The Wilberforce Surgery

Quality Report

6-10 Story Street
Hull
HU1 3SA
Tel: 01482 344265
Website: www.thewilberforcesurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 23 August 2017
Date of publication: 24/11/2017

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

Summary of findings

Contents

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Wilberforce Surgery on 23 August 2017. The overall rating for the practice was requires improvement.

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. However, when things went wrong reviews and investigations into significant events were not thorough enough and lessons learned were not communicated widely enough to support improvement.
- The practice did not have clearly defined and embedded systems to minimise risks to patient safety, in relation to recall of patients on high risk medicines and the monitoring of vulnerable patients at the practice. For example, the system for completing a review of patient safeguarding cases was not fully implemented and required review and no safeguarding meetings had taken place and the review of vulnerable adults was infrequent.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
  - The practice had not completed infection control audits or adopted any action plans for review.
- The monitoring of the refrigerator temperature checks was not robust and there were gaps in the recording of the refrigerator temperatures.
  - Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Not all PGDs were they readily available during the inspection.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

Summary of findings

- Patients we spoke with said they found it easy to make an appointment with the GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
  - The practice did not have adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents. For example, there was no oxygen available at the time of our visit and arrangements for access to a defibrillator had not been established.
- 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 areas where the provider must make improvements are:

- Ensure care and treatment is provided in a safe way to patients.
- Establish effective systems and processes to ensure good governance in accordance with the fundamental standards of care.

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Although patient feedback is being sought in other ways, the practice should develop the patient participation group (PPG) to drive improvement through further suggestions from a patient perspective.
- Although the provider had a complaints process in place we did not see a transparent system for ensuring patients were aware of what to do in the event they need to make a complaint. For example, there was no information available for patients in the waiting area which explained what to do in the event of a complaint.
- Review the system that identifies patients who are also carers to help ensure that all patients on the practice list who are carers are offered relevant support if appropriate.
  - Although team meetings take place on an ad-hoc basis the practice should develop a more regular review for staff to have
  - The practice should arrange and hold multi-disciplinary meetings on a frequent basis including meetings with district nurses, social workers and health visitors to monitor vulnerable patients.
  - The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 69%, which was worse than the local CCG average of 81% and the national average of 81%. The practice should review their process for the recall of patients.

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?

Inadequate

The practice is rated as inadequate for providing safe services.

- The system for reporting and recording significant events was clear. When things went wrong patients were informed as soon as practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. However, from the documented examples we reviewed when things went wrong reviews and investigations into significant events were not thorough enough and lessons learned were not communicated widely enough to support improvement.
- The practice had not completed infection control audits or adopted any action plans for review. Also there was no annual infection control statement with regard to compliance with practice available.
- The practice did not have clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices to minimise risks to patient safety, in relation to recall of patients on high risk medicines. For example, some patients were not monitored at regular intervals who were prescribed high risk medicines such as methotrexate and lithium.
- We saw that some vaccines were stored on the floor of the medicines refrigerator which did not facilitate good ventilation as defined by the manufacturer's recommendations. The monitoring of the refrigerator temperature checks was not robust and there were gaps in the recording of the refrigerator temperatures.
- Staff demonstrated that they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Not all PGDs were they readily available during the inspection.
- The system for completing a review of patients with Long Term Conditions and patients receiving end of life care was not fully implemented and required review. For example, no palliative care meetings had taken place with other healthcare professionals and clinicians at the practice for a considerable length of time.

Summary of findings

- In addition there was insufficient evidence to suggest that vulnerable patients and those with safeguarding concerns were reviewed and discussed with external agencies on a regular basis.
- The practice did not have adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents. For example, there was no oxygen available at the time of our visit and arrangements for access to a defibrillator had not been established.

Are services effective?

Good

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were above or comparable compared to the national average.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- The management of reviews of patients with end of life care needs with multi-disciplinary teams required review. For example, patients on the practice end of life care list were not regularly review with other health care professional such as community and palliative care nurses.

Are services caring?

Good

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Survey information we reviewed showed that 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 accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient confidentiality.
- The practice had identified 43 patients as carers (1.2% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Summary of findings

- The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population. For example, the practice worked with community staff to identify their patients who were at high risk of attending accident and emergency (A&E) or having an unplanned admission to hospital. Care plans were developed to reduce the risk of unplanned admission or A&E attendances.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting conditions, including patients with a condition other than cancer and patients living with dementia.
- Patients we spoke with said they found it easy to make an appointment with the 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 only available on the practice website. Evidence from examples reviewed showed the practice responded quickly to some issues raised. However, we did not see evidence that any outcome was confirmed for the patient. Also, we did not see any review of complaints to identify trends to establish root cause in order to stop things re-occurring. There was no reference made of who patients could contact if they were not satisfied with the outcome of a complaint investigation for example the NHS Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman.

