

Shirley Road Health Centre

Inspection report

189 Shirley Road
Acocks Green
Birmingham
B27 7NP
Tel: 07904369628
www.hanyahealthcare.com

Date of inspection visit: 25 September 2023
Date of publication: 24/10/2023

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 of Hanya Healthcare Ltd at Shirley Road Health Centre on 25 September 2023 as part of our inspection programme and to provide a rating for the service. The service has not previously been inspected.

Hanya Healthcare Ltd at Shirley Road Health Centre is an independent nurse led wound care service.

The service has a 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.

Our key findings were:

- The service provided care in a way that kept patients safe.
- Clinical records seen demonstrated the delivery of safe and effective care and treatment with appropriate follow up provided.
- The provider worked with other services when needed to ensure patients safety.
- There were policies in place to support the running of the service and risk assessments to support the delivery of the service and minimise risks to patients.
- All patients received an initial assessment to ensure that the service could meet their needs.
- Patient feedback seen showed that patients were treated with kindness and respect.
- Patients received timely care which was flexible to their needs.
- We found the service was well led.

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

- Record the source of any results in patient records so that it is clear how they have been obtained to inform care and treatment.
- Maintain clear and complete records of staff immunisation status in line with government recommendations and risk assess where these are not available.
- Improve awareness of the complaints process for patients.

Dr Sean O'Kelly BSc MB ChB MSc DCH FRCA

Overall summary

Chief Inspector of Health Care

Our inspection team

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

Background to Shirley Road Health Centre

Shirley Road Health Centre is the location of Hanya Healthcare Ltd, a nurse led wound care service for children (over the age of 5 years) and adults. Details about the service provided can be found on their website at www.hanyahealthcare.com.

Hanya Healthcare Ltd has an administrative office at their provider address in Solihull. The provider rents a room at Shirley Road Health Centre, 189 Shirley Road, Acocks Green, Birmingham, B27 7NP as required, where it carries out their regulated activities. However, the majority of the provider's regulated activity is carried out in the patient's own home.

The service has one team member (the provider and registered manager) who is a registered nurse and independent prescriber.

Patients can access the service by telephone or through the provider website. The service is available Monday to Friday by appointment.

How we inspected this service

During the inspection, we carried out a site visit, spoke with staff, reviewed information about the service made available to us by the provider and intelligence held by CQC, reviewed a sample of clinical records, made observations and reviewed patient feedback.

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?

We rated safe as Good because:

Hanya Healthcare Ltd at Shirley Road Health Centre demonstrated that services were provided in a way that ensured patient safety.

However, the provider should improve records relating to their immunisation status.

Safety systems and processes

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

- The provider conducted safety risk assessments. There were appropriate safety policies, which were regularly reviewed. They outlined who to go to for further guidance. The service had systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse.
- The provider had systems in place to assure that an adult accompanying a child had parental authority.
- The provider 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 was Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checked. (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).
- The provider had up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control. The provider had carried out an infection control audit of the premises in the last 12 months.
- Records held at the Shirley Road Health Centre showed regular water testing and flushing of water outlets were carried out to minimise the risk of Legionella (a bacterium that can be found in water supplies).
- The provider held records of their immunisation status but we found these were not fully in line with recommended guidance and no risk assessment had been undertaken where immunisations were absent.
- 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.
- The Shirley Road Health Centre was maintained by NHS Properties who carried out environmental risk assessments, which took into account the profile of people using the service and those who may be accompanying them.

Risks to patients

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

- The provider advised that they were currently managing workloads but were also considering the recruitment of additional staff to support the growth of the service.
- The provider did not use any agency or locum staff.
- The provider 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. The provider had undertaken basic life support and sepsis training.
- Emergency medicines and equipment were available within the Shirley Road Health Centre. However, the provider advised that the nature of the service did not require emergency medicines or equipment. They told us that if they were concerned about a patient, they would contact emergency services.

Are services safe?

- Enquiries relating to certain wounds for example, stab wounds, would be referred directly to A&E or other more suitable services for the patient's needs.
- There were appropriate indemnity arrangements in place for the provision of the service.

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. We reviewed 7 care records, these showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to relevant staff in an accessible way. We did however, note that the source of information from GP and secondary care investigations was not always fully documented in the patient records.
- The service had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment. Information was routinely shared with a patient's GP to let them know their patient was being treated by the service.
- The service had a system in place to retain medical records in line with Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) guidance in the event that they ceased trading.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

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

- The provider did not stock any medicines and any prescribing was limited to dressings and antibiotics. The provider advised that they had an arrangement with local pharmacists and would usually pick up the private prescriptions to take to the patient.
- Due to the small numbers of patients seen the service had not carried out any specific medicines audit to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. However, there had been some general peer review of their work.
- The service did not prescribe controlled drugs.

Track record on safety and incidents

The service had a good safety record.

- There were 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 incidents and significant events. However, the provider advised that there had not been any since registering the service.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the Duty of Candour.
- The service acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts, and was able to give an example of this.

Are services effective?

We rated effective as Good because:

Hanya Healthcare Ltd at Shirley Road Health Centre was providing effective care in accordance with the relevant regulations. However, the provider should seek to undertake routine quality improvement work as the service grows.

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).

- Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. Where appropriate this included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- All new patients received an initial consultation to assess their treatment needs in which their medical history and other relevant information was discussed. This enabled the provider to assess whether the service was best placed to meet their needs.
- The provider advised that they followed local formulary for wound care.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Patients were made aware that they would need follow up appointments and the frequency required to support their specific needs.
- The provider undertook additional training and told us they read journals and utilised the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines to update and maintain their knowledge in wound care. They had established informal networks with similar specialists for support and advice.

Monitoring care and treatment

There was limited involvement in quality improvement activity with plans to increase this as the service grew.

- The service had been active for a relatively short time and did not currently have sufficient numbers of cases to undertake effective audit work at present. However, there were plans to do so in the future.
- The provider had sought and received feedback from their peers of their work to help support improvement and utilised patient feedback in improving the service.

Effective staffing

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

- The service was provided by a sole nurse and independent prescriber registered with the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC). The provider was up to date with their appraisals and revalidation (a requirement for nurses to remain on the NMC register).
- The provider maintained their clinical practice at an urgent care centre.
- Training records showed that the provider undertook regular training and updates in wound care and were in the process of completing a master's degree in advanced wound care.
- They told us that they also received training and support from representatives of wound care products used during their work.
- The provider had identified mandatory learning requirements and were able to show they were up to date in areas such as safeguarding, basic life support, infection prevention and control, information governance and fire safety.

Are services effective?

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- Patients received coordinated and person-centred care. The provider referred to, and communicated effectively with, other services when appropriate. For example, we saw from our review of care records that relevant information was routinely shared with the patients usual GP.
- Before providing treatment, the provider ensured they had adequate knowledge of the patient's health, any relevant test results and their medicines history. The provider shared with us examples of cases where patients were signposted to more suitable sources of treatment where this information was not available to ensure safe care and treatment.
- All patients were asked for consent to share details of their consultation and any medicines prescribed with their registered GP when they used the service.
- The provider had risk assessed the treatments they offered. Prescribing was limited to the scope of the service provided.

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. An information pack was given to new patients which provided advice on wound care.
- Risk factors relating to care and treatment were identified and highlighted to patients and their usual GP for additional support. For example, if wounds were infected or not showing sufficient improvement within a given time frame.
- Where patients needs could not be met by the service, the provider 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.

- Staff understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making and had received relevant training in this area.
- Staff supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.

Are services caring?

We rated caring as Good because:

Hanya Healthcare Ltd at Shirley Road Health Centre demonstrated that they provided a caring service in which patients were treated with dignity and respect.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- The service routinely sought feedback on the quality of clinical care patients received. All patients were asked to complete a patient questionnaire. However, there had only been two responses to date. The provider advised that patients preferred to leave their reviews online.
- There were 11 online reviews made about the service in the last 12 months, all reviews were positive giving the service a 4.9 out of 5 star rating.
- Feedback from patients was positive about the way the provider treated people. Comments left by patients showed that they were happy with the service received, they felt staff were knowledgeable, professional and respectful and that they would be happy to recommend the service to others.
- 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 not available for patients who did not have English as a first language. The provider told us that they had not had a situation where one was required but advised that they would ask a family member to interpret if the patient was happy to do this.
- All new patients received an information pack which provided written information about the service for them to take away. They also underwent an assessment where they were able to ask any questions they might have about their care.
- Information about the service was also available on the provider's website.
- The provider told us that they advised patients where they could get support through the NHS, as they were aware of the cost implications of their private service.

