

Dr Hariharan and Partner

Quality Report

Dr Hariharan and Partner
Clifton House
1 Church Street
Golcar
Huddersfield
HD7 4AQ
Tel: 01484 465420
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 4 August 2015
Date of publication: 22/10/2015

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	7

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	8
Background to Dr Hariharan and Partner	8
Why we carried out this inspection	8
How we carried out this inspection	8
Detailed findings	10

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Hariharan and Partner on 4 August 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered following best practice guidance. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and planned.
- 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.

However there were areas of practice where the provider needs to make improvements.

The provider should:

- Ensure all clinical staff have Hepatitis B immunisation
- The testing (or risk assessment) for the presence of legionella is undertaken
- Regular effective fire risk assessments are undertaken in accordance with the regulations, specifically carry out regular fire drills

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. Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Lessons were learned and communicated widely to support improvement. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed. Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. There were enough staff to keep patients safe.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services. Data showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality. Staff referred to guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence and used it routinely. Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered in line with current legislation. This included assessing capacity and promoting good health. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and appropriate training planned to meet these needs. There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff. Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services. Data showed that 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 also saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services. It 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. 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

Good



Summary of findings

needs. Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed that the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as good for being well-led. It had a clear vision and strategy. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this. There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings. There were systems in place to monitor and improve quality and identify risk. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group (PPG) was in the process of being developed. Staff had received inductions, regular performance reviews and attended staff meetings and events.

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. Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients were good for conditions commonly found in older people. The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population and had a range of enhanced services, for example, in dementia and end of life care. It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and rapid access appointments for those with enhanced needs.

Good



People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for the care of people with long-term conditions. Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority. Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed. All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medication needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

The practice is rated as good for the care of families, children and young people. There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations. 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. Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. We saw good examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

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

Good



Summary of findings

to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care. The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

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 information on patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability. It had carried out annual health checks for people with a learning disability and the majority of these patients had received a follow up. It offered longer appointments for people with a learning disability.

The practice regularly worked with multidisciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people. It had told 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). The majority of people experiencing poor mental health had received an annual physical health check. The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia. It 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. Staff had received training on how to care for people with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The National GP Patient Survey results published on 8 May 2015 showed the practice was performing above local and national averages.

- 79% find it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared with a CCG average of 74% and a national average of 73%.
- 89% find the receptionists at this surgery helpful compared with a CCG average of 87% and a national average of 87%.
- 88% with a preferred GP usually get to see or speak to that GP compared with a CCG average of 65% and a national average of 60%.
- 86% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with a CCG average of 86% and a national average of 85%.
- 99% say the last appointment they got was convenient compared with a CCG average of 92% and a national average of 92%.
- 74% describe their experience of making an appointment as good compared with a CCG average of 74% and a national average of 73%.

- 82% usually wait 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen compared with a CCG average of 66% and a national average of 65%.
- 78% feel they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with a CCG average of 57% and a national average of 58%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 32 comment cards which were overall positive about the standard of care received. A small number identified that obtaining an appointment was difficult.

Reception staff, nurses and GPs all received praise for their professional care and patients said they felt listened to and involved in decisions about their treatment. Patients informed us that they were treated with compassion and that GPs listened to the patients, were friendly and helpful.

Dr Hariharan and Partner

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team consisted of a CQC Lead Inspector, two CQC Inspectors and three specialist advisors (a GP, a practice manager and a practice nurse). Our inspection team also included an Expert by Experience who is a person who uses services themselves and wants to help CQC to find out more about people's experience of the care they receive.

Background to Dr Hariharan and Partner

Dr Hariharan and Partner is registered with CQC to provide primary care services, which includes access to GPs, family planning, surgical procedures, treatment of disease, disorder or injury and diagnostic and screening procedures. It provides GP services for patients living in the Golcar area of Huddersfield.

As part of the same registration a second branch surgery 'Nook Surgery' also provides the same service in the Salendine area of Huddersfield was also visited as part of this inspection. The two sites had a single patient list, so patients could be seen at either practice depending on what was more convenient for them. The practice had four GPs (two male and two female), a management team, practice nurses, healthcare assistants and administrative staff.