Are services well-led?

Requires improvement 

The practice is rated as requires improvement for being well-led.

- The practice did not have a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had policies and procedures to govern activity.
- There was a limited overarching governance framework that supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care.
- The practice did not have effective systems in place for monitoring patients on high risk medicines.
- There was insufficient attention to safeguarding children and vulnerable adults. The system for completing a review of patient safeguarding cases was not fully implemented and required review. For example, no safeguarding meetings had taken place and the review of vulnerable adults was infrequent.

Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. In the investigation reports we reviewed we saw evidence the practice complied with these requirements.
- The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents and sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken. However, we found there was not an effective system for lessons learned and analysis of significant events to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- We did not see any examples where feedback had been acted on. The practice engaged on an 'ad-hoc' basis with the patient participation group on a 'virtual' email basis.

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

Requires improvement

The provider was rated as inadequate for safe; requires improvement for well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. The practice is rated as requires improvement for the care of older people.

- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified at an early stage older patients who may need palliative care as they were approaching the end of life. It involved older patients in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care. However, the management of reviews of patients with end of life care needs with multi-disciplinary teams required review.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs.
- Where older patients had complex needs, the practice shared summary care records with local care services.
- Older patients were provided with health promotional advice and support to help them to maintain their health and independence for as long as possible.

People with long term conditions

Requires improvement

The provider was rated as inadequate for safe; requires improvement for well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. The practice is rated as requires improvement for the care of people with long-term conditions (LTCs).

- The GP and Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Nationally reported data for 2015/2016 showed that outcomes for patients with long term conditions were generally similar or

Summary of findings

similar to the local CCG and national average. For example, the percentage of patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) who had had a review, undertaken by a healthcare professional, including an assessment of breathlessness in the preceding 12 months was 83%. This was better than the local CCG average of 77% and similar to the national average of 83%.

- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- There were emergency processes for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.
- All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for 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. However, we did not see any documented evidence that multi-disciplinary meetings had taken place.

Families, children and young people

Requires improvement

The provider was rated as inadequate for safe; requires improvement for well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. The practice is rated as requires improvement 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.
- Patients told us, on the day of inspection, that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. For example, appointments were arranged out of school hours and a private quiet area was provided for breastfeeding.
- The practice worked with midwives, health visitors and school nurses to support this population group on an ad-hoc basis.

Summary of findings

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Requires improvement

The provider was rated as inadequate for safe; requires improvement for well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. The practice is rated as requires improvement for the care of working-age people (including those recently retired and students).

- The needs of these population groups had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care, for example, appointments were available from 8am one morning a week and until 6.30pm one evening a week. Early and late Nursing appointments started at 8am one day a week and two late clinics until 6pm.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflected the needs for this age group.
- Telephone consultations were available every day with a call back appointment arranged at a time to suit the patient.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Requires improvement

The provider was rated as inadequate for safe; requires improvement for well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. The practice is rated as requires improvement for the care of people whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice contracted a dedicated recovery case manager to review specific substance and alcohol misuse cases with patients.
- The management of reviews of patients with end of life care needs with multi-disciplinary teams required review. For example, patients on the practice end of life care list were not regularly review with other health care professional such as community and palliative care nurses.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice had information available for vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Summary of findings

- Staff interviewed knew how to recognise signs of abuse in children, young people and adults whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. They 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)

Requires improvement 

The provider was rated as inadequate for safe; requires improvement for well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. The practice is rated as requires improvement for the care of people experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia).

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- 100% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, compared to the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 78%. This was significantly better than the national and local CCG average.
  The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and dementia. For example, a register of patients with mental health was maintained and referrals were made to local mental health teams as a result of reviewing reports from psychiatry assessments.
- The practice did not have a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving high risk medicines.
- Nationally reported data from 2015/2016 showed the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months was 90%. This was comparable to the local CCG average of 84% and comparable to the national average of 89%.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.
- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 6 July 2017 showed the practice was performing in line with local CCG and national averages. 378 survey forms were distributed and 84 were returned. This represented 2.5% of the practice's patient list.

