

Dr Mumuksh Patel

Quality Report

Dr Mumuksh Patel

1 Glebe Street

Chiswick

London

W4 2BD

Tel: 020 8747 4800

Website: www.glebestreetsurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 16 May 2017

Date of publication: 27/06/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Good



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

| | |
|---|----|
| Overall summary | 2 |
| The five questions we ask and what we found | 4 |
| The six population groups and what we found | 7 |
| What people who use the service say | 10 |

Detailed findings from this inspection

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Our inspection team | 11 |
| Background to Dr Mumuksh Patel | 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 Dr Mumuksh Patel on 5 January 2016. The overall rating for the practice was requires improvement. The full comprehensive report can be found by selecting the Dr Mumuksh Patel 'all reports' link for on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

This inspection was an announced comprehensive inspection carried out on 16 May 2017 to confirm that the practice had carried out their plan to meet the legal requirements in relation to the breaches in regulations that we identified in our previous inspection on 5 January 2016. This report covers our findings in relation to those requirements and additional improvements made since our last inspection.

Overall the practice is now 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 a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients we spoke with 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.

Summary of findings

- 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 the requirements of the duty of candour. Examples we reviewed showed the practice complied with these requirements.

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.

Good



- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed, we found there was an effective system 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 were informed as soon as practicable, 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 to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff demonstrated that they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- The practice had adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national average.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge 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.
- End of life care was coordinated with other services involved.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice in line with others for most aspects of care.

Summary of findings

- Survey information we reviewed showed that 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 accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting conditions, including patients with a condition other than cancer and patients living with dementia.
- Patients we spoke with 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 evidence from two examples reviewed 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 policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- An overarching governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received inductions, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour.

Good



Summary of findings

- The principal GP encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents and sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on. The practice engaged with the patient participation group.
- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels. Staff training was a priority and was built into staff rotas.
- GPs who were skilled in specialist areas used their expertise to offer additional services to patients.

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.

Good



- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified at an early stage older patients who may need palliative care as they were approaching the end of life. It involved older patients in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs.
- Where older patients had complex needs, the practice shared summary care records with local care services.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in long-term disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood test was 62 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months, was higher than the national average (practice 82%; national 78%).
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less (01/04/2015 to 31/03/2016) was higher than the national average (practice 81%; national 78%).
- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- There were emergency processes for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.
- All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for a structured annual review to check their

Summary of findings

health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found there were systems to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us, on the day of inspection, that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- The practice provided support for premature babies and their families following discharge from hospital.

Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

- The practice worked with midwives, health visitors and school nurses to support this population group. For example, in the provision of ante-natal, post-natal and child health surveillance clinics.
- The practice had emergency processes for acutely ill children and young people and for acute pregnancy complications.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of these populations had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care, for example, extended opening hours and Saturday appointments.
- 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.

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.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice had information available for vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed knew how to recognise signs of abuse in children, young people and adults whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. They 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.

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).

- 80% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was comparable to the national average. The practice had eleven patients who were eligible for the screening
- The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and dementia.
- The practice had a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving medicines for mental health needs.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.
- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016 for the most recent data. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Two hundred and fifty survey forms were distributed and 115 were returned. This represented 46% of the survey group and 3% of the practice list size.

- 85% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.
- 67% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.

- 74% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared with the CCG average of 75% and to the national average of 80%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 29 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients reported that staff at the practice were always attentive to their needs and they felt well cared for by all staff at the practice

We spoke with four patients during the inspection. All patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring and paid attention to detail which they found to be very useful.

Dr Mumuksh Patel

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser.

Background to Dr Mumuksh Patel

The surgery is located in the London Borough of Hounslow, and provides a general practice service to around 4000 patients from a converted building. The practice is registered as a single handed GP with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to provide the regulated activities of: treatment of disease, disorder or injury; diagnostic and screening procedures and family planning

services; and maternity and midwifery services at one location.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract and provides a full range of essential, additional and enhanced services including maternity services, child and adult immunisations, family planning, sexual health services and minor surgery.

The practice has one male GP working eight sessions, a salaried female GP working six sessions and locum GPs are used when required. The practice has a part time practice manager; the rest of the practice team consists of one part time practice nurse, two health care assistants and eight administrative staff consisting of medical secretaries, reception staff, clerks and typist.

The practice also hosts Foundation year two doctor trainees in conjunction with another local practice.

The practice is currently open five days a week from 08:15-18:00. Consultation times are 08:15 until 12:30 and 15:00 until 18:00. When the practice is closed, the telephone answering service directs patients to contact the out of hours provider.

The practice had been previously inspected and areas for improvement were found.

