

Atherley House Surgery

Quality Report

143 – 145 Shirley Road

Southampton

SO15 3FH

Tel: 02380 221964

Website: www.atherleyhousesurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 4 August 2016

Date of publication: 13/01/2017

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

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	7
What people who use the service say	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Atherley House Surgery	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Atherley House Surgery on 4th 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.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- The provider should continue to ensure there are systems in place for the management of patients with long terms conditions who need to be supported to make improvements to their health.

Summary of findings

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?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- Risks to patients who used services were assessed and 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.

Good



Are services effective?

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.
- Due to a transient patient population the practice had a high exception reporting rate which identified that patients with long term conditions may not have received the necessary reviews and support to improve their health and wellbeing.

Good



Are services caring?

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.

Good



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?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- 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. The practice was part of the a federation of GP practices who had successfully bid to implement 8am to 8pm working seven days a week from five newly formed hubs within Southampton City.
- 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?

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

Good



- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a 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

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.

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 priority.
- Performance for diabetes related Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) indicators was better than the national average. For example 90% of patients with diabetes at the practice had a blood test to monitor average blood sugar compared to with the national average 77.5%.
- Due to a transient patient population not all patients with long term conditions had utilised the support on offer from the practice to make improvements to their health.
- 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.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- Performance for cervical screening was better than the national average. A total of 91% of women aged 25-64 whose notes recorded that a cervical screening test in the preceding 5 years, compared to the 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, health visitors and school nurses.

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.

Good



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 and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients 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.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

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).

- 95% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average.
- There were 56 patients on the practices mental health register, one was excepted, therefore a total of 55 patients had an agreed care plan documented in the preceding 12 months.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and forty-five survey forms were distributed and 113 were returned. This represented 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 71% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 60% 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 76%.
- 81% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 75% 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 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 19 comment cards of which 18 were positive about the standard of care received. Comments included efficient, helpful, excellent, always treated well, friendly, caring and understanding. Staff members were also singled out for praise and mentioned by name.

We spoke with six patients during the inspection. All six patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- The provider should continue to ensure there are systems in place for the management of patients with long terms conditions who need to be supported to make improvements to their health.

Atherley House 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.

Background to Atherley House Surgery

Atherley House Surgery is located in a purpose built building in Shirley, Southampton. The practice has approximately 4,700 patients registered with it.

The practice provides services under a NHS General Medical Services contract and is part of NHS Southampton Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The practice is located in one of the fourth more deprived areas of England. The practice has a higher than national average number of patients aged 20 to 45 years old. A total of 17% of patients at the practice are over 65 years of age, which is lower than the CCG average of 21% and national average of 28%. A total of 52% of patients at the practice have a long-standing health condition, which is slightly lower than the CCG average of 53% and national average of 54%. Approximately 19% of the practice population describe themselves as being from an ethnic minority group; the majority of the population are White British.

The practice has three GP partners, two of the partners are female and one is male. Together the GPs provide care equivalent to approximately 19 sessions per week. The GPs are supported by two part time practice nurses and a part

time health care assistant who also provides a phlebotomy service. The clinical team are supported by a practice manager with administrative and clerical staff. The practice is a teaching practice for medical students.

Atherley House Surgery is open between 8.30am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours surgeries are available every Tuesday morning from 7.30am to 8.00am and every other Saturday each month from 8.30am to 11.00am. The GPs also offer home visits to patients who need them.

The practice has opted out of providing out-of-hours services to their own patients and refers them to the Portsmouth Health Limited service via the NHS 111 service. The practice offers online facilities for booking of appointments and for requesting prescriptions.

We inspected the only location:

Atherley House Surgery

143 -145 Shirley Road

Shirley

Southampton

SO15 3FH

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 4th August 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff which included GPs, the practice manager, a practice nurse, a health care assistant, administrative and clerical 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.

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, a patient had been booked for a diabetic review but consultation notes were written up in the wrong patient's records. All staff were informed to check patient's details before booking appointments.

