

Transform Hospital Group Fulham

Inspection report

Nightingale House
1-7 Fulham High Street
London
SW6 3JH
Tel:

Date of inspection visit: 28 October 2021
Date of publication: 26/11/2021

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 to people's needs? Good 

Are services well-led? Good 

Overall summary

This service is rated as Good overall.

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 Transform Hospital Group, Fulham on 28 October 2021. This was as part of our inspection programme; the service had not previously been inspected.

This service is registered with CQC under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 in respect of some, but not all, of the services it provides. There are some exemptions from regulation by CQC which relate to particular types of regulated activities and services and these are set out in Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 of The Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Transform Hospital Group Fulham provides some cosmetic surgery services, which are not within CQC scope of registration. Therefore, we did not inspect or report on these services.

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:

- Review its safeguarding policy to ensure all clinicians are trained at level 3 safeguarding for adults and children.

Dr Rosie Benneyworth BM BS BMedSci MRCGP

Chief Inspector of Primary Medical Services and Integrated Care

Our inspection team

The inspection was led by a CQC inspector and included an additional CQC inspector, a GP specialist advisor and a nurse specialist advisor.

Background to Transform Hospital Group Fulham

Transform Hospital Group Fulham is a clinic which is part of a group of services under the provider Transform Hospital Group Ltd. They treat patients who are over 18 years of age and provide a range of services including pre- and post-operative care to cosmetic and bariatric surgery (a surgery that helps reduce food consumption and help weight loss).

The Fulham clinic address is Nightingale House, 1-7 Fulham High Street, SW6 3JH. The clinic is based on the ground floor of an apartment building. The clinic has good transport links with regular buses and local tube stations.

The clinic recently reopened to patients following national COVID-19 restrictions.

The clinic is registered by the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities Treatment of disease, disorder or injury. Care provided in the clinic, within the scope of CQC registration, includes pre-operative consultations with surgeons and nurses, blood sampling, routine pre and post-operative swabs, post-operative reviews with surgeons and nurses, wound care including removal of sutures, routine gastric band volume adjustments and prescribing of medicines to aid weight loss.

The clinic is managed by the clinic manager and administrative staff with oversight from the head of governance and compliance. The clinical staff includes ten locum surgeons and four employed nurses.

The service is open from Monday to Friday between 9am-7pm and 10am-4pm on Saturdays.

We gathered and reviewed pre-inspection information before inspecting the service. On the day of the inspection we spoke with the head of governance and compliance, the service manager, a surgeon, a nurse and members of the administration team. We also reviewed a wide range of documentary evidence including patient records, policies, written protocols and guidelines, recruitment, induction and training records, significant event analyses and patient feedback.

The Registered Manager of the clinic had left the company at the time of the inspection, but the newly appointed clinic manager was in the process of applying for the role. 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.

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. All electronic equipment had an up to date portable appliance test carried out, and all clinical equipment had recently been calibrated. The practice had carried out a legionella risk assessment and was able to evidence that actions recommended by the report were being regularly carried out. The provider ensured that facilities and equipment were safe, and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions. There were adequate systems for safely managing healthcare waste.
- 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 had systems to safeguard vulnerable adults from abuse. All staff received level 2 adult safeguarding training. Policies were regularly reviewed and were accessible to all staff. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance. Staff knew how to identify and report concerns. The practice confirmed that patients under the age of 18 were not seen by the service. However, to be in line with national guidelines we recommended the provider ensures all clinical staff are also trained in child safeguarding level three.
- 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 were trained in basic life support and first aid. Staff we interviewed were able to adequately explain what they would do in the case of an emergency.
- Staff who acted as chaperones were appropriately trained for the role.
- The practice was visibly clean and hygienic, there was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control, the policy and procedures had been enhanced and updated to reflect the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

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.
- 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.
- 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.

Are services safe?

- We reviewed five individual care records and were satisfied they 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.

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, minimised risks. The service kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use.
- The service carried out regular medicines' audits to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing.
- 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.
- Patients' health was monitored in relation to the use of medicines and followed up on appropriately.

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.

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 raised concerns. The practice had recorded four significant events in the past 12 months. One of the significant events recorded, related to a patient informing the service about potential self-harm. The practice raised the concern and spoke with the patient and then sought them help from the relevant local authorities.
- 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.
- 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. For example, we were shown an example where a safety alert had been issued recalling a certain batch of clinical wipes due to a risk of it being contaminated. In response to this, we saw evidence the infection control lead had carried out an audit and recalled all of the clinical wipes and cross checked their serial numbers to ensure they were not part of the infected batch.