Why we carried out this inspection

We undertook a comprehensive inspection of Dr Mumuksh Patel on 05 January 2016 under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The practice was rated as requires improvement for providing safe, effective and well led services. Overall the practice was rated as requires improvement. The full comprehensive report following the inspection on 5 January 2016 can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Dr Mumuksh Patel on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

We undertook a further announced comprehensive inspection of Dr Mumuksh Patel on 16 May 2017. This inspection was carried out to review the actions taken by the practice to improve the quality of care and to confirm that the practice was now meeting legal requirements.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit

On 16 May 2017. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

Spoke with a range of staff including the principal GP, salaried GP, practice manager; nurse & administrative staff and spoke with patients who used the service.

- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.
- Visited all practice locations
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver care and treatment plans.

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

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?

- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 05 January 2016, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing safe services as the arrangements in respect of reporting significant events and dealing with medical emergencies required improvements.

These arrangements had significantly improved when we undertook a follow up inspection on 16 May 2017. The practice is now rated as good for providing safe services.

Safe track record and learning

There was a system for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- From the sample of six documented examples we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed. The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, the practice was working with secondary care providers to address concerns where urgent referrals were not being accepted and the practice was not being advised to ensure alternative arrangements were being made for patients.
- The practice also monitored trends in significant events and evaluated any action taken.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to minimise risks to patient safety.

- Arrangements for safeguarding 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.
- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3 and the practice nurse to level 2.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).

The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene.

- We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- The practice nurse was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.

The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice minimised risks to patient safety (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal).

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. Repeat prescriptions were signed before being dispensed to patients and there was a reliable process to ensure this occurred. The practice carried out regular

Are services safe?

medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. However we found that the clinic did not have a system to monitor the use of blank prescription forms and pads for use by the principal GP on home visits. When we spoke with the practice manager and the principal GP they told us they had no system in place as the GP was no longer using paper prescriptions on home visits. Therefore the practice took action to destroy the paper prescriptions. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified).

- Health care assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines and patient specific prescriptions or directions from a prescriber were produced appropriately. (A patient specific direction is the traditional written instruction, from an independent prescriber, for medicines to be supplied or administered to a named patient).
- The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse) and had procedures to manage them safely. There were also arrangements for the destruction of controlled drugs. When we spoke to the practice to ascertain the reasons for keeping the controlled drugs they told us the practice had historically kept controlled drugs and they would review this. However following our inspection the practice wrote to us to let us know they had made a decision not to keep controlled drugs and they had removed these from the premises and safely disposed them off safely.
- We reviewed six personnel files and found

Monitoring risks to patients

There were procedures for assessing, monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety.

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire

marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.

- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.
- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments 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).
- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system to ensure enough staff were on duty to meet the needs of patients.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- At our previous inspection on 5 January 2016. We found that the practice did not have AED nor a risk assessment to mitigate the reasons on not keeping one on site. During this inspection we found that the practice had carried out a risk assessment as to whether they needed to have a defibrillator available on the premises. The practice had assessed that they were located within minutes from the local ambulance station as well as the local hospital and therefore they did not require to have a defibrillator on the premises. The CQC GP clinical advisor felt that the arrangements were safe.
- A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.

Are services safe?

- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan 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

At our previous inspection on 5 January 2016 we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing effective services as the arrangements in respect of clinical audits, lack of formal records to show multidisciplinary work was taking place and staff appraisal needed improving.

These arrangements had significantly improved when we undertook a follow up inspection on 16 May 2017. The provider is now rated as good for providing effective services.

Effective needs assessment

Clinicians were aware of relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- The practice had systems 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 99% of the total number of points available. This was higher than the CCG and national averages of 95% respectively.

This practice was not an outlier for any performance data.

Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood test was 62 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months, was higher than the national average (practice 82%; national 78%).

- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less (01/04/2015 to 31/03/2016 was higher than the national average (practice 81%; national 78%).

When we inspected the practice, on 5 January 2016, there was no evidence of any two cycle clinical audits to demonstrate quality improvement in patient outcomes.

At this inspection there was evidence of quality improvement including completed clinical audits.

- There had been two clinical audits carried out since our last inspection, both of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included reviewing the care of patients with cardiac problems to ensure they were on the correct anticoagulation medicines. During the first cycle the practice identified 40 patients that were taking these medicines. Eleven of these patients did not have the correct anti-coagulation. The practice initiated treatment for three of these patients; six of them refused the correct medicines and another two did not require to be on the medicines. The second cycle of the audit did not identify any discrepancies with prescribing and the practice were monitoring this regularly going forwards.

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. At our last inspection on 5 January 2016, we found that not all staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months. During this inspection we found that the practice had made improvements and all staff had an up to date appraisal.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, and 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

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. At our last inspection we found that; though 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. The practice did not routinely record and maintain a record of discussions and decisions

from these meetings. At this inspection we found that the practice had developed a formalised way of ensuring that all the meetings were recorded and minutes were available.

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 receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 84%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 78% and 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. 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. 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 comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 80% to 91% and five year olds from 78% to 98%.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 5 January 2016, we rated the practice as good for providing caring services. At our follow up inspection on 16 May 2017 we also found the practice was good for providing caring services.

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

- We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.
- Screen shields 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.
- Patients could be treated by a clinician of the same sex if that was their preference.
- All of the 29 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.
- We spoke with six patients. They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comments 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 above average for most of its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:
 - 91% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
 - 86% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 87%.

- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 92%
- 88% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 85%.
- 86% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 87% and the national average of 91%.
- 87% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 92%.
- 99% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 97%.
- 84% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 96%.
- 83% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with 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:

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

Are services caring?

compared to the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 82%. 84% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 90%.

- 80% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 85%

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

- Staff told us that interpretation 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. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital.

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. Support for isolated or house-bound patients included signposting to relevant support and volunteer services.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 40 patients as carers (1 % of the practice list). However the practice told us that they were continually reviewing the current system to ensure it captured all the necessary information to offer appropriate support. 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 or sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 5 January 2016, we rated the practice as good for providing responsive services. At our follow up inspection on 16 May 2017 we also found the practice was good for providing responsive services.

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population:

- 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.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions. There were early and ongoing conversations with these patients about their end of life care as part of their wider treatment and care planning.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice sent text message reminders of appointments and test results.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately/ were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- The practice has considered and implemented the NHS England Accessible Information Standard to ensure that disabled patients receive information in formats that they can understand and receive appropriate support to help them to communicate.

Access to the service

The practice is currently open five days a week from 08:15-18:00. Consultation times are 08:15 until 12:30 and 15:00 until 18:00. When the practice is closed, the telephone answering service directs patients to contact the out of hours provider. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for

people that needed them. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 66% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 75% and the national average of 80%.
- 70% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared with the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 73%.
- 73% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 76%.
- 90% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 91%.
- 67% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.
- 74% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 48% and the national average of 58%.

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

The practice had a system to assess:

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

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system for handling complaints and concerns.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. This was included in the practice information leaflet and displayed in the reception area.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, openness and transparency with dealing with the complaint et. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, the practice were working with secondary care to improve the process of referrals after receiving a complaint from a patient whose care was delayed by a local hospital.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 5 January 2016, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing well-led services as the practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity, but some of these were not dated so we were not assured that they reflected current practice. We also found that whilst they were some systems in place to monitor and improve quality and identify risk. Improvements were required.

When we undertook a follow up inspection of the service on 16 May 2017 we found the practice had made significant improvements. The practice is now rated as good for being well-led.

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- At our last inspection we found that whilst the practice had a clear strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored. They did not reflect some challenges the practice was facing with an increased patient list and lack of space to manage this. At this inspection we found that though the practice's patient list was under control; they had plans in place to work with other local practices to deal with these challenges.

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 and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs and nurses had lead roles in key areas.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. At our previous inspection on 5 January 2016 we found that some of the policies not

dated so we were not assured that they reflected current practice. At this follow up inspection we found that these were all updated and were being reviewed regularly.

- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained. Practice meetings were held monthly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.
- At our previous inspection we found that the practice did not have a programme of continuous clinical and internal audit that was used to monitor quality and to make improvements. At this inspection we found that improvements had been made and continuous audit was ongoing.
- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. At our previous we found that the practice had not completed a risk assessment to support their decision of not having AED on site. At this follow up inspection we found that the practice had carried out an assessment to mitigate lack of AED and there was a system in place for reviewing and identifying risks.
- We saw evidence from minutes of a meetings structure that allowed for lessons to be learned and shared following significant events and complaints.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the principal GP and the practice manager 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 provider was aware of and had systems 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.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

From the sample of three documented examples we reviewed we found that the practice had systems 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 and staff felt supported by management.

- The practice held and minuted a range of multi-disciplinary meetings including meetings with district nurses and social workers to monitor vulnerable patients. GPs, where required, met with health visitors to monitor vulnerable families and safeguarding concerns.
- At our previous inspection on 5 January 2016 we found that; though the practice held regular team meetings. The practice did not have a consistent way of recording and storing the practice minutes. During this follow up inspection we found that all minutes of meetings were comprehensive and were available for practice staff to view.
- 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 was also part of a CCG initiative that had been introduced to facilitate Patient Participation Groups. This was still work in progress and the practice were actively encouraging their patients to join the group.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example the practice was working with other local practices to formalise hub working in order to manager resources much more efficiently.