

# Burngreave Surgery

## Quality Report

5 Burngreave Road  
Sheffield  
S3 9DA

Tel: 0114 272 5619

Website: [www.burngreavesurgery.co.uk](http://www.burngreavesurgery.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit: 6 June 2016

Date of publication: 21/07/2016

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

## Ratings

### Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

# Summary of findings

## Contents

### Summary of this inspection

Overall summary	Page 2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	10

### Detailed findings from this inspection

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

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Burngreave Surgery on 6 June 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.

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

We saw areas of outstanding practice:

The practice had a gym at one of their branch sites situated across the road from the practice where patients could be referred for six week exercise courses with a health trainer.

One of the practice nurses had been into local schools discussing the importance of cytology screening with teenage girls, once they reach the age of 25 years.

One of the GPs had visited the Somali community centre to discuss various health problems.

# Summary of findings

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

To develop an action plan to address survey results for telephone access.

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

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

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

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



### Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



### Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice comparable to others for several aspects of care.
- Patients told us 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 observed staff treating patients with kindness and respect and they maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Good



# Summary of findings

## Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it 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.

Good



## Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as good for being well led.

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

Good



# Summary of findings

## The six population groups and what we found

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

### Older people

Good



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

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

### People with long term conditions

Good



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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in long term condition management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance in diabetes indicators at 99.7% was higher than the CCG average of 90% and 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

Good



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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency attendances.

# Summary of findings

- Immunisation rates were slightly lower than CCG average for all standard childhood immunisations. For example, immunisation rates in children under two years ranged between 86% and 91% compared to the CCG average of 90% to 96%.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The percentage of women aged 25 to 64 years who had attended for a cervical screening test within the last five years was 72%. This was slightly lower than the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 74%.
- One of the practice nurses had been into local schools discussing the importance of cytology screening with teenage girls once they reach the age of 25 years.
- 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, district nurses, community dieticians, health visitors and school nurses.
- The practice had a larger than average child population, 26% of patients registered at the practice were under 15 years old. 42% of the children in the practice catchment area were living in poverty as measured by HM Revenue and Customs. The practice had developed good communication with social services and community support workers.

## Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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

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

## People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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

# Summary of findings

- The practice held a register of patients whose circumstances could make them vulnerable, including homeless people and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable .
- Patients were informed about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in 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.
- 62% of patients registered at the practice did not speak English as their first language. The practice had good relationships with interpreters and used a telephone interpreter service when necessary to ensure informed consent was given and advice and instructions understood. Because of the diverse mix of languages spoken by these patients it was not possible to supply leaflets in all languages.

## People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good 

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

- Performance in mental health indicators at 99% was higher than the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 93%.
- The practice regularly worked with multidisciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- Patients experiencing poor mental health had been advised 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.



# Summary of findings

- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

# Summary of findings

## What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 7 January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 408 survey forms were distributed and 112 were returned. This represented 2% of the practice patient list.

- 55% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.
- 85% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 85%.
- 78% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.

- 72% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 76% and the 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 30 CQC comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Comments received included 'I feel listened to' and 'can't fault the service'.

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

# Burngreave Surgery

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### **Our inspection team was led by:**

A CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

## Background to Burngreave Surgery

Burngreave Surgery is located in a converted house near the centre of Sheffield. It has two branches, The Cornerstone Building, 1-3 Burngreave Road, Sheffield and Herries Road Surgery, 450 Herries Road, Sheffield.

The practice provides Personal Medical Services (PMS) for 6,478 patients in the NHS Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) area. They have a higher than average population of children under 15 years old and a higher than average population of adults age 20 to 30 years old.

The practice catchment area has been identified as one of the first most deprived areas nationally.

There are two full time GP partners, one male, one female and one female part time salaried GP. The practice employs four practice nurses and two healthcare assistants. These are supported by a practice manager and a team of reception and administrative staff.

Burngreave Surgery is open from 8.30am and 6pm, Monday to Friday with the exception of Thursday when they close at 1pm.

The practice offers daily GP telephone triage with access to same day appointments. There are also prebookable appointments through the week. Extended hours with GP and nurse appointments are offered on Tuesday evenings at the Cornerstone building until 8.30pm.

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

As part of the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009: Regulation 15 we noted GP partners registered with the Care Quality Commission as the partnership did not reflect the GP partners currently at the practice. We were told this would be addressed following the inspection and the appropriate applications and notifications submitted.

