

City Health Care Partnership CIC - The Calvert Practice

Quality Report

The Calvert Practice
110a Calvert Lane
Hull
HU4 6BH

Tel: 01482 303882

Website: www.calvertpractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 30 August 2016

Date of publication: 02/12/2016

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

Ratings

Overall rating for this service		Good	
Are services safe?		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	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to City Health Care Partnership CIC - The Calvert Practice	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at City Health Care Partnership CIC - The Calvert Practice on 30 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.
- Some patients said they found it was not easy to make an appointment with a named GP, that there was little continuity of care and urgent appointments were not always 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.

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.

Good



- 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 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.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were mixed compared to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- 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.
- There had been one clinical audit completed in the last two years, it was not a completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice lower than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.

Summary of findings

- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice worked with the CCG and the community professionals to identify their patients who were at high risk of attending accident and emergency or having an unplanned admission to hospital.
- Some patients said that they found it difficult to get an appointment by phone and if urgent they were referred to the local Walk-In Centre. We spoke with 11 people on the day of the inspection and received 26 comment cards and both these data sources showed that over 50% found it difficult to get an appointment by phone and if urgent they were referred to the local Walk-In Centre. The results of the national GP patient survey support these findings.
- Patients told us that same day appointments were not always available for babies and children with urgent conditions. Following the inspection, the practice clarified the policy to ensure same day appointments were available for babies and children with urgent conditions.
- 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.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 practice encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.

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.
- 93% of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This was comparable to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 88%
- 77% of patients with asthma, on the register, had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that included an assessment of asthma control using the 3 RCP questions. (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This was comparable to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 75%
- 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.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 87%, which was higher than the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 74%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

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. However, extended hour appointments with GPs were not offered and extended hours appointments with nurses were only offered at a different practice.
- 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 including 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).

- 74% of patients with schizophrenia and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months. This was comparable to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 76%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 7 July 2016. 244 survey forms were distributed and 112 were returned. This represented 4% of the practice's patient list. The results were mixed compared to local and national averages.

- 71% of respondents with a preferred GP usually get to see or speak to that GP compared to the CCG average 54% and national average 59%.
- 88% of respondents say the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average 83% and national average 85%.
- 47% of respondents find it easy to get through by phone compared to the CCG average 67% and national average 73%.
- 68% of respondents were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average 80% and national average 85%.
- 52% of respondents describe their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average 70% and national average 73%.

- 79% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 85%.
- 66% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 26 comment cards of which 12 were positive about the standard of care received. The other 14 commented on the difficulty getting an appointment and lack of continuity due to the practice using locum GPs.

We spoke with 11 patients during the inspection. All 11 patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were caring however over 50% complained of difficulties getting an appointment. A summary of the preceding three months Friends and Family Test results showed 75% of patients would be likely or extremely likely to recommend the practice to others.

City Health Care Partnership CIC - The Calvert Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

a CQC Lead Inspector and included a GP specialist adviser and an Expert by Experience.

Background to City Health Care Partnership CIC - The Calvert Practice

The Calvert Practice operates from premises purpose-built and is situated in the west of Hull City. The practice provides services under an Alternative Provider Medical Services (APMS) contract with NHS England, Hull Area Team to the practice list of approximately 2,700 patients of all ages. There are disabled parking spaces. All patient services are on the first floor which is served by a lift.

The practice has one male GP and one female GP, one practice nurse and a healthcare assistant. They are supported by a practice manager, a data quality manager and four reception and administrative staff. A senior administrator and a senior receptionist work at this practice and another. Regular locum GPs are used.

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. GP appointments were from 9.30am - 11.40am and 2.40pm - 4.50pm Monday to Friday. Nurse appointments were available 8am to 12pm Monday to Friday, 1pm to 3.30pm Tuesday and Friday afternoon and until 6.30pm on Thursday.

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. This has been agreed with the NHS England area team. The majority of patients are of white British background. The practice population profile is similar to the England average except for the 0-4 years age group which is higher than the England and CCG averages.

The practice scored two 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 a greater need for health services. The overall practice deprivation score is higher than the England average, the practice is 37.9% and the England average is 26.6%.

The practice has opted out of providing out of hours services (OOHs) for their patients. When the practice is closed patients use the 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.

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 30 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (practice manager, GPs, nurse, healthcare assistant, reception and administrative 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, 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.

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 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. 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 were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3. Nurses were trained to safeguarding level 2.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored 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. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out

Are services safe?

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.
- There were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had oxygen available with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available. There was no defibrillator available on the premises as a risk assessment had been completed by the practice to ensure they had an appropriate alternative.
- 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.

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 95.5% of the total number of points available compared to the CCG average 94.2% and the England average 94.8%.

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

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. (Practice rate is 92% compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 89%).
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national average. (Practice rate is 97% compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 93%).

There was no evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been one clinical audit completed in the last two years, it was not a completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- We found no evidence that the practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review or research.

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, those reviewing patients with diabetes had undertaken disease-specific diplomas.
- 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 information governance, annual basic life support training and basic life support training. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 three 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.

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 87%, which was higher than the CCG average of 79% 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 for those with a learning disability 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. 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 98% to 100% and five year olds from 92.5 to 100%.

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 26 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 11 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 similar to or above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 87% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 89%.
- 88% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 95%.
- 88% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 83% and 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 CCG average of 83% and the national average of 85%.
- 86% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 85% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 86%.
- 79% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 82%.
- 87% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- 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.

Are services caring?

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 8% of their patients as carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, the practice sent them a sympathy card.

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 the CCG to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice worked with the CCG and community professionals to identify their patients who were at high risk of attending accident and emergency or having an unplanned admission to hospital.

Services were planned and delivered to take into account the needs of different patient groups and to help provide flexibility, choice and continuity of care. For example;

- The practice offered specific alcohol and smoking cessation counselling for patients.
- 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.
- Patients told us same day appointments were not always available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation. Following the inspection, the practice clarified the policy to ensure same day appointments were available for babies and children with urgent conditions.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. The practice, along with all other practices in the Hull CCG area had a contractual agreement for NHS 111 service to provide Out of Hours (OOHs) services from 6.30pm. This had been agreed with the NHS England area team.

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

- 71% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 76%.
- 47% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 67% and the national average of 73%.

We spoke with the provider about this and they had recently submitted a project proposal paper to the CCG which also included 23 other practices in the local area to pilot a new software tool that allows patients to book, cancel, check or change appointments 24/7 365 days a year using a telephone.

We spoke with 11 people on the day of the inspection and over 50% said that they found it difficult to get an appointment by phone and if urgent they were referred to the local Walk-In Centre. This was similar to the feedback we received on the CQC comment cards.

Some of the patients we spoke with had varied positive and negative comments about the service. For example, patients said staff were polite and helpful and treated them with dignity and respect and other patients described the difficulty in getting appointments and that consultation times were too short.

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.

The process was identified as a GP telephoned the patient or carer in advance to gather information to allow for an informed decision to 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

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.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- 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 and posters were displayed.

We looked at 12 complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, complaints about access to appointments led to the introduction of a triage scheme.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements. However there was no evidence of clinical audit improving patient outcomes.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

The practice told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the practice were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when

things go wrong with care and treatment). The practice 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 written correspondence.

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident 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 patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, improving access to appointments by developing and promoting an on-line appointments system.
- 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.