear and effective clarity around 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 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.
- Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was clear evidence of action to change services to improve quality.

Are services well-led?

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

- 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 effective 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, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

- The patients', staff and external partners' views and concerns were encouraged, heard and acted on to shape services and culture. For example, through an annual patient feedback survey.
- Staff were able to describe to us the systems in place to give feedback. For example, through attendance of regular documented governance meetings. 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 was 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.
- There were systems to support improvement and innovation work. For example, with the effective use of clinical audit.