Privacy and Dignity

The service respected patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff recognised the importance of people's dignity and respect.
- The majority of treatments were carried out in the patients own home, where the patient was able to receive treatment privately and discuss sensitive issues in confidence if they wanted to.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

We rated responsive as Choose a rating because:

Hanya Healthcare Ltd at Shirley Road Health Centre provided a responsive service. They made reasonable adjustments and delivered services that met the needs of their patients in a timely way. However, the provider should improve patient awareness of their complaints processes.

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, since establishing the service the provider had increased the number of home visits in response to demand.
- The provider hired out a clinical room for providing the service in a local health centre. We visited the facilities and found they 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. The clinical room was located on the first floor and accessible to people with mobility difficulties however, the provider would also carry out home visits depending on the patient's preference.

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 assessments, and treatment. The provider worked flexibly to ensure patients had follow up appointments as needed to promote healing.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- The appointment system was easy to use. Patients could book their appointment by phone or online.
- Referrals and transfers to other services were undertaken in a timely way. For example, if swabs were needed to test for infection.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The service had a system for responding to complaints.

- As a sole provider any complaints would be directed to them. There was no specific information available to inform patients as to the complaints process. However, patients were able to raise any issues directly with the provider as they were providing treatment.
- There was also contact information for the service and feedback forms on the provider's website if patients needed to raise a concern. Information on the practice website also spoke about how they would use feedback to improve the service.
- The provider advised that they were planning to add this information about raising a complaint as part of the new patient information pack.
- The provider advised that they had not received any complaints and that feedback to date had all been positive.

Are services well-led?

We rated well-led as Choose a rating because:

Hanya Healthcare Ltd at Shirley Road Health Centre demonstrated that it had the leadership and culture to support the delivery of high-quality care.

Leadership capacity and capability;

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

- The provider was knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of the service. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- The service was led by a sole provider who understood the service they were delivering and the need for future planning as the service expanded.

Vision and strategy

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

- The provider had a vision for the service and how they wanted it to develop to support the needs of different patients including those who were vulnerable.
- The provider had clearly shared their values on their website.

Culture

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

- The service focused on the needs of patients and adapted the service to meet those needs.
- Our conversation with the provider indicated an openness, honesty and transparency in their approach to the inspection. The provider understood the requirement of duty of candour but had not had any cause to implement this. Since establishing the service feedback had been positive and there were no incidents or complaints received.
- The provider had recognised the risks relating to lone working and had developed systems to minimise the risks to their safety when undertaking home visits.
- Training records for the provider showed they had completed equality and diversity training.

Governance arrangements

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

- As a sole provider, the clinical lead was accountable for all aspects of the service.
- The provider had put in place a set of policies to support the governance and management of the service. They had allocated regular time to undertake administrative tasks.
- The provider had additional clinical support from colleagues in their other health related employment in peer reviewing their work and for advice.

Are services well-led?

Managing risks, issues and performance

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

- The provider was able to share with us risk assessments relating to the delivery of the service. These continued to be developed as the service evolved.
- There was an effective, process to identify, understand, monitor and address current and future risks including risks to patient safety.
- The provider maintained oversight of performance through feedback received relating to the service and peer review of records. They also utilised safety alerts to check service provision for any potential risks.
- The provider advised that they had not had any incidents or complaints and that due to lack of patient numbers it was too soon for any meaningful clinical audits.
- The provider had a business continuity plan in place in the event of a major incidents affecting the continuity of the service.

Appropriate and accurate information

The service acted on appropriate and accurate information.

- Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Records enabled the provider to monitor progress in relation to wound healing.
- As a sole provider, there were no formal meetings with which to document performance. However, feedback from patients was positive and no concerns had been raised relating to the quality of care.
- 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. The provider was registered with the Information Commissioners Office.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The service involved patients and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

- The service encouraged and heard views and concerns from the public, patients, and external partners and acted on them to shape services and culture. For example, the provider was moving away from a more clinic based service to undertaking home visits and flexible hours to meet patient demand.
- The provider told us how they engaged with commissioners to identify how the service could help meet the needs of the wider community.

Continuous improvement and innovation

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

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement. The provider undertook training and development opportunities to maintain and increase their skills as a clinician.
- The service made use of feedback to improve the service delivered.
- There were systems to support improvement and innovation work, the provider had identified potential areas to expand the service and were working with commissioners to see if they could be developed.