

Frithwood Surgery

Quality Report

45 Tanglewood Way Bussage Stroud Gloucestershire GL68DE Tel: 01453 882868 Website: www.frithwoodsurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 28 January 2016 Date of publication: 22/03/2016

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

Ratings

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

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
Areas for improvement	10
Outstanding practice	10
Detailed findings from this inspection	
Our inspection team	11
Background to Frithwood Surgery	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13
Action we have told the provider to take	22

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Frithwood Surgery on 28 January 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good, this includes all the population groups.

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

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

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that 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 three area of outstanding practice:

• The practice employed a nurse who contacted and visited patients over the age of 75 to ensure that their health and social needs were being met.

- The practice had established a number of ways for remote patients to pick up their dispensed prescriptions.
- The practice worked with patient participation group in arranging health walks for patients.

The areas where the provider must make improvement

• Ensure that there is adequate recording and monitoring of the vaccine fridge temperatures.

- Ensure all Patient Group Directions are signed locally and in date.
- Ensure there are systems in place to monitor the use of handwritten prescription pads.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

• Undertake internal management checks of Controlled Drugs.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP) Chief Inspector of General Practice

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 requires improvement for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When there were safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology.
 They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

However, we found:

- Not all Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been signed by a GP and one of the PGDs was out of date.
- There was not adequate recording and monitoring of the vaccine fridge temperatures.
- There was a lack of monitoring of handwritten prescription pads.

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

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 (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, one of the GPs was the practice representative for the CCG and participated in comparative peer reviews in prescribing and referral data which was feedback to colleagues after each
- 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.
- 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.
- The practice had established a number of ways for remote patients to pick up their dispensed prescriptions. Patients were able to collect their dispensed medicines from locations such as a village shop nearer to them.

Are services well-led?

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

 The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.

Good



Good





- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

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 patients.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- There was a lead nurse for patients over the age of 75 who contacted patients to ensure that their health and social needs were being met. The nurse would also administer flu vaccines to elderly patients unable to attend the practice.
- The practice held weekly multi-disciplinary meeting and the needs of older patients as well as those at risks were discussed. The number of patients on the practice's palliative care register who have had a review was 100%.

People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for the care of patients 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.
- The practice achieved 91% of the targets for care of patients with diabetes in 2014/15 which was below the clinical commissioning group average of 95% and above the national average of 89%.
- 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.

Families, children and young people

The practice is rated as good for the care of families, children and young patients.

Good



Good



- 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 patients who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- 74% of patients diagnosed with asthma, on the register, had an asthma review in the last 12 months (04/2014 to 03/2015) compared to the national average of 75%.
- Patients told us that children and young patients were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years (04/2014 to 03/2015) was 83% which was comparable to the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses. For example, the practice held weekly primary healthcare team meetings to share information and discuss patients at risks.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age patients (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.
- Extended hours were available from 7.30am to 8am on Thursday mornings and 6.30pm to 7pm on Wednesday and Thursday evenings.
- 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.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The practice is rated as good for the care of patients 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.

Good





- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice provided GP services to a local residential unit for young patients.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The practice is rated as good for the care of patients experiencing poor mental health (including people living with dementia).

- 97% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months (04/ 2014 to 03/2015), which was above the national average of 84%.
- The percentage of patients with severe mental health problems who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months (04/2014 to 03/2015), was 100% compared to the national average of 88%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those diagnosed with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.



What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 2 July 2015 showed the practice was performing above local and national averages. Two hundred and sixty-one survey forms were distributed and 113 (43%) were returned. This represented 1.7% of the practice's patient list.

- 100% of patients found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 84% and a national average of 73%.
- 91% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to a CCG average of 90% and a national average of 85%.
- 96% of patients described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good compared to a CCG average of 89% and a national average of 85%.

• 92% of patients said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to a CCG average of 82% and a 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 33 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients commented on the caring and respectful nature of all staff at the practice. Some patients said they found the practice clean and hygienic.

We spoke with five patients during the inspection. Most of the five patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. One patient however, commented on the difficulties they had experienced to obtain a referral and how they did not feel listened to by the GPs at the practice.

Data from the November 2015 Friends and Family Test showed that 77% of patients would recommend the practice to their friends and family.

Areas for improvement

Action the service MUST take to improve

- Ensure that there is adequate recording and monitoring of the vaccine fridge temperatures.
- Ensure all Patient Group Directions are signed locally and in date.

• Ensure there are systems in place to monitor the use of handwritten prescription pads.

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

• Undertake internal management checks of Controlled Drugs.

Outstanding practice

- The practice employed a nurse who contacted and visited patients over the age of 75 to ensure that their health and social needs were being met.
- The practice had established a number of ways for remote patients to pick up their dispensed prescriptions.
- The practice worked with patient participation group in arranging health walks for patients.



Frithwood Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser, a second CQC inspector and a member of the CQC Medicines Team.

Background to Frithwood Surgery

Frithwood is located in the new development of Bussage in Stroud and serves local villages within a five mile radius including Chalford, Eastcombe, Brownshill, France Lynch and Bisley. The practice delivers it's services under a General Medical Services (GMS contract is a contract between NHS England and general practices for delivering general medical services and is the commonest form of GP contract) contract to approximately 6800 patients at the following address:

45 Tanglewood Way,

Bussage,

Stroud,

Gloucestershire,

GL6 8DE.

The practice partnership has four partners of which two are male and two are female. The practice also employed a salaried GP, which makes a total practice compliment of three and a quarter whole time equivalent GPs. The practice also employed two nurse prescribers, one practice nurses and one nurse for the elderly patients making a nursing team of approximately two whole time equivalent nurses. There was also one health care assistant and two

phlebotomists employed. The practice management and administration team included one practice manager, one IT administrator, two secretaries and six administration and reception staff.

The practice also has a dispensary and it dispenses to around a third of the practice registered patients. The dispensary team included three dispensers and a dispensary manager.

The practice had a higher than average patient population of 40 to 54 years old and over 65 years old. The general Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) population profile for the geographic area of the practice is in the least deprivation decile. (An area itself is not deprived: it is the circumstances and lifestyles of the people living there that affect its deprivation score. It is important to remember that not everyone living in a deprived area is deprived and that not all deprived people live in deprived areas). Average male and female life expectancy for the practice is 82 and 85 years, which is above the national average of 79 and 83 years respectively.

The practice is open from 8am to 12.30pm every morning and 1.30pm to 6.30pm every afternoon. Telephone access was available from 8am to 6.30pm and urgent calls are put through to the on-call GP between 8am and 8.30am, and 12.30pm to 1.30pm by a member of the reception staff. Appointments are available with a GP from 8am to 12.15pm and 3.30pm to 6pm; and with a nurse from 8am to 6.15pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours are available from 7.30am to 8am on Thursday mornings and 6.30pm to 7pm on Wednesday and Thursday evenings. In addition to pre-booked appointments, urgent appointments are also available on the same day.

The practice has opted out of providing out of hours services to its patients. Patients can access the out of hours services provided by South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust via the NHS 111 service.

Detailed findings

This inspection is part of the CQC comprehensive inspection programme and is the first inspection of Frithwood Surgery.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

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

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 28 January 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including four GPs, three nurses, the practice manager, three reception and administrative staff, a health visitor and patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.

 Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- · Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

We also looked at how well services were provided for specific groups of people and what good care looked like for them. The population groups are:

- Older people.
- People with long-term conditions.
- Families, children and young people.
- Working age people (including those recently retired and students).
- People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia).

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



Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, the practice reviewed it's procedures following a significant event analysis to ensure that patients who have had intermenstrual bleeds for three months have a cervical examination by a GP even if recent smear results were normal to ensure timely assessment.

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

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level 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 check (DBS check). (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.
- 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.

Medicines Management

The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice did not always keep patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). There were systems in place to record the current temperature of all the fridges but the minimum and maximum temperatures were not recorded and therefore it was not possible to determine if they were maintaining the correct temperature range at all times. The fridge used to store vaccines was kept locked.

We found that the system for dispensing repeat prescriptions was safe, with prescriptions being signed before patients received their medicines. The practice was signed up to the Dispensing Services Quality Scheme to help ensure processes were suitable and the quality of the service was maintained. Dispensing staff had all completed appropriate medicines training. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) pharmacy team, to



Are services safe?

ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored but there were no robust systems in place to monitor the use of handwritten forms. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation, although many had not been authorised for local use and one went out of date in October 2015. PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presenting for treatment.

The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage arrangements because of their potential for misuse) and had in place standard procedures that set out how they were managed. These were being followed by the practice staff. For example, controlled drugs were stored in a controlled drugs cupboard and access to them was restricted and the keys held securely. There were arrangements in place for the destruction of controlled drugs.

