

Soho Square General Practice

Quality Report

1 Frith Road

London

W1D 3HZ

Tel: 020 3405 6570

www.sohosquaregeneralpractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 18 May 2016

Date of publication: 04/11/2016

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	4
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9
Outstanding practice	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Soho Square General Practice	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Soho Square General Practice on 18 May 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

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

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

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

Summary of findings

- The provider should improve its identification of patients who are carers and the support offered to them by the practice.

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



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

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were comparable to the national averages.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

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 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.

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.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision which included achieving the highest quality care and safety standards with an open and transparent governance structure. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the 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 management team encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

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.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice worked closely with the Primary Care Navigator for the care of older patients. Primary Care Navigators are trained to listen and guide patients to the help and resources they need, from local to national services.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators were similar to the national averages. Performance for the percentage of patients on the diabetes register with a record of a foot examination was 82% in comparison to the national average of 88%; the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who had received an influenza immunisation, was 90% in comparison to the national average of 94%.
- 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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 74%, which was the same as the national average.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

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

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 practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



Summary of findings

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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national averages. 95% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had received a comprehensive, agreed care plan in the last 12 months which was above the national average of 84%.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face-to-face consultation in the last 12 months was 89% which was above the national average of 84%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above the local and national averages. Four hundred and eight survey forms were distributed and 90 were returned. This represented 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 89% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 83% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.

- 96% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.
- 90% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 36 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service MUST take to improve

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

Outstanding practice

Soho Square General Practice

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 and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Soho Square General Practice

Haverstock Healthcare Limited – Soho Square General Practice, provides GP primary medical services to approximately 3950 patients living in the London Borough of Westminster. The patient population groups served by the practice include a cross-section of socio-economic groups with a high prevalence of patients from Chinese ethnic backgrounds.

The practice team comprises of two male GPs providing 18 sessions, a service manager, two practice nurses and four administrative staff.

The practice is open between 8am-7.30pm Monday and Friday and 8am-6.30pm on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. Appointments are from 10am-1pm every morning and 4.30pm-7.30pm on Monday and Friday; 4.00pm-6.30pm on Tuesday and Wednesday. Home visits are provided for patients who are housebound or too ill to visit the practice.

The practice has a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract (PMS is one of the three contracting routes that have been available to enable the commissioning of

primary medical services). Haverstock Healthcare Limited were appointed as a caretaker of the practice in July 2015. The practice refers patients to the London Central and West Out of Hours and the NHS '111' service for healthcare advice during out of hours.

The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of maternity and midwifery services; diagnostic and screening procedures; treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

The practice provides a range of services including maternity care, childhood immunisations, chronic disease management and travel immunisations.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 18 May 2016.

Detailed findings

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (insert job roles of staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- The practice had a Duty of Candour policy in place which was available to all staff. (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).
- GPs told us that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, an incident occurred in which the plug to the medicines fridge had been unplugged in error resulting in vaccines having to be disposed of. As a result of this incident, a red cross tape was placed over the plug with a sign for this plug to not be removed from the socket. Staff were also instructed to monitor the fridge each morning and afternoon in addition to the allocated times the fridge temperature was taken and recorded. The practice also purchased an additional thermometer to ensure accurate temperature readings and monitoring of the medicines fridge.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements.

Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. One GP was the safeguarding lead for children and a second GP was the lead for safeguarding adults. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and practice nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three and administrative staff to level one.

- A notice in the waiting room and at reception 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. The Associate Director of Nursing Operations for Haverstock was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with local infection prevention teams to keep up the practice nurses up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and

Are services safe?

there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.

- We reviewed two personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available; a health and safety risk assessment had been undertaken and there was a poster in the office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out six-monthly fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit was also 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.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through clinical practice meetings.