## Why we carried out this inspection

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

## How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 6 June 2016. During our visit we:

## Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff including a GP, the practice manager, a nurse and reception staff. We also spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and 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 living with dementia).

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

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

### Safe track record and learning

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

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, changes were made in the way referrals were made to podiatry.

### 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 adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to level three in child safeguarding.

- 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 there was a risk assessment in place to support the decision not to have undertaken Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. (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.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed three recruitment files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

### Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available which identified local

## Are services safe?

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 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.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.

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 97.5% of the total number of points available with exception reporting at 11.6% compared to the CCG and national average of 9.4%. (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 at 99.7% was higher than the CCG average of 90.4% and the national average of 89.2%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators at 99.2% was higher than the CCG average of 94.3% and the national average of 92.8%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been several clinical audits completed in the last two years, three of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.

- The practice participated in local audits and national benchmarking.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included more regular review of female patients of child bearing age with a diagnosis of diabetes.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as looking at ways to increase attendance for cytology screening. One of the practice nurses had been into local schools discussing the importance of cytology screening with teenage girls once they reach the age of 25 years.

### Effective staffing

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

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

### Coordinating patient care and information sharing

# Are services effective?

## (for example, treatment is effective)

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.

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

### Consent to care and treatment

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

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

### Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients with palliative care needs, carers, those at risk of developing a long term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- The practice has its own gym at a branch site across the road from the practice for the benefit of patients. This

was instigated by the patient participation group. There were four sessions a week and patients could access this for six weeks through the exercise assessor. There were ladies only sessions available as well as mixed sessions.

- The practice hosted various services at its Cornerstones Building branch, including chiropody services, diabetic eye screening, community dietician, community support worker, physiotherapy, health trainers, Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT), councillors and Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT).

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 72% which was slightly lower than the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 74%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability. They always ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national bowel and breast cancer screening programmes and there was an alert added to the notes of patients who did not attend, so that this could be discussed next time they attended the practice.

There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were slightly lower than CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 86% to 91% (CCG averages 90% to 96%) and five year olds from 86% to 94% (CCG averages 89% to 96%).

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

One of the GPs had visited the Somali community centre to discuss various health problems.



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

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

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

- 94% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 91%.
- 84% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

### Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 87% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 86%.
- 89% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 82%.
- 92% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 85%.

The practice provided facilities to help patients be involved in decisions about their care information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Staff told us that interpreter services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. 62% of patients registered at the practice did not have English as their first language. We saw evidence of good relationships with interpreters, the practice staff told us that they preferred to use face to face interpreters where possible. They also used a telephone interpreter service where necessary to ensure informed consent was given and advice and instructions understood. Because of the

## Are services caring?

diverse mix of languages spoken by these patients it was not possible to supply leaflets in all languages. We were told by patients on the day of the inspection that although they found speaking English difficult, they felt welcome and were given the time they needed.

### **Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment**

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 64 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them.

# 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.

- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation. The practice had a larger than average child population, 26% of patients registered at the practice were under 15 years old. 42% of the children in the practice catchment area were living in poverty as measured by HM Revenue and Customs benefits data. The practice had developed good communication with social services and community support workers.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- Patients had access to 24 hour blood pressure monitoring where required.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and interpreter services available.

### Access to the service

Burngreave Surgery was open from 8.30am to 6pm, Monday to Friday with the exception of Thursday when they close at 1pm. Appointments were available at various times throughout the day over the three sites.

The practice offered daily GP telephone triage with access to same day appointments. There were also prebookable appointments through the week.

Extended hours with GP and nurse appointments were offered on Tuesday evenings at the Cornerstone building until 8.30pm.

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

- 62% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 75%.
- 55% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.

However, what patients told us on the day of the inspection did not reflect this. They told us that they were able to get appointments when they needed them. The practice told us that they were actively promoting the on-line booking system and had fitted an extra telephone line for telephone triage. They also had posters displayed, asking patients who did not require an appointment to ring after 10am.

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

### Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- The 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. There were posters displayed in the practice.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were handled satisfactorily in a timely way. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, referral pathways were now discussed at clinical meetings to keep up to date with any changes.

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

## Our findings

### Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which staff knew and understood.
- 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.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

### Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

### Seeking and acting on feedback from patients, the public and staff

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients, the public and staff. It proactively sought patients' feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service.

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the telephone system was changed to one that didn't cost as much to access.

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 focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice.