

Ashville Surgery

Quality Report

Swan House,
24 Parsons Green Lane,
London SW6 4HS
Tel: 020 7371 7171
Website: www.ashvillesurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 20 January 2016
Date of publication: 15/04/2016

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

Ratings

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

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Ashville Surgery	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Ashville Medical centre on 20 January 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 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 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.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure regular staff meetings are held.
- Review the practices opening hours in light of patient feedback in the GP patient survey.

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 there were unintended or unexpected 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.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated good for providing effective services.

- Our findings at inspection showed that systems were in place to ensure that all clinicians were up to date with both National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines and other locally agreed guidelines.
- We also saw evidence to confirm that these guidelines were positively influencing and improving practice and outcomes for patients. The practice computers had links to clinical guidelines and had developed protocols and templates for long term conditions.
- Data showed that the practice performance was better than neighbouring practices in the Clinical Commissioning Group.
- The practice met with other local providers to share best practice.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Summary of findings

- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

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

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population. Patients over 75 years had a named GP to co-ordinate their care.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- The practice was pro-actively managing patients with long term conditions (LTC). The practice nurse was the lead on managing patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) and asthma. Annual reviews and spirometry for patients with COPD were carried out. Patients with COPD were all given self-management plans and had 'rescue antibiotics' and oral steroids at home. Patients had guidance on how and when to use them.
- Services such as spirometry, phlebotomy, ABPM and anticoagulation management service were carried out at the practice.
- The practice had scored 97.2% on the recent QOF report for diabetes which was above the CCG average.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- Systems were in place for identifying and following-up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk. For example, they would refer families for additional support and had multidisciplinary meetings with health visitors where any safeguarding concerns would be discussed.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice triaged all requests for appointments on the day for all children when their parent requested the child be seen for urgent medical matters, thus were able to offer appointments at a mutually convenient times, for example after school, when appropriate
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses. Monthly meetings were held, however health visitors were based relatively close to the practice which allowed them to discuss any concerns they had immediately.

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 practice offered working age patients access to extended appointments three times a week. They also had GP telephone triage for all requests for same day appointments, which enabled telephone consultations where appropriate, without patients having to take time off work.
- They offered on-line services which included appointment management, viewing patient records, repeat prescriptions and registration.
- Patients had access to NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The GPs told us that patients whose circumstances may make them vulnerable such as people with learning disabilities and homeless patients, were coded on appropriate registers.

Good



Summary of findings

- These patients had 'pop ups' on their computer notes to alert all members of staff of vulnerable patients. GPs told us this was to allow them to meet their specific additional needs such as double appointments, interpreter, visual/hearing impaired, carer details, and risk assessment stratification.
- Patients with learning disabilities were invited annually for a specific review with their named GP. We saw all ten on the register had reviews carried out in the last 12 months.

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 practice had a register of patients experiencing poor mental health. These patients were invited to attend annual physical health checks and all 55 had been reviewed in the last 12 months.
- There was a primary care mental health worker (PCMH) based at the practice one day a week, whose role included supporting patients with mental illness transfer from secondary care back to primary care. GPs could also refer new patients to them.
- There were monthly reviews of all patients being seen by the PCMH worker with the lead GP
- Reception staff we spoke with were aware of signs to recognise for patients in crisis and to have them urgently assessed by a GP if presented.
- The practice had achieved 100% of the latest QOF points for patients with Dementia which was above both CCG and national averages.
- The practice had annual reviews for patients with dementia, which included early consideration of advance care planning and discussing power of attorney issues. All dementia patients had a care plan which both they and carers had been involved in drafting.
- Dementia friendly training had been arranged for all staff at the practice.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in July 2015 showed the practice was performing above local and national averages. There were 111 responses and a response rate of 27%.

- 70% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 75% and a national average of 73%.
- 89% found the receptionists at this surgery helpful compared to CCG average of 85% and a national average 87%
- 81% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to a CCG average 83% and a national average 85%
- 92% said the last appointment they got was convenient compared to a CCG average 83% and a national average 92%.

- 70% described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to a CCG average 72% and a national average 73%.
- 80% usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen (CCG average 53%, national average 65%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 47 comment cards and although all positive about the standard of care received, there were some comments relating to not being able to get through on the phone. Patients felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were considerate and treated them with dignity and respect

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

Ashville 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 advisor and an Expert by Experience.

Background to Ashville Surgery

Ashville Surgery provides GP primary care services to approximately 10000 people living in Hammersmith and Fulham. Fulham is a mixed community and the practice is located in an area with predominantly professional families to the south, single occupancy and shared flats to the north and a number of social housing estates to the east.

The practice is staffed by five GPs, two males and three female doctors who work a combination of full and part time hours, totalling 4.5 WTE. Other staff included two nurses, a HCA and ten administrative staff. The practice holds a General Medical Services (GMS) contract and was commissioned by NHSE London. The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures, treatment of disease, disorder and injury and maternity and midwifery services.

