

Priory View Medical Centre

Quality Report

2a Green Lane
Leeds
West Yorkshire
LS12 1HU

Tel: 0113 295 4260

Website: www.prioryviewmedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 17 August 2016

Date of publication: 11/01/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	11
Areas for improvement	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Priory View Medical Centre	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Priory View Medical Centre on 17 August 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

We saw one area where the provider should make improvement are:

- The practice should review their arrangements to meet patients' language and communication needs alongside best practice guidelines. This is in order to assure themselves they are taking all steps possible to maintain patient confidentiality and safety.

Summary of findings

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. However; we noted one area of risk as on occasion, family members were used as interpreters. This could raise concerns around potential confidentiality and safeguarding issues.

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 higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Good



Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Leeds West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example; the practice had adopted the House of Care approach for the chronic disease management of diabetes within the practice. This was aimed at encouraging patients with diabetes to understand their condition and select their own personal health and lifestyle targets. The practice was also involved in the quality improvement scheme for 2015/16, working with two other practices to increase the identification of patients with pre-diabetes and diabetes.
- The practice was part of the Patient Empowerment Project which aimed to improve the health and wellbeing of patients. Through this project, GPs were provided with a link to refer patients to local groups and community activities within the voluntary sector. Patients were then provided with support to help them develop the skills, knowledge and confidence to manage their condition.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice used a text messaging service to remind patients about their appointments, patients could also cancel their appointments via this method. This service was also used to advise patients when the practice was running health campaigns.
- 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.
- Patients at the practice could access additional services such as a vasectomy service and a dermatology service which were also available to all patients in the Leeds West area.

Good



Summary of findings

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.
- 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.

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.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The health care assistants and nursing staff within the practice offered health checks and hospital discharge reviews.
- The practice offered home visits for influenza, shingles and pneumonia vaccinations for those patients who were unable to access the surgery.
- The practice had assigned a nurse to provide services to care homes; the nurse liaised closely with GPs within the practice.
- A GP partner worked closely with local neighbourhood teams and held regular meetings to ensure effective care for patients.

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.
- Overall performance for diabetes related indicators was lower than the CCG and national average. However, the practice had performed better in some areas. For example; 93% of patients newly diagnosed with diabetes, on the register, in the preceding 12 months had been referred to a structured education programme. This was better than the CCG average of 89% and national average of 92%.
- 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



Summary of findings

- The practice had adopted the House of Care approach for chronic disease management of diabetes within the practice. This was aimed at encouraging patients with diabetes to understand their condition and select their own personal health and lifestyle targets.
- The practice was also involved in the quality improvement scheme for 2015/16, working with two other practices to increase the identification of patients with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

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 (A&E) attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- The practice offered booked appointments for childhood vaccinations rather than specific clinics. This was to ensure appointments were booked at a time to suit families.
- The practice carried out audits to identify any patient not attending for childhood vaccinations and these patients were contacted in writing.
- 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 offered a full range of contraceptive services including implants and emergency contraception.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses. The midwife held ante-natal clinics twice a week from the practice for patients to access.

Good



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.

Good



Summary of findings

- NHS health checks were offered to all patients aged between 40 and 74.
- 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. These were utilised by patients at the practice, with 52% of patients registered to use online services.
- The practice offered appointments outside of normal working hours six days per week, including Saturday mornings.
- The practice offered telephone triage appointments where patients could speak with a GP and access a same day appointment if required.

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, travellers 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 with dementia).

- Data showed that 85% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 84%
- 90% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive care plan, documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months. This was better than the CCG average of 85% and national average of 89%.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- All staff within the practice had received dementia awareness training.
- 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 a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 7 July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. A total of 265 survey forms were distributed and 106 (40%) were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient population.

- 77% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone which was the same as the CCG average and better than the national average of 73%.
- 89% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 85%.
- 86% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 85%.

- 82% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 12 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients used words such as outstanding, excellent and fantastic to describe the service.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- The practice should review their arrangements to meet patients' language and communication needs alongside best practice guidelines. This is in order to assure themselves they are taking all steps possible to maintain patient confidentiality and safety.

Priory View Medical Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The lead inspector was supported by a GP specialist adviser and a practice nurse specialist adviser.

Background to Priory View Medical Centre

Priory View Medical Centre is located at 2a Green Lane, Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS12 1HU. The service operates from a two storey, purpose building with car parking available for staff and patients.

The practice is situated within the Leeds West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and provides primary medical services under the terms of a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract. This is a contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering services to the local community.

The service is provided by four GP partners (two male and two female), a salaried GP (male) a nurse practitioner and two health care assistants. The clinical team are supported by a practice manager and an experienced team of administrative and reception staff.

The practice serves a population of 9,056 patients who can access a number of clinics for example; physiotherapy, dermatology and paediatrics.

The practice is open between the hours 8am until 6pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours are also provided between 7am and 8am and 6pm and 7pm Monday to Thursday. The practice also holds a Saturday morning surgery between the hours of 9am and 12pm.

When the practice is closed out-of-hours services are provided by Local Care Direct, which can be accessed via the surgery telephone number or by calling the NHS 111 service.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 17 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including two GP partners, the nurse practitioner, a health care assistant and the practice manager.
- We received feedback from the reception manager and three members of the reception and administrative team via questionnaires.
- 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.

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 with dementia).

