

Dr J Sender and Partners

Quality Report

Merrow Park Surgery
Kingfisher Drive
Merrow
Guildford
GU4 7EP

Tel: 01483 503331

Website: www.merrowparksurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 9 February 2016

Date of publication: 29/03/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

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	5
What people who use the service say	8
Areas for improvement	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Dr J Sender and Partners	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr J Sender & Partners on 9 February 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and 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 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.

- Urgent appointments were usually available on the day they were requested.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

The area where the provider should make improvement is:

- Ensure the practice of keeping the cleaning cupboard locked has been embedded into the day to day practice routine.

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.

- 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 there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of the local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice was part of a local frailty initiative to provide care and support for frail patients.
- Feedback from patients reported that access to a named GP and continuity of care was not always available quickly, although urgent appointments were usually available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

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 this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about 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.

Good



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. As a result of the care planning the practice signposted older people to other services and support such as advisers who helped to promote independence.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice participated in a local frailty initiative to prevent admission to hospital. This involved attending local multidisciplinary team meetings with social care and the geriatrician to plan the care needed for frail people.
- The duty doctor or a frailty coordinator from the practice contacted patients who had been discharged from hospital to ensure they had the medical support they needed.

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.
- 88% of patients on the diabetes register had a record of a foot examination and classification which was the same as the national average of 88%
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- 71% of patients with asthma, on the register, had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months compared to a national average of 75%
- 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.
- 82% of eligible female patients had a cervical screening test which was the same as the national average of 82%
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- Electronic prescribing allowed prescriptions to be sent to a pharmacy near to the workplace.
- The practice offered extended opening hours for appointments with GPs, nurses and health care assistants.
- The practice provided implant and intrauterine device fitting contraceptive services to people from outside the practice area.

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.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams 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.
- The practice hosted a weekly session by an advice agency which patients found useful.

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).

- 96% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is better than the national average of 84%.
- 93% of patients experiencing poor mental health had an agreed care plan, which is better than the national average of the national average of 88%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had been trained in dementia awareness and had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.
- The practice hosted local counselling services and patients stated that they felt more comfortable being seen in familiar surroundings.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 2 July 2015. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 265 survey forms were distributed and 115 were returned. This represented 1.1% of the practice's patient list.

- 94% of patients found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a Clinical Commissioning Group average of 78% and a national average of 73%.
- 93% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 91% and national average 85%).
- 95% of patients described the overall experience of their GP surgery as good (national average 85%).
- 91% of patients said they would recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 84% and national average 78%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 20 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Several patients commented that it took a long time to get a routine appointment. The practice were aware of this and were recruiting a GP. Many patients referred to the excellent care they had received from doctors, nurses and receptionists and they felt the staff were very professional.

We spoke with seven patients during the inspection. Six patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. One patient was newly registered so had not seen a doctor or nurse at the time of the inspection. The friends and family test showed that 91% of patients would recommend the practice to family or friends.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Ensure the practice of keeping the cleaning cupboard locked has been embedded into the day to day practice routine.

Dr J Sender and Partners

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser, a second CQC inspector and a CQC inspection manager.

Background to Dr J Sender and Partners

Dr J Sender & Partners, also known as Mellow Park Surgery, is located in purpose built premises in a residential area, next to a school and local shops. All patient services are provided on the ground floor with administration offices upstairs.

The practice operates from:

Mellow Park Surgery

Kingfisher Drive

Mellow

Guildford

GU4 7EP

There are approximately 10700 patients registered at the practice. Statistics show very little income deprivation among the registered population. The registered population is lower than average for 20-39 year olds, and slightly higher than average for those aged 45-59 years.

The practice has five partners, one maternity locum GP and one GP registrar (two male and five female). Three of the doctors work full time and the other four work part time. There are three practice nurses and four health care assistants.

The practice is a training practice and regularly has GP trainees working in the practice.

The practice is open from 8am to 7pm on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday and 8am to 8pm on Wednesday. Appointments are from 8.20am to 11.10am and 3.45pm to 6pm. In addition the practice offers extended hours opening with appointments from 6.30pm to 7pm on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday and from 6.30pm to 7.50pm on Wednesday. Patients can book appointments in person, by phone or on line.

Patients requiring a GP outside of normal working hours are advised to contact the NHS GP out of hours service on telephone number 111. The out of hours service is provided by Care UK.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract. GMS contracts are nationally agreed between the General Medical Council and NHS England.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

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

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 9 February 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, practice nurse, health care assistants, receptionists and data administrators) 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 practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, there had been an incident where a patient's sample was incorrectly labelled with the name of a patient with a similar name. This was thoroughly investigated by the practice who contacted both patients involved to explain what had happened and apologise. The practice implemented changes in procedures to prevent reoccurrence including putting an alert on the records of patients with similar names and making changes to the sample request process to link it directly to the patient record.