We saw a positive culture in the practice for reporting and learning from medicines incidents and errors. Incidents were logged efficiently and then reviewed promptly. This helped make sure appropriate actions were taken to minimise the chance of similar errors occurring again. The practice had established a number of ways for remote patients to pick up their dispensed prescriptions. They had systems in place to monitor how these medicines were collected. They also had arrangements in place to ensure that patients collecting medicines from these locations were given all the relevant information they required.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

 There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk

- assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was 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, however, these were not stored in a secure area of the practice. All staff knew of their location and all the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.



Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 97% of the total number of points available, with 8% 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 91% which was below the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 95% and above national average of 89%
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 100% which was above the CCG and national average of 98%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 89% which was below the CCG average of 97% and national average of 93%.
 - Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been over 10 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, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services.
 For example, recent action taken as a result of learning from a significant event and clinical audit included ensuring the GPs had access to the UK Medical Eligibility Criteria guidelines and referred to this when prescribing combined oral contraceptive pill.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as recognising that there were an increasing prevalence of dementia which was identified through annual audits. The over 75 nurse visited patients and carried out dementia reviews and liased with external professionals when needed.

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. It 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 during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, and facilitation and support for revalidatingGPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.



Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
 When providing care and treatment for children and young patients, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.

• The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- The practice was part of the NHS Forest, a project to encourage staff and patients to get involved in using green spaces for health activities. The practice organised health walks in partnership with the patient participation group. The practice produced information leaflet which included a one and half mile route map and patients could also record their walk details.
- Smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 83%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 84% 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.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 77% to 100% and five year olds from 96% to 99%.

Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 82%, and at risk groups 68%. These were above the national average of 73% and 52% respectively.

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



Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

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

All of the 33 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

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

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

- 96% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and national average of 89%.
- 93% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 87%.
- 99% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 97% and 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 90%.
- 96% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 92% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% and 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 85% and national average of 81%.
- 86% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 85%.

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

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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



Are services caring?

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 2% of the practice list as carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or 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 clinical commissioning group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, one of the GPs was the practice representative for the CCG and participated in comparative peer reviews in prescribing and referral data which was feedback to colleagues after each meeting.

- The practice offered extended hours on Thursday mornings from 7.30am and until 7pm on Wednesday and Thursday evenings for patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- The practice had made arrangements so that patients were able to collect their dispensed medicines from locations such as a village shop nearer to them.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8am to 12.30pm every morning and 1.30pm to 6.30pm every afternoon. Telephone access was available from 8am to 6.30pm and urgent calls were put through to the on-call GP between 8am and 8.30am, and 12.30pm to 1.30pm by a member of the reception staff. Appointments were available with a GP from 8am to 12.15pm and 3.30pm to 6pm; and with a nurse from 8am to 6.15pm Monday to Friday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 82% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and national average of 75%.
- 100% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 73%.
- 80% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer compared to the CCG average of 69% and national average of 60%.

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- 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. For example, leaflet were available and information about how to complain was available on the practice website.

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, when a prescribing error occurred and was not picked up on repeat prescriptions, the practice discussed this with the clinical team to ensure that prescribers are more cautious and check the medicines dosages when entering this on repeat prescription template.



Are services well-led?

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

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

Leadership and culture

The partners in the practice were experienced and were keen to deliver high quality care. They prioritise safe, high quality and compassionate care. The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

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

When there were safety incidents:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- 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. There was an active PPG which met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the practice had carried out work to ensure level access to the premises following feedback that this would be beneficial to patients especially for wheelchair users.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes

Are services well-led?

Good



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

to improve outcomes for patients in the area. The practice provided and encouraged use of a range of non medical treatments such as social prescribing and health walks.

(Social prescribing is a means of enabling primary care services to refer patients with social, emotional or practical needs to a range of local, non-clinical services, often provided by the voluntary and community sector).

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures	Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and
Family planning services	treatment
Maternity and midwifery services	(1) Care and treatment must be provided in a safe way
Surgical procedures	for service users.
Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	(2) Without limiting paragraph (1), the things which a
	registered person must do to comply with that
	paragraph include—
	(g) the proper and safe management of medicines;
	How the regulation was not being met:
	 Medicines were not always kept safe. Systems to ensure the medicines were kept at appropriate temperatures were not operated effectively.
	 Patient Group Directions (PGD) were not always signed locally and one of the PGDs was out of date.
	 There were no systems in place to monitor the use of handwritten prescription pads.
	This was in breach of regulation 12(1)(2)(g) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.