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, an incident had been identified when a patient had attended the practice for a vaccination and the wrong dose was administered. The patient was contacted by the GP and given a full explanation. As a result of the incident, the practice updated the process for administering vaccinations and staff were advised to enter the vaccination name and dose onto the clinical system prior to administration as an additional check.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse, which included:

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended

safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 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 (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local IPC teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. The practice nurse had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. She received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had also been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. PGDs are documents permitting the supply of prescription-only medicines to groups of patients, without individual prescriptions.
- The Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific

Are services safe?

direction (PSD). A PSD is an instruction to administer a medicine to a list of individually named patients where each patient on the list has been individually assessed by a prescriber.

- We reviewed two personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

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 the safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed

to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty. This was continually reviewed and monitored by one of the GP partners in the practice.

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 stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results showed the practice had achieved 93% of the total number of points available, (CCG and national averages 96%) with 5% clinical exception reporting (CCG average 9% and national average 10%). These figures were better than the CCG and national averages. Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects.

Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Overall performance for diabetes related indicators was lower than the CCG and national average. However, the practice had performed better in some areas. For example; 93% of patients newly diagnosed with diabetes, on the register, in the preceding 12 months had been referred to a structured education programme. This was better than the CCG average of 89% and national average of 92%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators were better than the CCG and national average. For example, 90% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive

care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months, agreed between individuals, their family and/or carers as appropriate. This was better than the CCG average of 85% and national average of 89%.

The practice had taken a number of steps to increase performance against diabetes related indicators. For example; the practice had adopted a house of care approach for chronic disease management of Diabetes in the practice. In addition the practice were working on a joint project with two other local practices to increase identification of patients with pre-diabetes and diabetes, attending joint educational meetings and workshops and sharing data, ideas and resources.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- We looked at two clinical audits completed in the last two years; both 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, the practice had undertaken regular audits to identify the number of patients taking warfarin and to ensure there was a reason for taking the medication and the length of time this should be taken for, documented in the clinical notes. The first audit was carried out in January 2013 and identified 141 patients on warfarin with 56 of these patients having no treatment plan documented. The most recent cycle of the audit was carried out in August 2016 and findings indicated that of the 124 patients taking warfarin, only five patients did not have a documented treatment plan.

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. In addition, all practice staff had received dementia training.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.
- 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.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 75%, which was slightly lower than the CCG average of 79% and the 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 also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 95% to 100% (CCG average 94% and national average 88%) and five year olds from 89% to 98% (CCG average 96% and national average 89%).

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

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.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

Consent to care and treatment

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

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.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 12 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received and said that staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. Patients used words such as outstanding, excellent and fantastic to describe the service.

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

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

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

- 88% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and the national average of 89%.
- 90% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 87%.

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

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

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

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

- Staff told us that telephone translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. They also told us that some patients preferred to bring a relative to translate for them. This does not

Are services caring?

follow best practice guidelines with regards to the provision of translation services, as allowing the patients relatives to act in this capacity can present risks with patient confidentiality and safeguarding.

- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them and sent them a sympathy card.

This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Leeds West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example; the practice had adopted the House of Care approach for chronic disease management of diabetes within the practice. This was aimed at encouraging patients with diabetes to understand their condition and select their own personal health and lifestyle targets. The practice was also involved in the quality improvement scheme for 2015/16, working with two other practices to increase the identification of patients with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice used a text messaging service to remind patients about their appointments, patients could also cancel their appointments via this method. This service was also used to advise patients when the practice was running health campaigns.
- 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. These were utilised by patients at the practice, with 52% of patients registered to use online services.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice was part of the Patient Empowerment Project which aimed to improve the health and wellbeing of patients. Through this project, GPs were provided with a link to refer patients to local groups and community activities within the voluntary sector. Patients were then provided with support to help them develop the skills, knowledge and confidence to manage their condition.

- The practice provided a vasectomy service which could be accessed by registered patients and patients in the Leeds area could also be referred into this service.
- The practice provided a dermatology service for all patients in the Leeds West area.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am until 6pm Monday to Friday, with a range of appointments available between these times. Extended hours appointments were offered between 7am and 8am and 6pm and 7pm Monday to Thursday. The practice also held a Saturday morning surgery between the hours of 9am and 12pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 91% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 83% and national average of 76%.
- 77% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone which was the same as the CCG average and better than the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

Are services responsive to people's needs? (for example, to feedback?)

- 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. The practice had a patient information leaflet explaining the complaints procedure and a dedicated form which patients could use to outline their complaint.
- We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were handled appropriately, dealt with in a timely way and demonstrated openness and transparency when dealing with the complaint.

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 and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a strategy in place and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.
- The practice had identified a need to increase staffing levels within the practice and had successfully recruited a salaried GP (male) who joined the team in June 2016 and a practice nurse who was due to start with the practice in September 2016.
- At the time of our inspection the practice were working with four other practices to provide additional weekend appointments from 8am until 4pm on Saturday and Sunday. This service was to be implemented from September 2016.

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 was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were effective arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners and practice manager 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 GPs and practice manager 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. This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The lead GP 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.
- 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 involvement group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, helped to produce patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the practice consulted the group to establish the best way of communicating information to patients. As a result the practice displayed information on the notice boards in reception to inform patients of changes before these were implemented.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

· The practice had gathered feedback from staff through discussion, staff meetings and appraisals. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, the practice was working with two other local practices under the quality improvement scheme which aimed to improve identification of undiagnosed diabetes and pre-diabetes.