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 95% of the total number of points available with 9% exception reporting. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national averages. For example, performance for the percentage of patients on the diabetes register with a record of a foot examination was 82% in comparison to the national average of 88%; the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who had received an influenza immunisation, was 90% in comparison to the national average of 94%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national averages. For example, 95% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had received a comprehensive, agreed care plan which was above the national average

of 84%. The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face-to-face consultation was 89% which was above the national average of 84%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been two clinical audits completed in the last ten months which were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits and national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, an audit was undertaken to assess the practice performance relating to prescribing drugs which require monitoring blood tests to be undertaken at regular intervals. The first cycle of the audit found 66% of patients had a medication review including a blood test and the second cycle showed an improvement in the performance with 88% of patients receiving a review.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements. For example, the practice provided care plans for patients with chronic diseases; vulnerable patients; and those at risk of admission to hospital. The practice actively re-called these patients for review.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction training programme for all newly appointed staff and there was a staff handbook available for all staff. The training covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality. There was also a comprehensive induction handbook in place for locum GPs and nurses.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, mentoring, clinical supervision and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

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 assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through weekly 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, HIV positive patients, 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.
- Smoking cessation advice was available from practices nurses and a CCG smoking cessation specialist.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 74%, which was the same as the national average. The practice provided 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 ensuring a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates data was not available at the time of this inspection.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs. A poster was displayed at the reception desk in both English and Chinese, informing patients they were able to talk to the reception team in private if they wished.

All of the 36 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. We spoke with four members of the patient participation group (PPG). They told us they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 97% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 85% and the national average of 89%.
- 94% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 87%.
- 100% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 95%.

- 92% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 91% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern which was the same as the national average of 91%.
- 99% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 84% 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. The majority of results were above the local and national averages. For example:

- 92% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 86%.
- 89% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 77% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

- 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?

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 24 patients as carers (0.6% of the practice list). Staff told us patient's

identified as carers were prioritised for appointments and signposted to support organisations such as 'Carers UK.' Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them. This call was either followed by a patient consultation and 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 engaged with the local CCG commissioned network plan to reduce inappropriate referrals to secondary care, prevent unnecessary hospital admissions, provide enhanced care planning for patients and ensure cost effective prescribing.

- 36% of the practice patient population were Chinese speaking and 54% of the population's first language was not English. In response to this, the practice arranged for appointments to be 15 minutes to account for potential language issues and the use of interpreters. The practice also actively recruited staff who could speak Chinese to improve communication with patients.
- The practice offered extended hours on a Monday evening until 8pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- The practice provided a walk-in service for patients each morning.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 9am-8pm on Mondays; 9am-6.30pm on Tuesdays; 9am-6pm on Wednesdays; 8.30am-6pm on Thursdays and 9am-6pm on Fridays. Appointments were from 9.30am-12.30pm and

2.30pm-8pm on Mondays; 9.30am-12.30am and 4pm-6.30pm on Tuesdays; 9.30am-12.30pm and 2.30pm-6.00pm on Wednesdays; 8.30am-12.30pm and 3pm-6pm on Fridays. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to five weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also 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 above the local and national averages.

- 89% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 86% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

The reception team recorded the patient details of those requesting a home visit and these were passed on to the GPs. Patients or carers were telephoned by one of the GPs in advance to gather information to allow for an informed decision to be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- The Service Manager was the designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system through posters in the waiting area and a practice complaints leaflet.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and

also from analysis of trends and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, in response to a complaint relating to a consultation between a patient and GP; staff were instructed to explain in detail the referral process to improve communication with patients.

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 which included achieving the highest quality care and safety standards with an open and transparent governance structure.

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice staff were supported and provided with mentoring by the wider Haverstock team such as the Medical Director and Associate Director of Nursing.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- Clinical audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the management team 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 management team were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included a practice policy which supported staff in communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

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

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, in response to feedback received from the PPG; the practice increased the number of Chinese-speaking staff recruited.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. For example, as a result of feedback from patients and staff, changes were made to the appointment system to incorporate telephone consultations twice daily. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.