

Beacon Medical

Quality Report

St Hughs Avenue,
Cleethorpes
DN35 8EB
Tel: 01472 694054
Website: www.beaconmedical.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 12 May 2016
Date of publication: 04/07/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service		Good	
Are services safe?	Requires improvement		
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	7
What people who use the service say	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Beacon Medical	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13
Action we have told the provider to take	22

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Beacon Medical on 12 May 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

- 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 managed, with the exception of those relating to recruitment checks.
- 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.
- When things went wrong reviews and investigations were not thorough enough and lessons learned were not communicated widely enough to support improvement.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Data showed patient outcomes were similar compared to the national average. Although some audits had been carried out, we saw no evidence that audits were driving improvements to patient outcomes.
- Information about services and how to complain was available on the website and easy to understand. Some 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 practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity.

Summary of findings

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- Put in place a procedure to manage the implementation national medicines and safety alerts within the practice.
- Ensure recruitment procedures and policy is followed and arrangements include all necessary employment checks for all staff.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Improving the identification of carers that are registered at the practice
- Carry out two-cycle clinical audits to improve patient outcomes.

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 requires improvement for providing safe services.

Requires improvement



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- 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 did not have a system in place to ensure national medicine safety alerts were effectively managed.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. However, when things went wrong reviews and investigations were not thorough enough and lessons learned were not communicated widely enough to support improvement.
- Although risks to patients who used services were assessed, the systems and processes to address these risks were not implemented well enough to ensure patients were kept safe for example some recruitment checks for some staff had not been carried out prior to them commencing employment at the practice.

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 similar to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Although some audits had been carried out, we saw no evidence that audits were driving improvements to patient outcomes.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



Summary of findings

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for most aspects of care. For example, 92% said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at giving them enough time higher than the CCG and national averages of 87%.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We 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 urgent appointments were available the same day but it was not easy to make an appointment with a named GP (Practice 30% compared to CCG average of 40% and national average of 36%). In response, the practice introduced a triage appointment system.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.

Information about how to complain was available on the website and easy to understand. Complaints posters were not in display in reception however this was resolved by the end of the inspection. There was limited learning from complaints although when present this 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 and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.

Good



Summary of findings

- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty.
- The practice did not have a system in place to ensure national medicine safety alerts were effectively managed.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

Good



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

- Offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- Was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Employed a community complex care team to provide support and care in people's homes to avoid hospital admittance, hospital discharge follow-up, End of Life care planning, memory and capacity assessments and over 75 years clinics for mobile and housebound patients

People with long term conditions

Good



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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- 92% of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This is similar to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 88%
- 92% of patients with asthma, on the register, had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that included an assessment of asthma control using the 3 RCP questions. (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This is better than the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 75%
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

Good



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

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. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- 84% of women aged 25-64 notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This is similar to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours (from 7.30am to 6.20pm) and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice does not offer an evening clinic for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- The practice was proactive in offering online repeat prescription service as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability and used Easy Read format for appointment letters and information about health checks.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.

Summary of findings

- 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.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good



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

- 98% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is better than the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 84%.
- 52% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This is worse than the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 88%.
- 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.
- The practice had links with the commissioned CCG service for mild to moderate mental health problems and an additional in-house counselling service.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 7 January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 237 survey forms were distributed and 115 were returned. This represented 0.9% of the practice's patient list.

- 82% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 80% 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%.
- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.
- 84% 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 25 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

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

The most recent three months results of the Friends and Family Test illustrates a split in rating as nine patients said they would be likely or extremely likely to recommend the practice and 16 said they would be extremely unlikely. This could be a response to recent introduction of a triage appointment system as the practice has also received three complaints on this topic.

Beacon Medical

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

a CQC inspector and included a GP specialist adviser and a practice nurse specialist adviser.

Background to Beacon Medical

Beacon Medical occupies GP premises purpose built in Cleethorpes, North East Lincolnshire. They have a Primary Medical Services (PMS) contract and also offer enhanced services, for example, childhood vaccination and immunisation scheme, facilitating timely diagnosis and support for people with dementia, rotavirus and shingles vaccination and for unplanned hospital admissions.

There are 13,139 patients on the practice list and the majority of patients are of white British background. The practice population in the 0-44 years age group is lower than the England average. The practice population in the 50-85+ years age group is higher than the England average. The practice scored five on the deprivation measurement scale, the deprivation scale goes from one to ten, with one being the most deprived. The overall practice deprivation score is slightly higher than the England average, the practice is 24 and the England average is 21.8. People living in more deprived areas tend to have a greater need for health services.

