Duke Street Surgery

Quality Report

4 Duke Street
Barrow in Furness
Cumbria
LA14 1LF
Tel: 01229 820068 / 823215
Website: www.dukestreetsurgery.nhs.uk/

Date of inspection visit: 12 August 2016
Date of publication: This is auto-populated when the report is published

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 service	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

Summary of findings

Contents

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Duke Street Surgery on 12 August 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

Our key findings across all the areas we inspected were as follows:

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice 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.

We saw one area of outstanding practice:

- The practice is rated outstanding for the care of people whose circumstances make them vulnerable. Strong safeguarding procedures were in place with safeguarding leads for nursing and administration staff

Summary of findings

in addition to the practice lead. Systems were in place to ensure information was shared effectively between services to keep patients safe. The practice was proactive in supporting multi-agency working with regard to safeguarding. Patients also had access to a mental health trained nurse who could offer physical and mental health reviews, medication reviews and specialist support.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Blinds with loop chords in patient areas should be risk assessed or secured.
- Consider keeping minutes of meetings held in the practice.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

Good

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse. These included additional safeguarding leads in the nursing and administrative teams in the practice.
- Risks to patients were assessed and generally well managed, however loop chords on blinds in areas where patients could access had not been secured.

Are services effective?

Good

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Are services caring?

Good

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice worked closely with the local Integrated Care Community (ICC) which provided services for patients, such as a Care Navigator. This was a person to whom patients could be referred, and who would direct them to services which would help them meet their health and social care needs.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

Good

The practice is rated as good for being well-led.

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings, however the practice should consider taking minutes of these.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.

Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

We always inspect the quality of care for these six population groups.

Older people

Good

The practice is rated as good for the care of older people.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in their population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Performance for indicators for diseases often suffered by older people was better than the national average. For example, the practice achieved 100% of the points available for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), compared to 96% nationally.

People with long term conditions

Good

The practice is rated as good for the care of people with long-term conditions.

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the points available in this area, compared to 89.2% nationally.
- One of the nursing team had developed a review form that patients who could not attend surgery could complete and submit to the nurses. This was available online and in reception, as well as being included in the letter that was sent to patients to invite them to their review.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

Good

The practice is rated as good for the care of families, children and young people.

Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good

The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age people (including those recently retired and students).

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was identical to the CCG and national averages.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Outstanding

The practice is rated as good for the care of people whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.

- The practice was situated in an area of high safeguarding activity and had been involved in two serious case reviews in the past two years. (Serious case reviews are local enquiries into the death or serious injury of a child where abuse or neglect is known or suspected to be a factor. They are carried out by Local Safeguarding Children Boards so that lessons can be learned.)
- Vulnerable children and adults were protected by a strong comprehensive safeguarding system. One of the GPs was the lead member of staff for safeguarding at the practice. They were supported by safeguarding leads in the nursing and administrative teams also. Calls to the practice from external agencies seeking information in safeguarding cases were put on the lead GP's urgent call list and responded to immediately.

Summary of findings

- Systems were in place to ensure information was shared effectively between services to keep patients safe. The practice was proactive in supporting and leading multi-agency working with regard to safeguarding.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients who needed them, including those with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good

The practice is rated as good for the care of people experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia).

- 72% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is lower than the national average.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the points available in this area, compared to 92.8% nationally.
- The practice employed a nurse who was specialised in supporting patients experiencing poor mental health. They were able to undertake annual mental health reviews, medicine reviews of patients with poor mental health as well as working with other staff in the practice to improve support for patients.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in July 2016 showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 271 survey forms were distributed and 120 were returned. This represented a response rate of 44%, and approximately 1.3% of the practice's patient list.

- 88% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 80% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 85%.
- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.
- 81% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 20 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Words used by patients to describe staff at the practice included 'helpful, 'caring' and 'respectful.

We spoke with four patients during the inspection. All four patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. In the three months prior to our inspection the practice had received 32 responses to their Friends and Family Test, of which 30 patients stated they would be likely or extremely likely to recommend the practice. Nobody replied that they would not recommend the practice.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Blinds with loop chords in patient areas should be risk assessed or secured.
- Consider keeping minutes of meetings held in the practice.

Outstanding practice

- The practice is rated outstanding for the care of people whose circumstances make them vulnerable. Strong safeguarding procedures were in place with safeguarding leads for nursing and administration staff in addition to the practice lead. Systems were in place to ensure information was shared effectively between services to keep patients safe. The practice was proactive in supporting multi-agency working with regard to safeguarding. Patients also had access to a mental health trained nurse who could offer physical and mental health reviews, medication reviews and specialist support.

Duke Street Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector**.** The team included a GP specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Duke Street Surgery

Duke Street Surgery is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide primary care services.

The practice provides services to approximately 9,500 patients from one location at 4 Duke Street, Barrow in Furness, Cumbria, LA14 1LF. We visited this location on this inspection.