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 relevant guidelines 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 were delivered in a coordinated way which considered the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. We saw that staff had undertaken extra training to enable them to identify patients who may have been suffering from body dysmorphia (this is a condition where a person spends a lot of time worrying about their appearance).
- 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 a comprehensive programme of quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided. During the Covid-19 lockdown period, when the service was not in operation, the service staff had completed extra training and updated systems, policies and processes.

- The service was actively involved in quality improvement activity. We saw evidence that they discussed new research and new treatments in multi-disciplinary meetings.
- The service made improvements using 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.
- Audits recently undertaken included those for infection rates following surgery and antibiotic prescribing. We saw evidence to show that surgeons had acted on the audits and adapted the way they carried out surgery to ensure a lower infection rate. For example, one surgeon told us they previously washed with standard issue antibacterial products, and as a result of the audit they added an extra layer of safety by also washing with betadine to reduce infection risks (Betadine is a topical antiseptic that provides infection protection against a variety of bacteria).
- We also saw evidence the lead nurse carried out record keeping audits every six weeks, to ensure records were accurate and included all information in line with best practice guidelines. Where notes did not include relevant information, feedback was provided, and corrections were made.

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 prevention and control and information governance.
- 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 training to meet them. Up-to-date records of skills, qualifications and training were maintained. Staff were encouraged and given opportunities to develop.

Are services effective?

- The provider provided staff with ongoing support. This included one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and support for revalidation. 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. We saw evidence of a policy which supported this finding.

Coordinating care and treatment

Staff worked together 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 after they were discharged from hospital. Staff communicated with patient's registered GPs with the consent of the patient.
- There were clear and effective arrangements for booking appointments.

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.
- 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.
- 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. Patients who were assessed to lack the capacity to consent were refused treatment.
- 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. Call handlers gave clear information to people who phoned into the service.
- Patients were able to leave reviews on independent internet review sites such as Trust Pilot. The service had received 19 Trust Pilot reviews in the past 12 months, all of which gave the service a five-star rating.
- We also spoke with two patients on the day of the inspection, both were positive about the service and told us they were always treated with kindness, respect and compassion.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to 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):

- Interpreting services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. Information leaflets were available in easy read formats, to help patients be involved in decisions about their care.
- The practice had access to a hearing loop for patients with hearing impairments. The practice was also able to provide information in braille for patients with visual impairments.

Privacy and dignity

The service respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff always respected confidentiality.
- 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.

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 recently developed a new service to aid weight loss.
- The provider improved services where possible in response to unmet needs.
- The service had a system in place that alerted staff to any specific safety or clinical needs of a person using the service.
- The clinic was situated on the ground floor of an apartment building with easy access for those with disabilities.

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 from Monday to Friday between 9am-7pm and 10am-4pm on Saturdays. The contact centre team booked appointments for patients to attend the clinic. The clinic staff then book ongoing appointments for patients at their convenience.

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 and it was easy to do. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.
- The complaint policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance. 18 complaints were received over the last two years. We reviewed four complaints and found that they were satisfactorily handled in a timely way.
- The service learned lessons from individual concerns and complaints and from analysis of trends. It acted as a result of complaints to improve the quality of care. For example, the practice shared various feedback from patients stating it was sometimes difficult to get through to the service on the telephone, to address this the service had invested into a new telephone system, and since then there have been no further complaints.

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 were accessible to all staff, staff we spoke to said they were very comfortable sharing positive feedback and concerns with their managers.
- 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.
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.
- The provider 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. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary.
- All staff were considered valued members of the team.
- There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of all staff.
- 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.

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

Are services well-led?

- 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. Performance was regularly discussed at senior management and level. Performance was shared with staff.
- 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 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- Staff were able to describe to us the systems in place to give feedback. This included internet search engines.

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. We saw evidence of numerous examples of staff training.
- The service made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints. Learning was shared and used to make improvements. For example, we were told there was a re-occurring issue of samples being mislabelled and then rejected by the laboratory. This meant patients had to be recalled which led to a series of complaints. To address this the service put in place a new policy whereby sample labels had to be checked by two members of staff prior to dispatching to the laboratory. Since putting this process in place, the issue had not been repeated.