The practice is a training practice for year two medical students.

The practice has three male and two female GPs. There are three advanced nurse practitioners, five practice nurses, a

community nurse, three health care assistants and two clinical pharmacists. There is a practice manager, four managers, three secretaries, five administrators and ten receptionists.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are from 8.20am to 11.20am every morning and 1.30pm to 6.10pm daily. No extended hours appointments are offered. Urgent GP appointment requests are triaged Monday to Friday 8am to 11.30am and 1.30pm to 3.30pm.

When the practice is closed, patients' calls are transferred to the Out Of Hours provider. Information for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is available in the waiting area and on the practice website.

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 12 May 2016. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, practice manager, nurse practitioner, nurse, health care assistant, reception and administration 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 incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- Patients were at potential risk of harm because some systems and processes to keep them safe had weaknesses. For example, the practice had not carried out a thorough analysis of some of the significant events.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw little evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, we asked to see records relating to a recent safety alert about home visits but there was no evidence that it had been actioned. We asked to see records relating to a recent safety alert about a new drug contraindication but there was no evidence that it had been actioned.

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. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended

safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to adult and child safeguarding level 3 nurses to level 2 and reception and administration staff to level 1.

- 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. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Four of the nurses had qualified as Independent Prescribers and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. They received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.

Are services safe?

- We reviewed four personnel files. All but one were complete regarding appropriate recruitment checks. One personnel file had no evidence of references taken nor qualifications checked prior to employment.

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 with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training 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 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.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 96% of the total number of points available. Clinical exception reporting rates were below or similar to CCG and national averages and the overall exception reporting rate was 5.5% which was below the CCG average of 6.9% and the national average of 9.2%. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed:

Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average.

Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average apart from 52% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses with a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This was lower than the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 88%.

- There had been five clinical audits completed in the last two years. None of these were two cycle completed audits where the changes could be implemented and improvements to patient outcomes monitored.
- The practice participated in local and national benchmarking.

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 had undertaken disease-specific additional training.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity however the outcome of the assessment was not recorded.

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 80%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 82%. 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 Easy Read format for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 96% to 100% and five year olds from 95% to 100%.

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.

We received 25 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards. All 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. Two of the comment cards commented on the difficulty they had experienced getting appointments.

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

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

- 93% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 89%
- 92% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%
- 99% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 95%

- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared to the CCG average of 98% and the national average of 97%
- 93% 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 compared to the national average of 91%
- 80% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 89% 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:

- 90% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 86%
- 88% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care better than the national average of 82%
- 88% 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. There were no notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Are services caring?

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 0.8% of the practice list as carers. 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 or gave 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. A review of patients' needs showed difficulty obtaining appointments. The practice introduced a triage system and routine appointments are now available within five days.

- 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 and translation services available. There was no hearing loop.
- Appointments could not be booked online.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.20am to 11.20am every morning and 1.30pm to 6.10pm daily. No extended hours appointments were offered. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six 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 comparable to local and national averages.

- 77% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 82% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

Following complaints that patients were unable to get appointments when needed, the practice undertook audits to identify the issue. As a result, the practice introduced a triage system for appointments in April 2015.

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had 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.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available on the website to help patients understand the complaints system. We found there was no poster in the reception area however this was resolved by the end of the inspection.

We looked at six complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. There was limited evidence that lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and there was no analysis of trends to enable action to improve the quality of care.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas 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 specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- There were effective arrangements for identifying, recording and managing most risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. The practice should ensure however that recruitment arrangements include all necessary employment checks for all staff.

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

• The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG), through complaints received and the national patient survey. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, at the request of the PPG, a 'You Said, We Did' display board had been put up in reception to demonstrate the value of the PPG and the responsiveness of the practice to issues that were raised.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

engaged to improve how the practice was run. For example, concerns about the telephone system had been fed into the practice plan and a new system had been implemented.

Continuous improvement

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 a part of a pilot collaboration of ten practices and an out of hours' organisation. This collaboration is looking to provide a centralised GP lead triage service Monday to Friday 8am to 8pm and Saturday and Sunday 8am to 12pm. The consultation and engagement was underway at the time of the inspection.

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Maternity and midwifery services Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 17 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Good governance</p> <p>How the regulation was not being met:</p> <p>The provider did not have suitable arrangements in place to ensure safety alerts were shared throughout the practice.</p> <p>in some cases the provider did not follow their own policy or procedure regarding the safe recruitment of staff</p> <p>The provider did not have suitable arrangements in place to ensure that lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and there was no analysis of trends to enable action to improve the quality of care.</p> <p>Regulation 17(2)</p>