- 76% said the last appointment they got was convenient compared with the local CCG average of 78% and national average of 81%.
- 88% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the local CCG average of 84% and national average of 86%.
- 86% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the local CCG average of 78% and national average of 82%.
- 69% described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the local CCG average of 69% and national average of 73%.
- 72% usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen compared to the local CCG average of 71% and national average of 64%.
- 74% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with the local CCG average of 80% and national average of 84%.

As part of our inspection we asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 34 comment cards which were mostly positive about the standard of care received. Patients described care as excellent and said staff were caring, helpful and easy to approach.

We also spoke with 16 patients during the inspection. All patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

Results from the Friends and Family test (FFT) for March to August 2017showed 44 responses had been received. 22 were extremely likely to recommend the practice, 19 were likely, one was extremely unlikely and two did not know.

Feedback on the comments cards, the questionnaires and from the FFT reflected the results of the national survey.

Areas for improvement

Action the service MUST take to improve

- Ensure care and treatment is provided in a safe way to patients.
- Establish effective systems and processes to ensure good governance in accordance with the fundamental standards of care.

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Although patient feedback is being sought in other ways, the practice should develop the patient participation group (PPG) to drive improvement through further suggestions from a patient perspective.
- Although the provider had a complaints process in place we did not see a transparent system for ensuring patients were aware of what to do in the event they need to make a complaint. For example, there was no information available for patients in the waiting area which explained what to do in the event of a complaint.
- Review the system that identifies patients who are also carers to help ensure that all patients on the practice list who are carers are offered relevant support if appropriate.
- Although team meetings take place on an ad-hoc basis the practice should develop a more regular review for staff to have

Summary of findings

- The practice should arrange and hold multi-disciplinary meetings on a frequent basis including meetings with district nurses, social workers and health visitors to monitor vulnerable patients.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 69%, which was worse than the local CCG average of 81% and the national average of 81%. The practice should review their process for the recall of patients.

The Wilberforce Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to The Wilberforce Surgery

The Wilberforce Surgery, 6-10 Story Street, Hull, HU1 3SA is situated in the centre of the City of Hull within a multi-occupancy health centre. The practice provides services under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with NHS England, Hull Area Team. The practice list size of 3,353 and the majority of patients are of 0 – 65 age group.

There are two GPs one of whom is male and one female. The practice also arranges for further consultations by regular locum GPs. There is one practice nurse and they are supported by a practice manager, reception and administrative staff. The practice also contracted a dedicated recovery case manager to review specific substance and alcohol misuse cases with patients.

The practice is open between 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are available from 9.30am to 12pm and 2pm to 4.30pm on a Monday. 9.30am to 12pm and 2.30pm to 5pm on a Tuesday. 9am to 1pm on Wednesday. 9am to 11.30am and 2pm to 4.30 pm on a Thursday and a Friday.

The proportion of the practice population in the 0-65 years age group is significantly higher than the England average. The practice population in the 66-75 and over 90 years age group is lower than the England average. The practice scored one on the deprivation measurement scale, the deprivation scale goes from one to ten, with one being the most deprived. People living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. The overall practice deprivation score is worse than the England average, the practice is 47.2 and the England average is 26.6.

The practice, along with all other practices in the Hull CCG area have a contractual agreement for NHS 111 service to provide Out of Hours (OOHs) services from 6.30pm to 8am. This has been agreed with the NHS England area team. When the practice is closed, patients use the NHS 111 service to contact the OOHs provider. Information for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is available in the waiting area, in the practice information leaflet and on the practice website.

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.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 23 August 2017.

Detailed findings

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including one GP, practice nurse, health care assistant, practice manager and two members of staff. Four questionnaires were completed by administration, secretarial and reception staff. We also spoke with 16 patients during our visit.
- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed a sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed 34 comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver care and treatment plans.

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.

Inadequate

Are services safe?

Our findings

There was a system for reporting and recording significant events. However, when things went wrong reviews and investigations into significant events were not fully implemented to allow practices to change and improve. Also lessons learned were not communicated widely enough to support improvement.