The practice was open from 8.30am to 6pm Mondays to Friday, except Thursday when they closed at 1pm. They had extended hours on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesday – between 6.30pm and 8pm. The telephones were staffed throughout working hours. Appointment slots were available throughout the opening hours. The out of hours services are provided by an alternative provider. The details of the ‘out of hours’ service were communicated in a

recorded message accessed by calling the practice when closed and details can also be found on the practice website. Longer appointments were available for patients who needed them and those with long-term conditions. This also included appointments with a named GP or nurse. Pre-bookable appointments could be booked up to two weeks in advance; urgent appointments were available for people that needed them.

The practice provided a wide range of services for patients with diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), contraception and child health care. The practice also provided health promotion services including a flu vaccination programme and cervical screening.

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.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting we reviewed a range of information we hold about the service and asked other organisations such as Healthwatch, to share what they knew about the service.

We carried out an announced visit on 20 January 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (doctors, nurse, practice manager and receptionists) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Reviewed policies and procedures, records and various documentation
- Reviewed Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards where patients shared their views and experiences of the service.

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 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 mental health problems

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.

- They had processes in place for documenting and discussing reported incidents. Staff were encouraged to log any significant event or incident and we saw there was a template located on the shared drive for all staff to complete when an incident occurred. Staff we spoke with were aware of their responsibilities to bring them to the attention of the practice manager. These were usually discussed on the day they occurred and at the weekly partners and monthly staff meetings. Minutes were also sent out to staff not present at these meetings.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events on a quarterly basis and sent annual reports to the CCG.

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, we saw that where a specific medication was given on repeat prescription without reviewing how effective it had been with the patient, the practice implemented a process of contacting patients before giving repeat prescriptions for certain medications. We saw the information was circulated to all clinicians and the practice protocols updated.

When there were unintended or unexpected 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 patients 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 lead GP attended all external safeguarding meetings.

- A chaperone policy was in place and there were visible notices on the waiting room noticeboard and in consulting rooms. We were told only clinical staff act as chaperones. All staff providing these duties had been Disclosure and Barring Service checked. (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).
- Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were followed. There was an infection control policy and protocols in place. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control lead and had undertaken further training to enable them to provide advice on the practice infection control policy and carry out staff training. All staff had received training. The practice completed annual audits and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. Cleaning records were kept which showed that all areas in the practice were cleaned daily, and the toilets were also checked regularly throughout the day and cleaned when needed.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). The practice carried out regular medicines audits, and liaised with the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. We saw records to confirm that temperature checks of the fridges were carried out daily to ensure that vaccinations were stored within the correct temperature range. There was a clear procedure to follow if temperatures were outside the recommended range. Prescription 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

Are services safe?

legislation. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable Health Care Assistants to administer vaccinations after specific training when a doctor or nurse were on the premises.

- We reviewed six 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.

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. The practice had a health and safety policy which staff were required to read as part of their induction. This was accessible on all computer desktops for staff. There was a fire risk assessment in place, all fire equipment had been serviced in December 2015 and a fire drill had taken place in June 2015. There was a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health, infection control and legionella. (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Staff we spoke with told us they had sufficient equipment to enable them to carry out diagnostic examinations, assessments and treatments. They told us that all equipment was tested and maintained

regularly and we saw equipment maintenance logs and other records that confirmed this. Portable electrical equipment testing (PAT) had been carried out in November 2015. We saw evidence of calibration of relevant equipment; for example, blood pressure monitors, ECG, weighing scales and pulse oximeter which had been carried out in December 2015.

- The practice manager Procedures were in place to manage expected absences, such as annual leave, and unexpected absences through staff sickness. For example, the senior receptionist provided cover for the receptionist staff when needed for all absences.

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 nurses 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 was 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

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 GPs and nursing staff we spoke with could clearly outline the rationale for their treatment approaches. They were familiar with current best practice guidance and accessing guidelines from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and from local commissioners. We saw the practice had weekly clinical meetings where new guidelines were disseminated, the implications for the practice's performance and patients were discussed and required actions agreed.
- 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 99% of the total number of points available, with 16% 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). We were told that level of exception reporting was due to a number of factors that included the surgery has a very mobile population with significant numbers of patients moving into and out of the area, they have many very elderly patients with extreme frailty and a number of patients are seen by the private sector therefore opt out of follow ups / reviews. However, they said all of their exception reporting for 2014-15 was undertaken with reference to, and compliance with, accepted guidelines.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from QOF showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 97%, which was 11% above the CCG and 5% above national averages.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 100%, which was 5% above the CCG and 2% above national averages.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100%, which was 14 % above the CCG and 7% above national averages.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been five clinical audits carried out in the last year. All were completed where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. For example, the practice had carried out an anticoagulation audit to ensure that all patients prescribed the anti-coagulant Warfarin were on the practice register, had a 'Yellow' book in which should be written the indication for which they were taking it, as well as a record of International Normalised Ratio (INR) readings and Warfarin dosage. On first audit they found there were 43 patients being prescribed warfarin and only 30 had up to date information in the books. On re-audit a further 2 patients were added to the register and 41 had up to date reviews on record. 4 patients did not have a recent documented INR despite being prescribed warfarin. Of these, one was self-testing (most days), one was a documented dissenter and however the practice continued to prescribe Warfarin because the benefits outweighed the potential risks. 2 others were attending the INR clinic at one of the local hospitals and the practice put in place a process to ensure that were either sent a copies of the most recent INR test for their patients.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.

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 learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 revalidating GPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.

- The nurse who administered vaccinations and took samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. They had attended refresher training and accessed on line resources to ensure they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes.
- 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 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 were discharged from hospital. All patients deemed vulnerable or with complex needs had care plans which they had been involved in drafting. They included information about how to manage their conditions. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place bi-monthly and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated. The district nursing team and health visitors

were based a few minutes' walk from the practice and met regularly with the GP's to discuss care planning concerns and often had ad hoc discussions when they had serious concerns about patients.

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 (MCA).
- 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. We saw evidence of this in patient's records.
- The practice also documented in patients notes if they had refused a chaperone when offered.

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 HCA was the Smoking Cessation adviser, who provided advice, counselling and support to patients trying to stop smoking'. At the time of the inspection, the HCA was on maternity leave, but there was a smoking cessation worker who ran designated clinics for smokers wishing to quit.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79%, which was comparable to the national average of 81%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Are services effective? (for example, treatment is effective)

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were above CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 71% to 91% and five year olds from 61% to 89%.

Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 63%, and at risk groups 25%. These were however below the CCG and national averages. The practice told us their take up of flu vaccination this year was considerably lower than last year due to a number of their patients having these carried out elsewhere and had not informed them.

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-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

A wide range of information was displayed in the waiting area of the practice and on the practice website to raise awareness of health issues including information on cancer, fever in children and influenza. There was also information about local health and community resources.

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 47 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 considerate and treated them with dignity and respect. However, we did receive a few comments regarding having trouble getting through on the phone and the length of time patients had to wait for a routine appointment. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Patients we spoke with on the day told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

We reviewed the most recent data available for the practice about patient satisfaction. This included information from the national GP patient survey from 2015 where 86% patients said they would recommend this practice.

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

- 92% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 89%.
- 89% said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 87%.

- 98% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average 95% and national average 95%
- 91% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average 84% and national average 85%.
- 92% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average 85% and national average 91%.
- 89% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average 85%, national average 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 in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 94% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 90%.
- 89% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 79% and national average 82%.
- 88% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 78% and national average 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

Are services caring?

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. The practice had identified there were 50 carers on their list. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that all patients' deaths were discussed at the weekly clinical meeting and if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them and sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice attended a monthly locality meeting with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other practices to discuss local needs and plan service improvements that needed to be prioritised such as A&E attendances and prescribing.

- Patients over 75 years had a named GP to co-ordinate their care. One GP specifically focused on older people care and carried out home visits when needed. Double appointments were available for these patients when required.
- The practice held registers for patients in receipt of palliative care, had complex needs or had long term conditions. Patients in these groups had a care plan and would be allocated longer appointment times when needed. Reception staff supported clinicians in ensuring annual reviews were completed for all patients in this group.
- The practice was pro-actively managing patients with Long term conditions (LTC). The practice nurse was the lead on managing patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) and asthma. Patients with COPD were all given self-management plans and had 'rescue antibiotics' and oral steroids at home. Patients also had guidance on how and when to use them. Services such as spirometry, phlebotomy, ABPM and anticoagulation management service were carried out at the practice.
- Systems were in place for identifying and following-up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk. For example, they would refer families for additional support and had multidisciplinary meetings with health visitors where any safeguarding concerns would be discussed. The practice triaged all requests for appointments on the day for all children when their parent requested the child be seen for urgent medical matters, thus were able to offer appointments at a mutually convenient times, for example after school, when appropriate. and told us they promoted sexual health screening.
- The practice offered working age patients access to extended appointments three times a week. They offered on-line services which included appointment management, viewing patient records, repeat prescriptions and registration. They also had GP telephone triage for all requests for same day appointments, which enabled telephone consultations where appropriate, without patients having to take time off work.
- The GPs told us that patients whose circumstances may make them vulnerable such as people with learning disabilities and homeless patients, were coded on appropriate registers. These patients had 'pop ups' on their computer notes to alert all members of staff of vulnerable patients. GPs told us this was to allow them to meet their specific additional needs such as double appointments, interpreter, visual/hearing impaired, carer details, and risk assessment stratification. Patients with learning disabilities were invited annually for a specific review with their named GP. We saw all ten on the register had reviews carried out in the last 12 months.
- The practice had a register of patients experiencing poor mental health. These patients were invited to attend annual physical health checks and all 55 had been reviewed in the last 12 months. There was a primary care mental health worker (PCMH) based at the practice one day a week whose role included supporting patients with mental illness transfer from secondary care back to primary care. GPs could also refer new patients to them. We saw there were monthly reviews of all patients being seen by the PCMH worker with the lead GP. Patients were also referred to other services such as MIND. Reception staff we spoke with were aware of signs to recognise for patients in crisis and to have them urgently assessed by a GP if presented.
- The practice had achieved 100% of the latest QOF points for patients with Dementia which was above both CCG and national averages. The practice had annual reviews for patients with dementia, which included early

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

consideration of advance care planning and discussing power of attorney issues. All dementia patients had a care plan which both they and carers had been involved in drafting.

- The premises were accessible to patients with disabilities and there was a hearing loop installed. The waiting area was large enough to accommodate patients with wheelchairs and allowed for easy access. Accessible toilet facilities were available for all patients attending the practice.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8.30am to 6pm Mondays to Friday, except Thursday when they closed at 1pm. They had extended hours on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesday – between 6.30pm and 8pm. The telephones were staffed throughout working hours. Appointment slots were available throughout the opening hours. The out of hours services are provided by an alternative provider. The details of the 'out of hours' service were communicated in a recorded message accessed by calling the practice when closed and details can also be found on the practice website. Longer appointments were available for patients who needed them and those with long-term conditions. This also included appointments with a named GP or nurse. Pre-bookable appointments could be booked up to two weeks in advance; urgent appointments were available for people that needed them.

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

- 64% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and national average of 75%.
- 70% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 75%, national average 73%).

- 68% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 57%, national average 59%).

People 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 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. All verbal complaints were recorded.
- The practice manager handled all complaints in the practice. We saw that these were analysed on a quarterly basis and the outcome and actions were sent to all members of staff.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system, for example posters were displayed on notice boards and a summary leaflet was available and given to patients when they registered. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow should they wish to make a complaint. None of the patients we spoke with had ever needed to make a complaint about the practice.

We looked at four complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were dealt with in a timely way, in line with the complaints policy and there were no themes emerging. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, we saw that where patients had complained about the information included in a referral letter the practice had written and apologised to the patient and had reviewed the wording of their letters.

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 vision and values was to deliver friendly, informal family medicine of a high standard in a 'homely', not overly medicalised or clinical environment.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were monitored at their annual away day.

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. We spoke with seven members of staff and they were all clear about their own roles and responsibilities. They told us they felt valued, well supported and knew who to go to in the practice with any concerns.
- The practice had a number of policies and procedures in place to govern activity and these were available to staff via the desktop on any computer within the practice. Staff had to read the key policies such as safeguarding, health and safety and infection control as part of their induction. All five policies and procedures we looked at had been reviewed and were up to date.
- The practice used the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) to measure their performance. The QOF data for this practice showed it was performing above national standards. They had scored 891 out of 900 in 2014 and 555 out of 559 in 2015 which was 8.5% above the CCG average and 4.5% above England average. We saw QOF data was regularly reviewed and discussed at the weekly clinical. The practice also took part in a peer reviewing system with neighbouring GP practices in Hammersmith and Fulham.
- There was a programme of continuous clinical and internal audit used to monitor quality and to make

improvements. The practice had carried out clinical audits in relation to NSAIDs, renal functioning, warfarin and audit of appointments and telephone calls relating to GP workloads.

- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. For example, all patients deemed vulnerable had risk assessments in their records.

Leadership and culture

The partners in the practice had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. They 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 unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The practice gave affected people 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 that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity and were happy to raise issues at team meetings. However, we were told that practice meetings were not held regularly and staff told us it had been five months since the last meeting. They however, felt they worked well together and that they were a highly functional team which listened and learnt, and were aware of their challenges such as, understanding the reporting requirements for the out of hospital contracts.
- We noted that team away days were held every year and staff told us these days were used both to assess business priorities and socialise with colleagues.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the management in the practice. All staff

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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 last survey had identified there can sometimes be delays in

getting through on the phone to reception. As a result, the practice appointed a new telephone supplier to service and maintain the system, they also recruited a new receptionist increase staff capacity to take calls.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff away days and generally through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff at all levels were actively encouraged to raise concerns. All staff we spoke with told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. They said 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. Staff were encouraged to develop and were given opportunities and training to do so. Staff told us that partners were open to learning and were receptive to suggestions about how to improve the service for patients.