

Dr D Pal & Dr M Pal

Quality Report

The Surgery
Morden Avenue
Ashton in Makerfield
Wigan
WN4 9PT
Tel: 01942 715667
Website: www.drpalashton-golborne.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 4 February 2016 Date of publication: 17/03/2016

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?	Requires improvement	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Contents

Summary of this inspection	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9
Outstanding practice	9
Detailed findings from this inspection	
Our inspection team	10
Background to Dr D Pal & Dr M Pal	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12
Action we have told the provider to take	19

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr D Pal & Dr M Pal on 4 February 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 a 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 the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment. However staff had been undertaking chaperone duties but did not have chaperone training, and a disclosure and barring service (DBS) check or risk assessment in place.

- 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.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with GP 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 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 worked with the community link worker (CLW). The CLW took referrals for patients who need extra help, but not necessarily medical help.

However there were areas of practice where the provider needs to make improvements.

Importantly the provider must:

• Ensure that chaperone training and a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check or risk assessment is in place for staff who carry out the role of a chaperone.

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

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as requires improvement for providing safe services.

- There was a 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 there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and 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.
- · Risks to patients were assessed and managed. However staff had been undertaking chaperone duties but did not have chaperone training, a disclosure and barring service (DBS) check or risk assessment in place.

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality and 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 multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



Are services caring?

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.



- 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?

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 Wigan Borough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a 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?

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.
- There was a leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The GPs encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

Good





The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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 its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified and supported an elderly couple who they recognised had become isolated by referring them to the community link worker (CLW). The CLW took referrals for patients who need extra help, but not necessarily medical help. It can vary from advice on benefits to social issues such as loneliness and not knowing which services are available and how they can be accessed. This service works in co-operation with Age UK so that patients over 65 will be linked to the services available through them.

Good



People with long term conditions

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
- 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.
- Data relating to long term conditions was comparable to the CCG average.

Families, children and young people

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

Good





- 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.
- The percentage of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years was 80% and that is comparable to the CCG and national average of 82%.
- 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 and health visitors.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Good





• 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.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- 100% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is well above the national average of 84%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people 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.



What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in January 2016 showed the practice was generally performing in most areas the same as local and national averages. 353 survey forms were distributed and 111 were returned. This represented just about 4% of the practice's patient list.

- 94% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 78% and a national average of 73%.
- 93% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 85%, national average 85%).
- 76% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 87%, national average 85%).

• 56% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 79%, national average 78%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 24 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

We spoke with four patients during the inspection. All four patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. Information from the "Friends and Family Test" indicated that the vast majority of patients completing the form are extremely likely or likely to recommend the practice to others.

Areas for improvement

Action the service MUST take to improve

Importantly the provider must:

• Ensure that a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check or risk assessment and chaperone training is in place for staff who carry out the role of a chaperone.

Outstanding practice

The practice worked with the community link worker (CLW). The CLW took referrals for patients who need extra help, but not necessarily medical help. It can vary from advice on benefits to social issues such as loneliness and

not knowing which services are available and how they can be accessed. This service works in co-operation with Age UK so that patients over 65 will be linked to the services available through them.



Dr D Pal & Dr M Pal

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 an Expert by Experience.

Background to Dr D Pal & Dr M Pal

This practice is located in a purpose built building in Ashton-in-Makerfield. It has car parking facilitates with designated space for disabled parking. The building is on ground floor level and offers easy access to patients. At the time of our inspection there were about 2700 patients registered with the practice. It is overseen by NHS Wigan Borough CCG.

The age range of the population is comparable to the national average across England. There are a higher proportion of patients registered who claim disability allowance. 71 per 1000 patients compared to the practice average across England with is 50 per 1000 patients.

There is one GP supported by an advanced nurse practitioner. There is also a practice manager and supporting administration and reception staff.

The practice delivers commissioned services under the General Medical Services (GMS) contract. It offers direct enhanced services for the childhood vaccination and immunisation scheme, extended hours access, facilitating timely diagnosis and support for people with dementia, influenza and pneumococcal immunisations, minor surgery, remote care monitoring and rotavirus and shingles immunisation.

The practice is open from 8am to 6.30pm from Monday to Friday with the exception of Tuesday when there are extended hours until 8pm and Wednesday when the practice closes at 1pm. GP appointments are available from 8.30am to 10.30am and from 4pm until 6pm and until 8pm on a Tuesday. The practice is open alternate Saturday mornings.

Patients can book appointments in person, online, or via the phone. Emergency appointments are available each day. There is an out of hours service available provided by Bridgewater Community Health Care Trust and commissioned by Wigan Borough CCG.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive inspection programme.

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.