- 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). For example, medicine was prescribed to a patient with an allergy. The patient had not taken the medicine but the provider had issued an instruction to staff to remind them of the standard operating procedures and policies for repeat medicines. We looked at the minutes from the two clinical meetings that had taken place over the past year dated 8 November 2016 and 12 December 2016. They did not include any element of significant event review and analysis.
- From the sample of investigation reports we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again. However, of the total of significant events we looked at we found that two records were recorded as patient complaints but we did not see any patient responses to these complaints.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, and minutes of meetings. We saw that significant events were not included as a review discussion as part of the meetings. We also found there was not an effective system for the analysis of significant events and sharing of lessons learned to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts that had been received into the practice and saw that there was a system in place for ensuring safety alerts were acted on. We saw records that alerts received between July 2017 and September 2017 had been actioned and audited by the practice.
- We saw some evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. However, the practice had not checked their learning was embedded. For example, a patient who was given a wrong prescription was entered into an incorrect patient record. A discussion had taken place with the relevant patient concerned and the provider had reviewed its internal procedures.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice did not have clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to minimise risks to patient safety. For example, staff were not able to access PGDs on the day of our inspection and reviews for patient on high risk medicines were not completed.

- Arrangements for safeguarding reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. However, the system for completing a review of patient safeguarding cases was not fully implemented and required review. We looked at three safeguarding children records and we did not see any evidence of safeguarding discussions and reviews, within internal meetings or reports generated.
- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. The GP was trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three. Nursing staff were also trained to level two.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).

- We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- The practice nurse was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. However, we did not see any IPC audits that had been undertaken. We spoke with the practice manager about this and they gave us their assurances that an annual IPC audit would be completed by the end of October 2017.

The arrangements for managing medicines (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal) did not fully minimise the risks to patient safety. In particular the governance of PGDs and the safe storage of medicines in the refrigerator were not well managed.

- Vaccines were administered by the nurse using directions that had been produced in line with legal requirements and national guidance. However, we observed that not all Patient Group Directions (PGDs) were readily available during the inspection. For example we only saw four signed PGDs; Pneumococcal Vaccine, Rotovirus Vaccine, Meningitis B Vaccine and Men C Vaccine. Staff were not able to access any other PGDs on the day of our inspection visit.
- We saw that some vaccines were stored on the floor of the medicines refrigerator which did not facilitate good ventilation as defined by the manufactures recommendations. The medicines refrigerator did not include secondary measures to ensure the air temperature was accurate. We also saw that the medicines refrigerator temperature checks were incomplete. For example, at the time of our visit on the 23 August the fridge temperature checks showed being last completed on 17 August. We did not see any completed checks for 18 August, 21 August or 22 August.
- We saw records of 11 patients who were prescribed high risk medicines however; we did not see any system in place for the review of these patients. For example, two patients were prescribed azathioprine; four patients were prescribed methotrexate and five patients' sulfasalazine. We saw that patients had received an inconsistent review carried out for a period of six months and sometimes four months. Following our inspection the practice sent us evidence that their system for managing high-risk medicines had been improved in line with published guidance.
- Patient records we reviewed found all repeat prescription templates were within review date, and medicine reviews had been carried out regularly, with the exception of high risk medicine reviews.
- The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems to monitor their use.

We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, evidence of satisfactory conduct in previous employments in the form of references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the DBS.

Monitoring risks to patients

There were procedures for assessing, monitoring and managing risks to patients and staff safety.

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.
- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet

patients' needs. There was a rota system to ensure enough staff were on duty to meet the needs of patients. Staff provided cover for sickness and holidays and regular locums were engaged when required.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice did not have adequate arrangements 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 to them in another practice within the health centre. However, staff were not aware of the location of the equipment in case of an emergency. Following our inspection visit we were provided with evidence that staff had been notified that an adjoining practice had agreed for them to use their defibrillator should it be needed in an emergency situation. At the time of the inspection the provider did not have any oxygen available to support patients in a medical emergency situation. Also, we did not see a risk assessment to indicate why they did not carry oxygen on the premises. However, following our inspection visit we were provided with evidence that portable oxygen had been purchased.
- There was a first aid kit and accident book available.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Good

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

Clinicians were aware of relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices to minimise risks to patient safety, with the exception in relation of recall of patients on high risk medication.

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). Results for 2015/2016 showed the practice achieved 94% of the total number of points available compared with the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and national average of 95%.

The practice had 10% exception reporting compared to the local CCG average of 13% and national average of 10%. (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 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 87% which was comparable to the local CCG average of 87% and the national average of 90%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 94% which was higher than the local CCG average of 87% and comparable to the national average of 93%.
- The percentage of patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) who had had a review, undertaken by a healthcare professional, including an assessment of breathlessness in the preceding 12 months was 83%. This was higher than the local CCG average of 77% and comparable to the national average of 83%.
- The percentage of patients with asthma who had had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months was 83%, which was higher than the local CCG average of 76% and the national average of 75%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- There had been five clinical audits commenced in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, an audit was done in December 2015 to review the healthcare of patients on the drug misuse register. The practice found 29 patients had no record of their Hepatitis C status. Systems were changed and a second cycle audit carried out in February 2016 showed that 17% of the patients with no test record had been offered to attend a clinic for testing and accepted the referral. The practice is planning a third audit.

Effective staffing

Evidence reviewed showed that staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.

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

- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found that 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. Information was shared between services, with patients' consent, using a shared care record. However, meetings took place on an 'ad-hoc' basis with other health care professionals when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs. Also, the management of reviews of patients with end of life care needs with multi-disciplinary teams were infrequent. For example, patients on the practice end of life care list were not regularly reviewed with other health care professionals such as community and palliative care nurses.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.

- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support and signposted them to relevant services. 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 and drug misuse.
- The practice referred and sign posted people who needed support for alcohol or drug problems to local counselling services.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 69%, which was worse than the local CCG average of 81% and the national average of 81%.

There was a policy to offer telephone or written reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability. They ensured a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems 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.

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer. The practice's uptake for females aged 50-70 screened for breast cancer in the last 36 months was 55%. This was lower than the national average of 72%. The practice's uptake for patients screened for bowel cancer in the last 30 months was 70%. This was higher than the national average of 58%.

Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates

Good

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

for the vaccines given were comparable to local CCG and national averages. For example, rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds was 92% and five year olds were 90%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and well person 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.

Good

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

During our inspection we observed that 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.
- Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.
- Patients could be treated by a clinician of the same sex as requested.

All of the 34 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 16 patients during the inspection visit. They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comments highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in July 2017 showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was above or comparable to the local CCG and national averages for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 93% said the GP gave them enough time compared to the local CCG average of 85% and national average of 86%.
- 94% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the local CCG average of 87% and national average of 89%.
- 91% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the local CCG average of 83% and national average of 86%.
- 96% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the local CCG average of 94% and national average of 95%.
- 90% said the nurse gave them enough time compared to the local CCG average of 93% and national average of 92%.
- 88% said the nurse was good at listening to them compared to the local CCG average of 92% and national average of 91%.
- 86% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the local CCG average of 90% and national average of 91%.
- 94% said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared to the local CCG average of 97% and national average of 97%.
- 82% patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the local CCG average of 86% and national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback from the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

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 mixed when compared to the local CCG and national averages. For example:

- 88% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the local CCG average of 84% and national average of 86%.
- 86% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the local CCG average of 78% and national average of 82%.

Good

Are services caring?

- 83% said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the local CCG average of 90% and national average of 90%.
- 77% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the local CCG average of 86% and national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that interpretation 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 by request in easy read format.
- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital).

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. Support for isolated or house-bound patients included signposting to relevant support and volunteer services.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 43 patients as carers (1.2% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. Older carers were offered timely and appropriate support. There were forms available in the waiting area that patients could complete if they were a carer.

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

Good

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population:

- The practice offered home visits to patients who otherwise could not attend the practice for health checks, blood checks and vaccinations.
- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- Appointments could be made on line, via the telephone and in person.
- Telephone consultations were available for working patients who could not attend during surgery hours or for those whose problem could be dealt with on the phone.
- The practice contracted a dedicated recovery case manager to review specific substance and alcohol misuse cases with patients.
- The practice offered urgent and non-urgent telephone consultations on a daily basis.
- Urgent access appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities and translation services available.
- Other reasonable adjustments were made and action was taken to remove barriers for patients who found it hard to use or access services.
- The practice had considered and implemented the NHS England Accessible Information Standard to ensure that disabled patients received information in formats that they could understand and receive appropriate support to help them to communicate.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were available from 9.30am to 12pm and 2pm to 4.30pm on a Monday. 9.30am to 12pm and 2.30pm to 5pm on a Tuesday. 9am to 1pm on Wednesday. 9am to 11.30am and 2pm to 4.30 pm on a Thursday and a Friday.

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

- 74% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the local CCG average of 77% and the national average of 76%.
- 66% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared with the local CCG average of 63% and the national average of 71%.
- 74% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the local CCG average of 80% and the national average of 84%.
- 76% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the local CCG average of 78% and the national average of 81%.
- 69% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the local CCG average of 69% and the national average of 73%.
- 65% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the local CCG average of 62% and the national average of 58%.

Patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them. Information about the opening times was available on the website and in the patient information leaflet.