The practice had a system in place for reviewing and acting on national patient safety alerts. For example, we saw that following an alert about Kawasaki Disease (**Kawasaki disease** is a rare childhood illness that affects the blood vessels) that the practice undertook a search of their patients and identified three patients so the alert was added to the patients notes.

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:

- 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 had not been fully updated to reflect the change in safeguarding lead for the practice and details of the external agencies for staff to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare was available. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs 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 on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three.

- Notices were on display in clinical rooms and on the electronic screen in the reception area that advised patients that chaperones were available if required. The practice had a chaperone policy in place but it did not make reference to training, specific role requirements or whether staff would require a risk assessment if they did not have a Disclosure and Barring Service check (DBS). The practice had a risk assessment in place for reception staff requiring them not to have a DBS. Information provided by the surgery showed that relevant members of staff had attended chaperone training. (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. 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

Are services safe?

practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.

- We reviewed two 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. However we found that in one record that only one reference had been obtained.

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).

- 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. However, two masks (adult and paediatric) were out of its original packaging and the practice was unable to tell us if the masks were in date and effective for use. The practice ordered replacement masks.
- A first aid kit and accident book was available in the reception area.
- 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 stored securely.
- 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.

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 100% of the total number of points available.

The practice's exception reporting was higher than the national average. For example for the all the clinical domains the practice scored 16.5% compared to the national average of 9.2% and for the public health domains the practice scored 19% compared to the national average of 6%. (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).

Data from 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) indicators was better than the national average. For example 90% of patients with diabetes at the practice had a blood test to monitor average blood sugar compared to with the national average 77.5%.

- We found that there were a total of 204 patients on the diabetes register who were eligible for this blood test however 67 (33%) patients had been excepted from this outcome which was higher than the England average (12%).
- A total of 49 patients out of 204 had not had an influenza immunisation in the preceding period 1 August to 31 March.
- A total of 46 patients out of 204 had not had their cholesterol measured in the preceding 12 months.
- Performance for patients diagnosed with dementia related QOF indicators was better than the national average. A total of 95% of patients with dementia had their care was reviewed in a face to face review in the preceding 12 months, compared to the national average of 84%.
- Performance for cervical screening was better than the national average. A total of 91% of women aged 25-64 whose notes recorded that a cervical screening test in the preceding five years, compared to the national average of 82%.
 - We found that there were a total of 1309 patients on the register who were eligible for a cervical smear however 253 (19%) patients had been excepted from this outcome which was higher than the England average 6.3%.
- Performance for patients with asthma was better than the national average. 83% of patients with asthma had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months, compared to the national average of 75%.
 - We found that there were 264 patients on the register eligible for the asthma review however 45 (17%) of patients had been except from this outcome which was higher than the England average 7%.
- Performance for patients COPD was better than the national average. 96% of patients with COPD had an assessment of breathlessness using the medical Research Council dyspnoea scale in the preceding 12 months, compared to the national average of 90%.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- We found that there were 115 patients on the register eligible for the assessment of breathlessness however 20 (17%) of patients had been excepted from this outcome which was higher than the England average 11%.
- There were 56 patients on their mental health register, one was excepted, therefore a total of 55 patients had an agreed care plan documented in the preceding 12 months.

We discussed the QOF results with the GPs and found that the practice's diabetes nurses left the practice some 18 months ago which was during the QOF reporting period. A nurse at the practice had since been trained in diabetes. The GPs described a culture of non-engagement by patients which was due to language barriers and patients, a transient patient population and patients not reordering medicines. The practice had systems in place to capture patients who did not engage these included having pop up alerts on the patients' medical records, phoning patients and undertaking home visits.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- The practice provide examples of two clinical audits they had undertaken in the last two years; Pregabalin Prescribing and Diabetes Attitude Scale DAS audit and we saw a further audit on Diazepam and temazepam. These were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits such as medicines management, childhood and school leavers immunisations, did not attend DNA appointments, cervical smears, follow up on two week referrals two week and abnormal blood results, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included patients with osteoporosis being identified for a treatment review.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements for example diabetic patients who had been prescribed GLP-1 agonists, by reviewing their treatment and working more intensively with the patient's the practice made savings from their prescribing budget and improved the patients glycaemic control.