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

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had 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 that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. 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 relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level 3.

- A notice in the waiting room and all clinical rooms 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 check (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 and practice manager were the infection control leads. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Infection control audits were undertaken every six months 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 and security). 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. Prescription 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. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable Health Care Assistants to administer vaccinations after specific training when a doctor or nurse were on the premises.
- At the time of the inspection the cleaning cupboard, which was situated in the main corridor, was unlocked. This presented a risk to patients as it contained hazardous cleaning fluids. The practice took prompt action to rectify this and assured us that they had put a policy in place to ensure the cupboard is kept locked during practice opening hours.
- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to

Are services safe?

employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

- 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.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was a panic button on reception and in clinical rooms and 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 administration area.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 95.5% of the total number of points available, with 3.9% exception reporting. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. 88% of patients on the diabetes register had a record of a foot examination and classification which was the same as the national average of 88%
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was similar to the national average (practice 83%, national 84%)
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. 93% of patients experiencing poor mental health had an agreed care plan, which is better than the national average of 88%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- We saw eight clinical audits that had been completed in the last two years, three of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, a doctor had reviewed all patients taking a particular type of medication to assess how effective it was in controlling their diabetes, and identified patients who would benefit from a further review of their medication.

The practice worked with the Clinical Commissioning Group pharmacist to review patients taking many different medicines and this review led to improved care, improved compliance with medication and a reduction in medicine wastage.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those staff reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a weekly basis in the practice and on a monthly basis in the local area and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young patients, 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 records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to the national average of 82%. There was a policy to send letters to patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening and had a high uptake of these screening programmes compared to national average.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were better than or comparable to Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 77% to 97% and five year olds from 71% to 98%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

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

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

We spoke with three members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 96% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 92% and national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 90% and national average 87%).
- 99% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 98% and national average 95%).
- 97% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 89% and national average 85%).

- 97% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 93% and national average 90%).
- 96% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 88% and national average 87%).

These results were supported by the Friends and Family data which showed that 91% of patients who responded would recommend the practice to family and friends. The data showed many examples of caring service from nurses and GPs.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 97% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 90% and national average of 86%.
- 92% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 87% and national average 81%)
- 91% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 87% and national average 85%)

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

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

Are services caring?

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 2.3% of the practice list as carers. One of the reception team was the carer lead and written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. The practice had close links with carer support groups and provided support information to carers.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent them a letter. This contact was followed by either a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs or by giving them advice on how to find a support service. We saw evidence of a recent bereavement being handled very sensitively with the family concerned.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice took part in a local frailty initiative, identifying patients at risk of admission to hospital and discussing these patients at monthly locality multi disciplinary meetings with the geriatrician and social care to ensure they had the support needed.

- The practice offered appointments after 6pm every evening for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours. These appointments were with GPs, practice nurses and health care assistants to offer a broad range of primary care services.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice offered text reminders for appointments.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- The practice operated a triage system where patients had a telephone discussion with the doctor to assess the urgency of their condition. This meant that some patients needs were dealt with by telephone, which patients reported they found helpful.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately. The practice was a registered yellow fever clinic.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.20am to 11.10am every morning and 3.45pm to 6pm daily. Extended surgery hours were offered from 6.30 to 7pm on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday and from 6.30pm to 7.50pm on

Wednesday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments with GPs that could be booked up to eight weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 73% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 72% and national average of 75%.
- 94% of patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 78% and national average 73%).
- 64% of patients said they usually get to see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 61% and national average 60%).

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- The complaint policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that a poster was displayed in the reception area informing patients of how to make a complaint.

We looked at 12 complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were handled with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, the practice changed how it carried out diabetic reviews for patients but had not updated the invitation letter sent to patients to reflect this. There was also a long wait for diabetic review appointments. As a result of a patient complaint about this the practice investigated and changed the letter sent to patients and increased the occasions when diabetic review appointments could be booked.

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 excellent patient care and treat patients with dignity and respect to build lasting relationships.

- Staff knew and understood the practice values.
- The practice had a robust strategy which reflected the vision and values and this was regularly reviewed at partners' away days.

Governance arrangements

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

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

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident in doing so and felt supported if they did. All of the practice team met on a quarterly basis and all the staff considered that this meeting was very useful.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported. 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. The practice proactively sought patients' feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service.

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through patient surveys and complaints received. They had implemented improvements as a result of this feedback, for example by making blood test appointments available to book on line. There was a newly formed patient participation group (PPG) which had met once.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff had suggested putting a queuing system in the reception area using barrier ropes to ensure greater confidentiality for the patient speaking to the receptionist and this had been implemented. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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