The practice is based in a large, historic building which was originally built as a doctor's surgery and is owned by the practice. It has level access and all patient services for the surgery are on the ground floor. There is a designated parking area for patients, with disabled parking spaces available.

The practice has 31 members of staff, including three GP partners (one female, two male), four salaried GPs (three female, one male), one (female) nurse practitioner, three (female) practice nurses, three (female) healthcare assistants, a practice manager, two medicines managers and 14 reception and administration staff, including a clinical interface manager.

The practice is part of Cumbria clinical commissioning group (CCG). Information taken from Public Health England placed the area in which the practice was located in the second most deprived decile. In general, people living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. Health outcomes for people in Barrow in Furness are generally lower than national averages and vary significantly. The life expectancy in the most deprived areas for men is 13 years lower, and for women eight years lower, than people in the least deprived areas. The area also has higher-than-average rates of obesity, self-harm and smoking related deaths. The practice population profile is relatively similar to the national average, with slightly more patients than average between the ages of 65-69 and slightly fewer between the ages of 35-39.

The surgery is open from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday, with extended opening hours from 7.30am on Wednesday and Friday. The practice is closed at weekends. Telephones at the practice are answered from 8am until 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. Outside of these times a message on the telephone answering system redirects patients to out of hours or emergency services as appropriate. The service for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is provided by the NHS 111 service and Cumbria Health On Call (CHOC).

The practice provides services to patients of all ages based on a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract agreement for general practice.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 12 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of 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?

We also looked at how well services were provided for specific groups of people and what good care looked like for them. The population groups are:

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions
- Families, children and young people
- Working age people (including those recently retired and students)
- People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable
- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia).

Please note that when referring to information throughout this report, for example any reference to the Quality and Outcomes Framework data, this relates to the most recent information available to the CQC at that time.

Good

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, the practice chaperone policy was reviewed and extra training was given to staff following a significant event.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse, which included:

- Strong arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. One of the GPs was the lead member of staff for safeguarding at the practice. They were supported by safeguarding leads in the nursing and administrative teams also. These leads monitored safeguarding activity in their teams and reported this back at the practice safeguarding meeting. For example, the administrative lead for safeguarding was the clinical interface manager, who could review discharge notifications for any potential signs of safeguarding concerns, such as repeated attendances at accident and emergency. The practice was in an area of high safeguarding activity and had been involved in two serious case reviews in the past two years. (Serious case reviews are local enquiries into the death or serious injury of a child where abuse or neglect is known or suspected to be a factor. They are carried out by Local Safeguarding Children Boards so that lessons can be learned.) The practice maintained a register of families about whom there were safeguarding concerns. This list included families who did not have any formal child protection plan in place, but who the practice had assessed as needing additional support. At the time of inspection there were 70 families on the register. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Concerns and requests for information from other agencies, such as social services, were put on to the GP safeguarding lead's urgent calls list, so that they could be dealt with immediately. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child safeguarding level three. On the day of inspection we found that some staff had not completed child safeguarding training to the appropriate level. However, staff we spoke to understood their roles and responsibilities with regard to safeguarding, and the practice has shown us evidence that this training has been completed since the inspection.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (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 practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. They had also created a patient safety information leaflet to advise patients about the signs and symptoms of infection. There was an infection control protocol in

place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.

- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored. However, while a system was in place to monitor the use of printed prescription pads, on the day of inspection we saw there was no such system to log the handwritten prescription pads in the practice. The practice has since provided us with evidence that this system is now in place. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment.) Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.
- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings). However, we saw that looped blind cords or chains had not been modified or secured out of reach in some areas that could be accessed by patients.
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had adequate arrangements in place to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff, but were stored in a cupboard in the waiting area out of view of the reception desk which could be accessed easily by patients. Since the inspection we have seen evidence that the practice has taken action to make these medicines more secure. All staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Good

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The practice assessed needs and delivered care in line with relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 99.6% of the total number of points available (clinical commissioning group (CCG) average 96.8%, national average 94.7%). The exception reporting rate was slightly higher than average at 12.6% (CCG average 10.1%, national average 9.2%). (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the points available in this area, compared to 89.2% nationally.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the points available in this area, compared to 92.8% nationally.
- Performance for asthma related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the points available in this area, compared to 97.4% nationally.
- Performance for indicators for diseases often suffered by older people was better than the national average. For example, the practice achieved 100% of the points available for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), compared to 96% nationally.