The practice had a system to assess:

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

When patients requested a home visit the details of their symptoms were recorded and an electronic task sent directly to the GP. If necessary the GP would call the patient back to gather further information so an informed decision could be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. 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

Good

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

The practice had a system for handling complaints and concerns.

- Its complaints policy and procedures were not in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England. For example, There was no reference made of who patients could contact if they were not satisfied with the outcome of a complaint investigation for example the NHS Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman.
- 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. However, this was not displayed in the reception area but was available on their website.

The practice manager told us that there had been two complaints for the last 12 months. We saw that there was a process for managing complaints. However, during our investigation regarding the review of significant events we found that two significant events that had been recorded as complaints. We did not see evidence that any outcome was confirmed for the patient. Also, we did not see any review of complaints to identify trends to establish root cause in order to stop things re-occurring.

Are services well-led?

Requires improvement

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

- The practice did not have a mission statement implemented and staff did not know or understand the practice values.
- The practice did not have a documented strategy and supporting business plans in place.

Governance arrangements

Effective governance had not been fully established at the practice:

- The lead partner had been identified for governance and safeguarding. However, the system for completing a review of patient safeguarding cases was not fully implemented and required review. For example, no safeguarding meetings had taken place and the review of vulnerable adults was infrequent.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. These were updated and reviewed regularly.
- Staff told us that practice meetings were not held on a regular basis. However, staff said they were provided with an opportunity for them to learn about the performance of the practice.
- A programme of clinical audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- We did not see any IPC audits that had been undertaken and there was no annual Infection Control statement with regard to compliance with practice available.
- We did not see any evidence that a system had been implemented to conduct an analysis of all significant events and complaints to assess the trends and impact on patients and the service.
- Clinical meeting minutes we looked at dated 8 November 2016 and 12 December 2016 did not include any element of significant event review and analysis.
- We saw evidence that some complaint outcomes were not confirmed for the patient. There was no reference made of who patients could contact if they were not satisfied with the outcome of a complaint investigation for example the NHS Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman. Information about how to complain was only available on the practice website and no information available in the patient waiting area.

Leadership and culture

The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems 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). The partner encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. From the sample of investigation reports we reviewed we found that the practice had not fully implemented systems 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. However, during our investigation regarding the review of significant events we found that two significant events that had been recorded as complaints. We did not see evidence that any outcome was confirmed for the patient.

The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management.

- Staff told us the practice held 'ad-hoc' team meetings and we saw minutes to confirm this from October 2016, 26 January 2017 and May 2017.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues with the manager or partners 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

Are services well-led?

Requires improvement

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

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients and staff. It proactively sought feedback from:

- Patient feedback was sourced through the 'virtual' patient participation group (VPPG). However, the provider told us that the patient participation (VPPG) was only used on a virtual basis by emailing the members. The practice manager told us that they were introducing regular meetings at the practice site in the near future as part of their programme to join other practices in the area as a part of the 'Hull Health Forward Confederation' (HHFC). This is a joint project with eight local practices to merge as a federation to allow patients improved choice of health care support and services.
- 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.
- Results from the Friends and Family test (FFT) for March to August 2017showed 44 responses had been received. 22 were extremely likely to recommend the practice, 19 were likely, one was extremely unlikely and two did not know.

This section is primarily information for the provider

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 Maternity and midwifery services Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment Care and treatment must be provided in a safe way for service users How the regulation was not being met The registered persons had not done all that was reasonably practicable to mitigate risks to the health and safety of service users receiving care and treatment. In particular: • There was no system in place to ensure that all patients taking high risk medicines attended for regular monitoring in line with national guidance. • Some Medicines were stored incorrectly. There were gaps in the recording and monitoring of the medicine refrigerators. • There was no system in place to allow Patient Group Directions (PGDs) to be made available to staff or approved in line with legislation. Regulation 12(1)(2)

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Maternity and midwifery services Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 17 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Good governance How the regulation was not being met Systems or processes must be established and operated effectively to ensure compliance with the requirements of the fundamental standards as set out in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities)

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Regulations 2014 Implementation of the governance framework was not robust enough to always provide assurance that safe good quality care was being provided.

In particular:

- Infection control audits were not taking place at regular intervals.
- multi-disciplinary and safeguarding meetings for patients with defined needs were not taking place regularly.
- Full staff team and clinical meetings were not held on a regular basis.
- The practice did not have a system in place for carrying out a planned review of changes introduced following significant events and complaints to determine their effectiveness and to assure themselves that changes had been embedded into practice.

Regulation 17(1)(2)