The practice is open 8:30am to 6:00pm on Monday to Friday. Patients can book appointments in person, via the phone and online. Appointments can be booked in advance for both the doctor and nurse clinics. When the

practice is closed patients can access the out of hours NHS 111 service. When the surgery is closed out-of-hours provision is provided by West Yorkshire Urgent Care Services.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract. This is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering services to the local community.

The practice is part of NHS Greater Huddersfield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). It is responsible for providing primary care services to 4,526 patients. The practice generally comprised of an equal number of women and men.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our comprehensive inspection programme covering Clinical Commissioning Groups throughout the country.

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

Please note 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 CQC at that time.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

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

- 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 are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks like for them. The population groups are:

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions
- Mothers, babies, children and young people
- The working age population and those recently retired
- People in vulnerable circumstances who may have poor access to primary care

- People experiencing a mental health problems

Before our inspection we carried out an analysis of the data from our intelligent monitoring system. We also reviewed information we held and asked other organisations and key stakeholders to share what they knew about the service.

We reviewed the policies, procedures and other information the practice provided before the inspection. The information reviewed did not highlight any significant areas of risk across the five key question areas.

We reviewed all areas of the practice including the administrative areas. We sought views from patients through 12 face-to-face interviews. We spoke with GPs, the practice manager, clinical nurses, a practice nurse, community nurse, patient engagement lead, a clinical pharmacist, a data quality manager and receptionists.

We observed how staff treated patients when they visited or phoned the practice. We reviewed how the GP made clinical decisions. We reviewed a variety of documents used by the practice to run the service.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was a system in place for reporting and recording significant events. Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents. All complaints received by the practice were entered onto the system and automatically treated as a significant event. The practice carried out regular analysis of significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared (via the intranet) to make sure action was taken to improve confidentiality in the practice. For example better management of conversations being overheard in reception.

Safety was monitored using information from a range of sources, including National Patient Safety Agency (NPSA) and National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. This enabled staff to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture of safety.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice could demonstrate its safe track record through having risk management systems in place for safeguarding, health and safety including infection control, medication management and staffing.

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard adults and children 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 GP 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.
- A notice was displayed in the waiting room, advising patients that nurses would act as chaperones, if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and were in the process of receiving a disclosure and barring check (DBS). These 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.
- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available. The practice did not have up to date fire risk assessments and regular fire drills were not carried out. 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 also 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.
- Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were followed. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. The introduction of a schedule for cleaning to maintain effective infection control monitoring was being implemented as a result of feedback from our visit. The practice had not carried out Legionella risk assessments and regular monitoring was not being implemented.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). Regular medication audits were carried out with the support of the clinical pharmacist to ensure the practice was prescribing in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use.
- Recruitment checks were carried out and the staff files we sampled showed that recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, references, qualifications and registration with the appropriate professional body. Appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service were being processed.

Are services safe?

- 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 during all times.

Arrangements to deal with 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. There was a first aid kit and accident book available. Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment and consent

The practice carried out assessments and treatment in line with National Institute for Health

and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines and had systems in place to ensure all clinical staff were kept up to date. The practice had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to develop how care and treatment was delivered to meet needs. For example, NICE guidance for patients with diabetes. The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments and audits.

Patients' consent to care and treatment was always sought in line with legislation and guidance. Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, assessments of capacity to consent were also carried out in line with relevant guidance. Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment. The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits to ensure it met the practice's responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice participated in the Quality and Outcomes Framework system (QOF). This is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice. The practice used the information collected for the QOF and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. Current results were 96% of the total number of points available. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 4 August showed

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better to the national average.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was similar to the national average.

- Performance for mental health related and hypertension indicators was better to the national average.
- The dementia diagnosis rate was comparable to the national average.

Clinical audits were carried out and all relevant staff were involved to improve care and treatment and people's outcomes. There had been a few clinical audits completed in the last two years, both of these were completed audits where the improvements made were checked and monitored. The practice participated in applicable 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 included Diabetes care and the use of Sitagliptin if other drugs used did not control blood glucose.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed non-clinical members of staff that covered such topics as fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- 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 these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision, and facilitation and support for the revalidation of doctors. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

and their intranet system. This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.

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

Consent to care and treatment

Patients' consent to care and treatment was always sought in line with legislation and guidance. Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, assessments of capacity to consent were also carried out in line with relevant guidance. Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment. The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits to ensure it met the practices responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Health promotion and prevention

Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice. These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, 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. Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 85.8% (QOF year 2014/15), which was comparable with the national average of 81.8% (national average 2013/14 taken from Primary Care webtool). There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test.

Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 79.2%, and at risk groups 65.04%. These were above national averages of 72.9% for over 65's and 53.2% for at risk. Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under twos ranged from 94% to 100% and five year olds from 97% to 100%.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We observed throughout the inspection that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients both attending at the reception desk and on the telephone. Curtains were provided in consulting rooms so that patients' privacy and dignity was maintained during examinations, investigations and treatments. We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations and that conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.

Of the 27 out of 32 patient CQC comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. The other comments did not have a specific trend, one related to a disabled parking space and another to lighting in the car park. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. We also spoke with 12 patients on the day of our inspection. 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.

Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs. Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Almost ninety per-cent of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 87%.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were happy with how they were treated and that this was with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was in line for its satisfaction scores on consultations with doctors and nurses. For example:

- 81% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 89%.
- 87% said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 87%.

- 88% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and national average of 95%
- 83% 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%.
- 91% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 91% and national average of 90%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients we spoke with on the day of our inspection told us that health issues were discussed with them and 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 we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment and results were in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 92% 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%.
- 82% 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%

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.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. There was a carer's register and 1% of the practice list had been identified as carers and were being

Are services caring?

supported, for example, by offering health checks. Written information was available for carers to ensure they understood 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 worked with the local CCG (Clinical Commissioning Group) to improve outcomes for patients in the area.

Speaking with the patient engagement officer they told us that the practice was developing an active PPG (Patient Participation Group) which would meet on a regular basis, carry out patient surveys and submit proposals for improvements to the practice management team.

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

- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability (up to half an hour).
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Urgent access appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities, hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice was planning to move to new premises to improve service.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 08:30am and 6:00pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 08:30 to 12:00pm every morning and 12:00pm to 5:40pm daily. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to two weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available.

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

- 77% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 75% and national average of 75%.
- 79% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 74% and national average of 73%.
- 74% patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 74% and national average of 73%.
- 82% patients said they usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time compared to the CCG average of 66% and national average of 65%.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a 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. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint.

We looked at four complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care.

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. Details of the vision and practice values were part of the practice's strategy and forward looking business plan.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance policy. This outlined the structures and procedures in place and incorporated seven key areas: clinical effectiveness, risk management, patient experience and involvement, resource effectiveness, strategic effectiveness and learning effectiveness.

Governance systems in the practice were underpinned by:

- A clear staffing structure and a staff awareness of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies that were implemented and that all staff could access.
- A system of reporting incidents without fear of recrimination and whereby learning from outcomes of analysis of incidents actively took place.
- A system of continuous audit cycles which demonstrated an improvement on patients' welfare.
- Clear methods of communication that involved the whole staff team and other healthcare professionals to disseminate best practice guidelines and other information.
- In the process of gaining patients' feedback and engaging patients in the delivery of the service. Acting on any concerns raised by both patients and staff.
- The GPs were all supported to address their professional development needs for revalidation and all staff in appraisal schemes and continuing professional development. The GPs had learnt from incidents and complaints.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The partners in the practice have the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritise safe, high quality and compassionate care. The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always take the time to listen to all members of staff. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty.

Staff told us that regular team meetings were held. Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and 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, and was looking to proactively gaining patients' feedback and engaging patients in the delivery of the service. It was in the process of gaining feedback in the future from patients through the patient participation group (PPG).

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

Innovation

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