

# Kersley Eye Clinic

## Inspection report

42 Harley Street  
London  
W1G 9PR  
Tel: 02074361591  
[www.kersleyeyeclinic.com](http://www.kersleyeyeclinic.com)

Date of inspection visit: 18 January 2022  
Date of publication: 14/02/2022

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 Kersley Eye Clinic on 18 January 2022 as part of our inspection programme.

The Kersley Eye Clinic in Harley Street London is a private clinic that provides Ophthalmic diagnosis and treatment to adults and children. Patients attending the clinic are attended to by Consultant Ophthalmic Surgeons.

This service is registered with CQC under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 to provide treatment of disease and disorder or injury and diagnostic and screening procedures.

One of the Consultants 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.

## **Our key findings were:**

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were always assessed and well managed, including those relating to medicines, safeguarding and recruitment checks.
- The clinic had policies and procedures to govern activity.
- The way the service was led and managed promoted the delivery of high-quality, person-centre care. There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The service proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

**Dr Rosie Benneyworth BM BS BMedSci MRCGP**

Chief Inspector of Primary Medical Services and Integrated Care

## Our inspection team

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

## Background to Kersley Eye Clinic

Kersley Eye Clinic

42 Harley Street

London

W1G 9PR

The Kersley Eye Clinic in Harley Street London is a private clinic that provides Ophthalmic diagnosis and treatment to adults and children. Patients attending the clinic are attended to by Consultant Ophthalmic Surgeons. The clinic has been providing Ophthalmic diagnosis and treatment, including emergency eye services in Harley Street for over forty years. The service is registered to provide care and for patients for all ages.

Online services can be accessed from the service website:

<https://kersleyeyeclinic.com/>

The clinic is open Monday to Friday from 9am to 5pm. Appointments are booked in advance though there is capacity for same day appointments or consultations if needed. The clinic opens on one Saturday morning per month to offer access to patients who need to be seen at less busy times or based on needs.

### How we inspected this service

- During the site visit, we spoke with the Registered Manager who is also the Lead Consultant at the service, and an operations practice manager.
- We looked at records related to patient assessments and the provision of care and treatment.
- Reviewed personnel files, service policies and procedures and other records concerned with running the service.

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:**

## **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 including locums. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance. 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. The Lead consultant at the service was the designated safeguarding lead for the service who was also part of the local safeguarding board at a local NHS hospital.
- The service had systems in place to assure that an adult accompanying a child had parental authority. This was further verified during consultation.
- 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). It was the clinic's policy to undertake DBS checks on all staff during the employment process.
- 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 lead clinician had further developed the infection control policies in line with the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure staff and patients remained safe.
- 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 provider carried out appropriate environmental risk assessments, which considered 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.**

- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed. The clinic had arrangements to ensure there was adequate clinical cover and worked closely with colleagues at a local clinic to provide cover when required.
- 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 who required emergency care.
- When there were changes to services or staff the service assessed and monitored the impact on safety.
- There were appropriate indemnity arrangements in place.
- There were suitable medicines and equipment to deal with medical emergencies which were stored appropriately and checked regularly. During our inspection the lead clinician demonstrated to us the process staff would follow in a medical emergency. We saw staff carry this out safely.

## **Information to deliver safe care and treatment**

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

# Are services safe?

- 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.
- 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 cease trading.
- Clinicians made appropriate and timely referrals in line with protocols and up to date evidence-based guidance.

## Safe and appropriate use of medicines

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

- The systems and arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and equipment which minimised risks. The service kept prescription stationery securely. Only the clinicians had access to the clinical system that was used to produce the prescriptions.
- The service carried out regular medicines audit 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. Where there was a different approach taken from national guidance there was a clear rationale for this that protected patient safety.
- There were effective protocols for verifying the identity of patients including children.

## Track record on safety and incidents

### The service had a good safety record.

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

## Lessons learned and improvements made

### The service learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- There was a system for recording and acting on significant events. Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.
- 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. Staff we spoke to were able to give an example of an incident or a significant event and the shared learning from it. We saw that the clinic discussed recent learning from incidents.
- Report on Duty of Candour here: 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.

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The service gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology

# Are services safe?

- They kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

The service acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. The service had an effective mechanism in place to disseminate alerts to all members of the team including sessional and agency staff.

# Are services effective?

**We rated effective as Good because:**

## **Effective needs assessment, care and treatment**

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

- 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.
- Patients were offered the choice of online appointments where appropriate.

## **Monitoring care and treatment**

**The service was actively involved in quality improvement activity.**

- The service used information about care and treatment to make improvements. 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. Examples of audits carried out that resulted in improvements in care included those relating to clinical record keeping, post-operative procedures and infection control.

## **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.
- Relevant professionals (medical and nursing) were registered with the General Medical Council (GMC) and were up to date with revalidation. Both Consultants worked in the NHS as well and their appraisal and revalidation were completed within the NHS.
- 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. For example, some members of staff had identified further development in different aspects of eye care relevant to their roles and this had been arranged.

## **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, with other services such as eye clinics, eye specialists and GP services.

# Are services effective?

- 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. We saw examples of patients being 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 and other specialists on each occasion they used the service.
- The clinic did not prescribe any high-risk medicines that required coordination with a patients GP.
- Care and treatment for patients in vulnerable circumstances was coordinated with other services.
- 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. There were clear and effective arrangements for following up on people who had been referred to other services.
- The service monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.

## 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.**

- 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 caring?

**We rated caring as Good because:**

## **Kindness, respect and compassion**

### **Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.**

- The service sought feedback on the quality of clinical care patients received.
- 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. This was identified during the registration process and arrangements made to make improvements. 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.
- For patients with learning disabilities or complex social needs family, carers or social workers were appropriately involved. The clinic decided for patients with additional needs to attend at less busy times for examples, for special appointments on a Saturday.
- Staff communicated with people in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids and easy read materials were available.

## **Privacy and Dignity**

### **The service respected patients' privacy and dignity.**

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

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

**We rated responsive as Good because:**

## **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.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.
- Reasonable adjustments had been made so that people in vulnerable circumstances could access and use services on an equal basis to others. For example, the reception staff at the clinic provided the required access for wheelchair users and once in the clinic rooms with step free access were available.

## **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.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- Patients reported that the appointment system was easy to use.
- Referrals and transfers to other services were undertaken in a timely way.

## **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 a complaint policy and procedures in place. The service learned lessons from individual concerns, complaints and from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care.

# Are services well-led?

## Leadership capacity and capability;

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

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

## Vision and strategy

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

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

## Culture

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

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

## Governance arrangements

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

# Are services well-led?

- 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.
- The service used performance information, which was reported and monitored, and management and staff were held to account
- The information used to monitor performance and the delivery of quality care was accurate and useful. There were plans to address any identified weaknesses.
- The service submitted data or notifications to external organisations as required.
- There were robust arrangements in line with data security standards for the availability, integrity and confidentiality of patient identifiable data, records and data management systems.

## 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 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.
- 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.

## Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

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

- The service encouraged and heard views and concerns from the public, patients, staff and external partners and acted on them to shape services and culture
- Staff could describe to us the systems in place to give feedback. 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

# Are services well-led?

## **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 the clinic held monthly quiz sessions at the staff meetings. The quiz sessions were related to their day to day work and this provided any opportunity to learn in a relaxed and conducive environment.