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 4 February 2016. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Reviewed information available to us from other organisations e.g. NHS England.
- Reviewed information from CQC intelligent monitoring systems.
- Spoke with staff, patients and the PPG.
- Spoke with staff from external organisations.
- Reviewed patient survey information.
- Observed how people were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- 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 are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks 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.



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. We saw evidence the practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, people received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and 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. The GP was the lead member of staff for safeguarding and trained to Safeguarding level three. The GP attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role.
- A notice was displayed in the waiting room, advising patients about chaperones, if required. However some staff had been undertaking chaperone duties but did not have a disclosure and barring service (DBS) check or risk assessment in place. The provider must ensure that only staff who have completed chaperone training and had a DBS check undertake chaperone duties or make sure there is a risk assessment to explain the reasoning for not undertaking a DBS check.
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to

be clean and tidy. The practice manager completed the "General Practice Preventing Infection Together" (GP PIT Programme) overseen by Wigan Borough CCG. This is an Infection Prevention Programme aimed at enabling Primary Medical Care Practices to meet the requirements the Health and Social Care Act. 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. 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 drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. The advanced nurse practitioner was an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. They had received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow the nurse to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed eight personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications and registration with the appropriate professional body.

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. 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).



Are services safe?

 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 that 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.

 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 in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.
- The practice had a business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.



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 peoples' 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 522 of 559, which was the number of points available, with 3.6% exception reporting. (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 comparable to the CCG and national averages.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 86% which comparable to CCG and national averages.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the CCG average and national averages.
- 100% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is well above the national average of 84%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

 The practice participated in clinical audit which led to improvements in clinical care. We saw evidence that the practice acted upon the results of clinical audits, and that they undertook follow up audits to ensure the management and monitoring of services to improve outcomes for patient was effective.

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. It covered such topics as health and safety, fire safety, security, administration and infection control.
- 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 vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations could 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 during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. 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.
 Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.



Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

 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 services 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. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a regular basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

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.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

 These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service. A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The percentage of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years was 80% and that is comparable to the CCG and national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 79% to 100% and five year olds from 92% to 100%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people 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 worked with the community link worker (CLW). The CLW took referrals for patients who need extra help, but not necessarily medical help. It can vary from advice on benefits to social issues such as loneliness and not knowing which services are available and how they can be accessed. This service works in co-operation with Age UK so that patients over 65 will be linked to the services available through them.



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 24 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 three members of the patient participation group. 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 generally below average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 72% said the GP was good at listening to them (CCG average 90%, national average 89%).
- 84% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 88%, national average 87%).
- 91% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 95%, national average 95%)
- 73% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 86%, national average 85%).
- 94% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 94%, national average 91%).

• 88% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 90%, national average 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 on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

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 generally below local and national averages. For example:

- 68% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments (CCG average 87%, national average 86%)
- 70% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 83%, national average 82%)
- 90% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 89%, national average 85%)

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.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had about 3% of the practice list as carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, the GP contacted them. 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.



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.

- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS.
- There were disabled facilities and translation services available.
- Test results were reviewed by the GP and the nurse on a regular basis. However we noted that some test results were not actioned in a timely manner if either the GP or nurse who was dealing with these matters were absent. However the GP assured us that these results would be addressed at the earliest opportunity.

Access to the service

The practice is open from 8am to 6.30pm from Monday to Friday with the exception of Tuesday when there are extended hours until 8pm and Wednesday when the practice closes at 1pm. GP appointments are available from 8.30am to 10.30am and from 4pm until 6pm and until 8pm on a Tuesday. The practice is open alternate Saturday mornings.

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

- 75% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours (CCG average 79%, national average 75%).
- 94% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 78%, national average 73%).
- 87% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 63%, national average 59%).

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.

- Its 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

The practice kept a complaints log for written complaints. We looked at all complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way and there was a culture of openness and transparency by the practice when dealing with the complaint.

Are services well-led?

(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.

 To provide the means for the patient population to receive medical consultation, examination and diagnosis by a GP. The service was to be provided in clean, practical and comfortable surroundings. The practice would provide the very best and most up-to-date treatment and advice.

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 which 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

The GP in the practice had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritise safe, high quality and compassionate care. The GP was visible in the practice and staff told us they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- 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 in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the GP in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the GP 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. It proactively sought patients' feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service.

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example the introduction of a display screen in the waiting area to provide health promotion information.
- 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.

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment Regulation: 12 Safe Care and Treatment (2) the things which a registered person must do to comply with that paragraph include — (c) ensuring that persons providing care or treatment to service users have the qualifications, competence, skills and experience to do
	How the regulation was not being met: The registered person did not ensure recruitment arrangements include all necessary employment checks for all staff were in place that included taking up references and completing disclosure and barring service checks, in particular for staff who were already undertaking chaperoning duties. Regulation 12 (2) (c)