

The New Surgery

Quality Report

The New Surgery
Mexborough
Doncaster
S64 0DB
Tel: 01709 511800
Website: www.newsurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 17 October 2016
Date of publication: 05/12/2016

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	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

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

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The New Surgery on 17 October 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 with the exception of prescription security.
- 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 difficult to get through to the practice by telephone however, there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice 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 upon.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Review the incident reporting process to include review of relevant policy or procedure during the investigation process.

Summary of findings

- Review the prescription security procedures to track them through the practice in order to comply with NHS Protect Security of prescription forms guidance (Updated August 2013).
- Revisit the contract of the premises with the landlord to include a service level agreement to determine who is responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the premises, utilities and fixtures and fittings.
- Implement a procedure to capture actions taken by the practice in response to best practice guidance and medicine alerts.
- Review the layout of the layout of the waiting area to promote confidentiality and also access to two treatment rooms via pharmacy floor space.

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. However, we noted relevant policy and procedures were not routinely reviewed as part of every incident reported.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and managed apart from the monitoring the use of electronic prescriptions.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

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 comparable or lower to others for several aspects of care. However this did not reflect what patients told us on the day and written comments received.

Good



Summary of findings

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it difficult to get through to the practice by telephone. Staff were aware of this and had improvement plans in place. Patients told us there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had been 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.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

The practice is rated as good for the care of older people.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.

Good



People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for the care of people with long term conditions.

- Nursing staff had lead roles in long term condition management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 4% above the CCG average and 11% above the national average.
- 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 accident and emergency attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80%, which was below the CCG and national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

Good



Summary of findings

- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



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 living with dementia).

- 89% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is above the national average of 84%.
- Of those experiencing poor mental health 85% had an agreed care plan in place which was lower than the national average of 88%

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice regularly worked with multidisciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living 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 those living with dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 7 July 2016 showed the practice was performing below local and national averages. 252 survey forms were distributed and 105 were returned. This represented 1.5% of the practice's patient list.

- 57% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 67% and a national average of 73%.
- 80% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 83%, national average 85%).
- 71% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 83%, national average 85%).

- 66% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 75%, 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 28 comment cards which were positive about the standard of care received. Comments included 'very good care', 'staff are helpful and understanding' and 'staff listen and treat me with dignity and respect'. Two less positive comments related to access to the practice by telephone and GP appointment times running late.

We spoke with 12 patients during the inspection. Feedback from patients about their care was positive. All patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were friendly, helpful and caring.

The New Surgery

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 The New Surgery

The New Surgery is located in Mexborough on the outskirts of Doncaster. The practice provide services for 6,941 patients under the terms of the NHS General Medical Services contract. The practice catchment area is classed as within the group of the second most deprived areas in England. The age profile of the practice population is similar to other GP practices in the area.

The practice has three GP partners, two female and one male. They are supported by a GP, two GP locums, two advanced nurse practitioners, two practice nurses, a healthcare assistant, a phlebotomist, a practice manager and a team of reception and administrative staff.

The practice is open between 8.30am to 6.30pm on weekdays with late evening appointments with the practice nurse and healthcare assistant until 8pm on Monday and from 7am on Thursday. Appointments with all staff are available during the practice opening hours. A phlebotomy service with the healthcare assistant is available daily. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance for GP appointments and 12 weeks in advance for practice nurse appointments, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

When the practice is closed calls were answered by the out-of-hours service which is accessed via the surgery telephone number or by calling the NHS 111 service.

The practice is located in a purpose built building with consultation and treatment rooms on the ground floor. There is accessible car parking to the front of the building.

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 registered provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 18 October 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GP, temporary GP, practice nurses, healthcare assistant, practice manager, administrative and reception staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed staff interactions with patients and carers and/or family members.

Detailed findings

- 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 living with dementia)

Please note that when referring to information throughout this report, for example any reference to the Quality and Outcomes Framework data, this relates to the most recent information available to the CQC at that time.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again. Not all incidents included a review of the relevant policy or procedure.
- The practice carried out an analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, the procedure for postnatal mother and baby checks was reviewed following an incident. The practice reviewed how patients were reminded to attend and introduced a specific mother and baby clinic at a set time each week. Staff would follow up those who did not attend to offer an alternative appointment. The change in practice was shared with staff at a staff meeting and cascaded to all staff following the meeting. The procedure was not captured within a written document and the practice manager told us this would be reviewed.

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 adult

safeguarding policy was not dated. The CCG child safeguarding policy had been adapted by the practice. The version used was due for review in 2014. The internet address where the new and updated policy could be found had been handwritten on the top of the policy.

- Details of whom to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare were displayed in each treatment room. 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 safeguarding level three.
- 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 prevention and control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention and control teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection prevention and control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection prevention and control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. On the day of inspection we noted that staff did not record the date the action was completed on the plan. The practice nurse told us this would be documented for future actions.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice

Are services safe?

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, however, the practice did not have a system in place to monitor use as per NHS Protect Security of prescription guidance 2013. The practice manager told us this would be addressed immediately and a process implemented.
- The advance nurse practitioners had qualified as independent prescribers and could therefore prescribe medicines for clinical conditions. They received support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Healthcare assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.
- We reviewed three 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. 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 evacuation drills. We noted not all the actions from the fire assessment in 2013 were completed and remained as outstanding actions in 2016. For example, the action plan recommended removal of a door at the side of the pharmacy that led to two treatment rooms and the door secure door code lock to staff areas be linked to the fire alarm. The practice manager reported the areas identified were currently being re-assessed as removal of the door may lead to security issues. Staff were aware the doors would need to be manually opened in the event of the fire alarm being activated. A member of staff was identified each day as responsible for opening the door should the

alarm go off. Records of weekly fire alarm and equipment checks were not consistent. For example the dates documented on the weekly checklist were 17 and 25 August 2016, 2, 13 and 29 September 2016 and 4 October 2016. The practice manager told us this would be reviewed to ensure they were completed weekly.