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. A nurse had completed diabetes training to become the lead for the practice.
- 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 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, and basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.
- The practice takes part in the Clinical Commissioning Group training sessions. The practice closes for half a day for protected Learning Time which the GPs, nurses and health care assistant attend. Patients are informed well in advance, information regarding the TARGET meetings (Time for Audit Research Governance Education and Training) for 2016/2017 was available on the practice's website. Patients were directed to use the NHS 111 system during closure.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

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.
- We saw that patients having minor surgery were required to sign the practice's minor surgery consent form prior to undergoing surgery.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 91% which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 74%. 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 they ensured a female sample taker was available.

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. A total of 56% of eligible patients attended breast cancer screening compared to the national average of 72%. A total of 52% of eligible patients were screened for bowel cancer compared to the CCG average of 55% and the national average of 58%.

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/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 92% to 100% and five year olds from 80% to 95%.

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

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 19 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered a very good service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with a member of the patient participation group (PPG) and six patients. 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 comparable and below average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 79% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 87% and the national average of 89%.
- 74% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
- 86% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.

- 94% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 88% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 86% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 87%.

Following the GP patient survey published in January 2016 (which aggregated data from January – March 2015 and July – September 2015), the practice had increased the time that patients were able to phone in to the practice to obtain test results.

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 in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 84% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 86%.
- 77% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 82% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

Are services caring?

- 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

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. 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, 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.

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 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.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- The practice offered an in house phlebotomy service to patients three mornings per week from 8.30am to 11.30 am.
- The practice had some information sheets available for patients in different languages.
- The practice had achieved 'dementia friendly' status. The practice had made a number of changes to improve the practice environment and services for patients living with a diagnosis of dementia. For example staff had undertaken training in Dementia Awareness and had designed a dementia advice leaflet which signposted patients to different services they could access. There was also signage in the practice to make it clearer for patients.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am and 18.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were available with doctors and nurses between these times. Extended hours appointments were offered on a Tuesday morning from 7.30am to 8am and every alternate Saturday from 8.30am to 11.30am. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four 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 comparable to local and national averages.

- 76% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 71% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to 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. Information was on available on screens that let patients know how long they had to wait if the GP was running late.

The practice had a system in place to assess:

- whether a home visit was clinically necessary; and
- the urgency of the need for medical attention.

In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

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.

We looked at eight complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, openness and transparency with dealing with the complaint. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action were taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a patient highlighted concerns through the friend and family test about privacy and a GP's attitude during their consultation. GP's were sent an email reminding them about respecting patient's privacy during consultations and met with the GP regarding their attitude in the consultation. The patient was contacted via email regarding the practices response.

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 vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

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

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework however this had not always supported the delivery of the strategy and delivery of 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 however the safeguarding policy was not up to date.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained however, due to a transient patient population the practice had a high exception reporting rate which identified that patients with long term conditions may not have received the necessary reviews and support to improve their health and wellbeing.
- 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 practice was looking to the future and had started to review options for planning of succession for when one of the partners retires in 2019.

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 meetings. For example, the GPs and practice manager met weekly, GPs and nurse met quarterly, admin and reception staff met monthly and the whole practice met twice a year.
- 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. It 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 were consulted regularly, carried out patient surveys

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the times that patients could obtain blood test results were increased as patients reported difficulty getting through. The practice changed its boundaries in 2015 to reduce the area the practice covered. The PPG was consulted about the proposals.

- 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

- 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. The practice was part of the a federation of GP practices had successfully bid to implement 8am to 8.00pm working seven days a week from five newly formed hubs within Southampton City.