The practice had introduced measures to encourage uptake of health reviews in patients with asthma. One of the nursing team had developed a review form that patients who could not attend surgery could complete and submit to the nurses. This was available online and in reception, as well as being included in the letter that was sent to patients to invite them to their review. There was also a link to the form on the prescriptions of patients who were prescribed asthma medication. The practice had a target of reviewing 70% of the 697 patients on their asthma register by April 2017. At the time of inspection in August 2016 the practice had already reviewed 35% of the register.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been two clinical audits completed in the last two years, both of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, and peer review.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included increasing the uptake of 'rescue packs' of medication for patients with COPD to keep in their homes in case their condition suddenly worsens.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could

Good

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to, and made use of, e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

The information needed to plan and deliver care and treatment was available to relevant staff in a timely and accessible way through the practice's patient record system and their intranet system.

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Meetings took place with other health care professionals regarding a range of issues, such as safeguarding and palliative care. However at the time of inspection there was no regular clinical multi-disciplinary team meeting to review care plans. When meetings did take place, minutes of these were not always recorded.

Consent to care and treatment

Staff sought patients' consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support.

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term conditions and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was identical to the CCG and national averages. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 82.6% to 98% (CCG average 83.3% to 96.7%) and five year olds from 71.8% to 97.3% (CCG average 72.5% to 97.9%).

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and

Good

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

The practice employed a mental health trained nurse who was able to undertake annual mental health reviews, medicine reviews of patients with poor mental health as well as working with other staff in the practice to improve support for patients. For example, they had completed Dementia Friendly training and had undertaken as assessment of the reception area to look for ways to make it more accessible for patients with dementia. The nurse also worked with the carer's champion to identify patients who may be caring for people with mental health needs and who may require additional support.

Good

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

All of the 20 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with four patients on the day of inspection. They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was above or in line with averages for satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 92% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and the national average of 89%.
- 96% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 95%.
- 89% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 85%.
- 94% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 91%.
- 94% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us 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. Patient feedback from the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views. We also saw that care plans were personalised.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were again above or in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 91% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 86%.
- 86% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 82%.
- 94% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 85%.

The practice provided facilities to help patients be involved in decisions about their care:

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Good

Are services caring?

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 114 patients as carers (1.2% of the practice list). The practice attempted to pro-actively identify carers, for example by searching the computer system for patients who lived with relatives with dementia. These patients were sent information about carer's services, including a "Hospital Passport" which had been developed by a local carers' charity. Patients with memory loss could keep these with them in case of emergency hospital admissions. They contained contact information for the carer, as well as information about the patient's likes and dislikes and their level of ability performing certain activities of living, such as washing and dressing themselves. There was a "carer's champion" who worked with other practice staff and external agencies to identify carers and help them to receive relevant support. Written information was also available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Good

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and clinical commissioning group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice worked closely with the local Integrated Care Community (ICC) which provided services for patients, such as a Care Navigator. This was a person to whom patients could be referred, and who would direct them to services which would help them meet their health and social care needs.

- The practice offered extended hours on a Wednesday and Friday morning from 7.30am for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients who needed them, including those with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice allowed other services to use rooms at the surgery to offer services that would benefit their patients. For example, a local carers' organisation held a monthly clinic at the practice.
- Patients could order repeat prescriptions and book GP appointments online. A form was available for patients with asthma to complete their annual health review online.
- Some staff had undertaken 'dementia friends' training, and had looked at ways to make the practice more accessible to patients with dementia.
- The practice recognised the needs of patients whose circumstances might make them vulnerable. They had robust procedures in place to safeguard children and adults from abuse, and were able to offer patients with poor mental health appointments with a mental health trained nurse.

Access to the service

The surgery was open from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday, with extended opening hours from 7.30am on Wednesday and Friday. The practice was closed at weekends. Telephones at the practice were answered from 8am until 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above local and national averages.

- 89% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 78%.
- 88% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 73%.

People told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had an effective system in place for handling complaints and concerns.

- Their complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system, such as a poster in the waiting area, a summary leaflet and information on the practice website.

We looked at six complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were dealt with in a timely way. There was openness and transparency when dealing with the complaint. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, further training was given to staff to help them support patients with hearing loss following a complaint.

Are services well-led?

Good

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This outlined the structures and procedures in place and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment.

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology
- The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

There was a clear leadership structure in place and staff felt supported by management.

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings, however minutes of these were not always recorded.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

Seeking and acting on feedback from patients, the public and staff

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients, the public and staff. They proactively sought patients' feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service.

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the virtual patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG carried out patient surveys, the results of which were used to drive improvements to the practice. For example, made changes to the appointment system following feedback from patients.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

Are services well-led?

Good

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

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example:

- The practice had introduced measures to encourage uptake of health reviews in patients with asthma. One of the nursing team had developed a review form that patients who could not attend surgery could complete and submit to the nurses. This was available online and in reception, as well as being included in the letter that was sent to patients to invite them to their review.
- The practice had improved their safeguarding procedure. There were safeguarding leads for nursing and administrative staff as well as an overall lead in the practice. Calls from other services for information regarding safeguarding cases were added to the safeguarding lead's urgent call list.