- 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). Cleaning staff kept records of weekly flushing for outlets not used regularly.
- 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.
- The practice leased the building from private landlords. We asked to see a service level agreement to determine who was responsible for the upkeep of the building and fixtures and fittings. We were told the practice did not have one and as tenants they were responsible for everything internal to the building and the landlord for everything external.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. 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

Are services safe?

stored securely. Staff told us benzylpenicillin was on order and a vial was sourced from another practice during our inspection to ensure the practice had some one site.

- 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 utility companies.

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. However, the practice did not keep a log of actions taken in relation to the guidelines. The practice manager told us this would be reviewed.

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 96% of the total number of points available with 8.7% 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 4% above the CCG average and 11% above the national average.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 2% above the CCG average and 5% above the national average.

However the practice did not achieve any outcomes for the depression related indicators for the QOF year 2014/15. Staff told us this was an issue with the way depression was coded within the patient record system and it had been rectified. Staff confirmed the depression indicators had improved for the QOF year 2015/16.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been five clinical audits completed in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking and accreditation.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included review of all patients who were prescribed medicines from the hospital to ensure they were taking the correct doses combined with medicines prescribed at the practice.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as: .

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long term conditions.
- 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 nurses and GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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.
- The practice had a GP partner vacancy and had employed another GP to cover maternity leave GP's leave. Two locum GPs were working regularly at the practice. More recently the practice had employed two advanced nurse practitioners to see patients with minor illnesses and long term conditions.

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 complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs. Staff at the practice frequently liaised with the respiratory, cardiac, epilepsy and diabetic community nurse specialists.

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. 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 healthcare assistant offered smoking cessation advice and the practice was awarded the Yorkshire Smoke Free Doncaster & Rotherham Provider of the Year 2015-16.
- A counsellor held a weekly clinic offering talking therapies to patients. Staff told us the service was popular with patients particularly to assist them to make healthy life choices.
- Staff also referred patients to the social prescribing project in Doncaster. They had the option to prescribe non-medical support to patients. This included support for loneliness and social isolation, to provide information regarding housing issues or advice on debt.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80%, which was below the CCG and national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice 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 fail safe 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 84% to 100% and five year olds from 82% to 99%.

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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.

Most of the 28 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. Two less positive comments related to access to the practice by telephone and GP's appointment times running late.

We spoke with one member 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.

The practice was comparable or below average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and reception staff as reported by patients in the National GP Patient Survey. For example:

- 80% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 89%.
- 86% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
- 96% 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%.
- 80% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.

- 91% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 83% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG the national average of 87%.

This did not reflect what patients told us on the day of the inspection and comments recorded on the CQC comment cards.

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 less positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment GPs. Results were below local and national averages for GPs and above for nurses. For example:

- 79% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 86%.
- 75% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 87% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

- 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 in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Are services caring?

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 60 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families experienced bereavement, their usual GP may contact them or sent them a sympathy card. This call provided advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. Staff were working with other practices in the area to improve the care delivered to those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable by joining up resources.

- The practice offered appointments with the practice nurse and the healthcare assistant on Monday until 8pm and from 7am on Wednesday for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for those who needed them.
- Home visits were available for those with clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS and were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- The practice premises had been assessed as an accessible practice, there was a hearing loop and interpretation services available.
- The premises were in need of review and updating. The waiting area was shared with a pharmacy co-located in the building. Access to two treatment rooms were via a door to the behind and to the side of the pharmacy counter. Patients walked into the pharmacy to access the door.
- The carpet in the waiting room and treatment room corridor was heavily marked and threadbare in places. The chairs in the waiting area were not easily moved as they were fixed together and covered fabric material that could not be easily cleaned. The two reception windows did not promote privacy as they were at a 90 degree angle to each other, therefore conversations could be overheard. Conversations in the reception area could be overheard in part of the treatment room corridor behind reception. However, patients did not report this as an issue to us.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours appointments were offered with the practice nurse and healthcare assistant until 8pm on Monday and from 7am on Wednesday. Appointments with staff were available throughout the day. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance for GPs and 12 weeks for practice nurses, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 74% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 76%.
- 57% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 34% usually wait 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen compared to the CCG average of 66% and national average of 65%.

Telephone access to the practice was an issue and staff were exploring new telephone systems to enable patients book, change and cancel appointments via the telephone 24 hours a day. They had secured funding for this through the NHS funded Technology Transformation Scheme. The practice had recently introduced a new telephone number to request prescriptions to alleviate calls to the appointment booking numbers.

Patients also reported a long wait in the practice to be seen as appointments with some GPs did not run to time. They told us they did not mind as the GP also gave them the time needed during consultation. People told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them.

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found 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, the practice reviewed information contained within patient records, with external agencies, to determine what information could be removed at the request of patients.

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 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. We noted the child and adult safeguarding policies needed updating.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection we spoke with one partner who demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with

patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular 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. We noted team away days were held every months.
- 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 had recently established themselves over the past 12 months and were actively recruiting new members. They had held two meetings since inception and planned to meet regularly and submit proposals for improvements to the practice management team. At the last meeting they had a talk from the local Carer's group to promote services available in the area to patients.

The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions. 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.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice

team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area and working with other practices to support those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.