

Saintbridge Surgery

Quality Report

Askwith Road
Gloucester
Gloucestershire
GL4 4SH

Tel: 01452 500222

Website: www.saintbridgesurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 19 April 2016

Date of publication: 13/05/2016

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	7
What people who use the service say	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

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

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Saintbridge Surgery on 19 April 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. The practice had textured surfaces on pavements around the premises and contrasting colour schemes within the practice to help visually impaired patients to find their way into and around the practice safely.
- 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

- To develop and implement a failsafe system to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme.
- To review processes for exception reporting to ensure that a GP has oversight and involvement prior to excepting patients.

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 at or above average compared to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

However,

- The practice did not have a system in place to ensure that results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme.
- The practice had a high exception report rate and we were advised that an administrator would except patients if they had not made contact with the practice after three invite for appointment letters had been sent. Clinicians did not have any oversight or involvement prior to excepting patients, the practice advised they would review and change their procedures.

Summary of findings

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.
- The practice had textured surfaces on pavements around the premises and contrasting colour schemes within the practice to help visually impaired patients to find their way into and around the practice safely.

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 had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

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 patients.

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Weekly meetings took place that included discussions of hospital admissions, hospital discharges and palliative care patients.
- The practice visited five local care homes every two weeks to see patients and carry out annual reviews, medication reviews and end of life planning. Each partner was allocated to a particular care home to ensure continuity of care.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance in 2014/15 for overall diabetes related indicators was 96% which was similar to the clinical commissioning group average of 95% and national average of 89%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

Good



- 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 patients who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.

Summary of findings

- Patients told us that children and young patients were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years was 94% which was above the national average of 82%.
- 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, health visitors and school nurses, meetings were held quarterly.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age patients (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.
- Extended hours evening appointments were available twice weekly for working age patients to attend outside of working hours.
- The practice operated a GP telephone triage system which enabled minor issues to be dealt with over the phone.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The practice is rated as good for the care of patients 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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)

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

- 69% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months (2014/15), which is lower than the national average of 84%.
- Overall performance for mental health related indicators in 2014/15 was 100% compared to the CCG average of 97% and national average of 82%.
- 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 in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Two hundred and seventy-six survey forms were distributed and 127 were returned, a completion rate of 46% (which represents about 1.5% of the patient population). Feedback from the survey showed;

- 74% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to a clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 83% and a 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 a CCG average of 89% and a national average of 76%.
- 88% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to a CCG average of 89% and a 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 a CCG average of 83% and a 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 12 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients commented on the excellent service they had received from the GPs at the practice and the polite and caring nature of all staff. Patients also commented positively about how they could access appointments.

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

We looked at the NHS Friends and Family Test for February 2016, where patients are asked if they would recommend the practice. The results showed an average of 91% of respondents would recommend the practice to their family and friends.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- To develop and implement a failsafe system to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme.
- To review processes for exception reporting to ensure that a GP has oversight and involvement prior to excepting patients.[HD1]

Saintbridge Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Saintbridge Surgery

Saintbridge Surgery is an urban, family GP practice located a short distance from Gloucester town centre. The practice is wheelchair accessible with automatic doors and lifts to the practice.

The practice is approved for training qualified doctors who wish to become GPs and provides general medical services to approximately 8,500 patients. Services to patients are provided under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with NHS England. (A GMS contract is a contract between NHS England and general practices for delivering general medical services and is the commonest form of GP contract).

The Practice has four GP partners (two female and two male) and one salaried GP (female) which is equivalent to four and a half whole time equivalent GPs. The clinical team includes four practice nurses and two healthcare assistants (all female). The practice management team supporting the GPs comprises of a medical administration line manager, a finance manager, a practice business administrator and a senior receptionist who are supported by eight administrators, six receptionists and two secretaries.

Information from Public Health England 2015 shows the practice has a higher than average patient population aged between 1 to 9 years of age. The general Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) population profile for the geographic area of the practice is in forth most deprivation decile. (An area itself is not deprived: it is the circumstances and lifestyles of the people living there that affect its deprivation score. It is important to remember that not everyone living in a deprived area is deprived and that not all deprived people live in deprived areas). Average male and female life expectancy for the practice is 79 and 84 years, which is comparable to the national averages of 79 and 83 years respectively.

The practice is open between 8.30am and 6.30pm on Monday to Friday. Between 8am and 8.30am every weekday telephone calls are picked up by the reception team and a duty doctor is on site to treat any medical emergencies. Appointments are available between 8.30am and 6pm. Extended surgery hours are also offered on Monday and Wednesday evenings each week between 6.30pm and 7.30pm.

Out of Hours cover is provided by South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust and can be accessed via NHS 111.

The practice provides its services from the following address:

Saintbridge Surgery

Askwith Road

Gloucester

Gloucestershire

GL4 4SH

This is the first inspection of Saintbridge Surgery.

Detailed findings

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 19 April 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including four GPs, three practice nurses, the medical administration line manager, the finance manager, the practice business administrator, the senior receptionist and one administrator.
- We spoke with six patients who used the service and four members of the patient participation group.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.

- Reviewed 12 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 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.
- 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, a late diagnosis of a medical condition was reported by a GP as a significant event, this was investigated at practice level, the patient was given a formal apology and a new procedure was put in place. The practice informed NHS England of this significant event and the investigation outcome.

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 children and a lead for safeguarding vulnerable 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 were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three.

- A notice in the waiting room and in treatment rooms 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. A 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 clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription (PSD).
- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of

Are services safe?

identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available 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. The practice also had panic buttons fitted in consultation and treatment rooms.
- 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 recently published results were 98% of the total number of points available. We noted that exception reporting was overall was 14% which was higher than the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 10% and the national average of 9%. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). We were advised that an administrator would except patients if they had not made contact with the practice after three invite for appointment letters had been sent. Clinicians did not have any oversight or involvement prior to excepting patients, the practice advised they would review and change their procedures to ensure that a clinician was actively involved in this process.

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

- Performance for diabetes related indicators
- Performance for mental health related indicators

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been 15 clinical audits completed in the last two years, all of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example,

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as: improving access to health and wellbeing services through funding staff to develop additional skills based on identified patients' needs.

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. The practice funded for the practice nurses to complete sexual health and respiratory courses specific to their role.
- 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, 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 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 patients, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 94%, which was above both the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 82%. We noted the practice exception reporting for cervical screening was almost three times higher than the CCG average and just over twice the national average. The practice demonstrated how, in response to higher exception rates, they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by writing to patients and ensuring a female sample taker was available. The practice advised they were going to implement a failsafe system to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme as they currently were not cross checking that this was happening. This could potentially result in a patients not receiving their results in a timely manner. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were comparable to CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 69% to 100% compared to CCG averages of 72% to 96%. Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to five year olds ranged from 87% to 97% compared to CCG averages of 90% to 95%.

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.

All of the 12 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with four 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. The PPG commented positively on the GP telephone triage system and advised that this had greatly improved patient access to appointments. 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 below average for nurses. For example:

- 93% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and national average of 89%.
- 90% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 87%.

- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 97% and 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 CCG average of 88% and national average of 85%.
- 81% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 90%.
- 88% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 87%.

The practice had a relatively new nursing team that were not in place when the above GP Survey data was collated. Comment cards, patients and PPG members were all happy with the care received by the nursing team since this survey and described them as caring, supportive and professional.

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 above national averages for GP data and below national averages for nursing data. For example:

- 90% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% 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 compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 82%.

Are services caring?

- 77% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% and 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.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The practice had a hearing loop in reception to assist patients with hearing aids.

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 125 patients as carers (1.5% of the practice list). The practice had a carers lead and a dedicated carers board in the waiting room. Carers were offered annual health checks and could be referred through social prescribing to services intended to support their wellbeing and enable them to maintain their caring role. 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 sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patient'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 took part in a local social prescribing initiative whereby patients with non-medical issues, such as debt or loneliness could be referred by a GP to a single hub for assessment as to which alternative service might be of most benefit.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on a Monday and Wednesday evening until 7.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- 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 vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice had textured surfaces on pavements around the premises to help the visually impaired to find their way into the surgery safely alongside contrasting colour schemes within the practice to help visually impaired patients.
- Weekly meetings took place that included discussions of hospital admissions, hospital discharges and palliative care patients.
- The practice visited five local care homes every two weeks to see patients and carry out annual reviews, medication reviews and end of life planning. Each partner was allocated to a particular care home to ensure continuity of care.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Between 8am and 8.30am every weekday telephone calls are picked up by the reception

team and a duty doctor was on site to treat any medical emergencies. Appointments were from 8.30am to 6.30pm daily with appointments available throughout the lunch period. Extended surgery hours were also offered on Monday and Wednesday evenings each week between 6.30pm and 7.30pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be arranged up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 76% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 78%.
- 74% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 73%.

Patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them. This was supported by friends and family test results from February 2016, where patients are asked if they would recommend the practice. The results showed an average of 91% of respondents would recommend the practice to their family and friends.

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 practice had adopted a GP telephone triage system that ensured all patients were called back the same day and offered a suitable appointment or home visit by a GP where appropriate. 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.

Are services responsive to people's needs? (for example, to feedback?)

- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw information was available to help patients understand the complaints system and there was a poster and complaint packs in the waiting area; details were also available on the practice's website.

We looked at five complaints received in the last 12 months and found that all complaints were dealt with in a timely

manner, with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, following a complaint the practice had enlisted the use of a sign language interpreter and utilised emails and text messages to communicate with patients with a hearing loss or impairment.

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.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions for most aspects of practice governance. However, the practice needed to review, develop and implement a failsafe systems relating to ensuring test results were received and for exception reporting.

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. The practice management was led by the four GPs partners who had full oversight of all aspects of the practice and were very knowledgeable with practice statistics on the day of our inspection. The following team members supported the GP partners with equal responsibility, a medical administration line manager, a finance manager, a practice business administrator and a senior receptionist. Each line manager shared tasks and supported one another to ensure that there was always a manager in the practice able to deal with any situation effectively.

- 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. We noted team away days were .
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example,

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

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, the practice took part in a local social prescribing initiative whereby patients with non-medical issues, such as debt or loneliness could be referred by a GP to a single hub for assessment as to which alternative support service might be of most benefit.