

Kings Langley Surgery

Quality Report

The Nap, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire.

WD4 8ET.

Tel: 01923 261035

Website: www.klbsurgeries.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 8 June 2016

Date of publication: 15/08/2016

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	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Kings Langley Surgery	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Kings Langley Surgery on 8 June 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients were positive about the standard of care they received and about staff behaviours. They said staff were dedicated, pleasant and caring and that their privacy and dignity was respected.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.

- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice 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 improvements are:

- Ensure that practice meetings are documented.
- Ensure the infection control lead completes regular update training.
- Ensure that an updated and comprehensive fire risk assessment is completed.
- Take steps to ensure that hot water temperatures at the practice are kept within the required levels.
- Ensure that all staff employed are supported by receiving appropriate supervision and appraisal and are completing the essential training relevant to their roles, including basic life support training.

Summary of findings

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

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

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the National GP Patient Survey published in January 2016 showed patients rated the practice similar to or above local and national averages for all aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.

Good



Summary of findings

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Data from the National GP Patient Survey published in January 2016 showed patients rated the practice in line with or above local and national averages for access to the practice. Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and get through to the practice by phone and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- 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 people.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Older people had access to targeted immunisations such as the flu vaccine. The practice had 2,488 patients aged over 65 years. Of those 1,815 (73%) had received the flu vaccination in the 2015/2016 year.
- The GPs completed weekly visits to local nursing and residential homes, some of which accommodated high dependency residents to ensure continuity of care for those patients.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable with the CCG and national averages. The practice achieved 87% of the points available compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 89%.
- All newly diagnosed patients with diabetes were managed in line with an agreed pathway.
- 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 GPs worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multi-disciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who may be at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were comparable to or lower than other practices in the local area for all standard childhood immunisations. Where the practice was below average, we found this was for a reason beyond their control.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 87% which was comparable to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- There were six week post-natal checks for mothers and their children.
- A range of contraceptive and family planning services were available.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice offered online services such as appointment booking and repeat prescriptions as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- There was additional out of working hours access to meet the needs of working age patients. There was extended opening at Kings Langley Surgery until 8pm every Monday and Tuesday and from 7am every Wednesday and at Long Meadow Surgery from 7am every Tuesday.
- The use of a three GP sessions a day system instead of the usual two sessions operated at most practices ensured that on all days except Wednesdays from 1.30pm to 3pm surgeries operated constantly throughout the day at both Kings Langley and Long Meadow surgeries.

Good



Summary of findings

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

Good



- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability. There were 23 patients on the practice's learning disability register at the time of our inspection. Of those, all had been invited for and six (26%) had received a health review in the past 12 months.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability and there was a GP lead for these patients.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- 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.
- Additional information was available for patients who were identified as carers and there was a nominated staff lead for these patients.
- The practice had identified 246 patients on the practice list as carers. This was approximately 1.8% of the practice's patient list. Of those, 133 (54%) were invited for and 26 (11%) had accepted and received a health review in the past 12 months.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

Good



- 83% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months. This was comparable with the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the CCG and national averages. The practice achieved 100% of the points available compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 93%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.

Summary of findings

- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.
- Mental health trust well-being workers were based at Kings Langley Surgery every day except Tuesdays. An NHS counsellor was also available on Monday, Wednesday and Friday every week at Kings Langley Surgery.
- There were GP leads for mental health and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The National GP Patient Survey results published in January 2016 showed the practice was performing in line with and above local and national averages. There were 259 survey forms distributed and 119 were returned. This was a response rate of 46% and represented less than 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 93% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 78% and a national average of 73%.
- 91% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 88%, national average 85%).
- 96% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 88%, national average 85%).
- 95% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who had just moved to the local area (CCG average 83%, national average 78%).

We asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 35 comment cards. We also spoke with seven patients during the inspection. From this feedback we found that patients were positive about the standard of care received. Patients said they felt staff were dedicated, pleasant and caring and that their privacy and dignity was respected. They told us they felt listened to by the GPs and involved in their own care and treatment.

Almost all of the patients we spoke with or who left comments for us were positive about access to the practice and appointments. Two out of 35 patients who left comments for us and one patient we spoke with said there was occasionally a longer wait than they'd like to get a pre-bookable appointment. All of the patients we spoke with or who left comments for us were positive about access to same day and urgent appointments at the practice.

Kings Langley 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 acting as a specialist adviser.

Background to Kings Langley Surgery

Kings Langley Surgery provides a range of primary medical services from its premises at The Nap, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire, WD4 8ET and Long Meadow Surgery, 15 High Street, Bovingdon, Hertfordshire, HP3 OHG.

The practice serves a population of approximately 14,000 and is a training practice. The area served is less deprived compared to England as a whole. The practice population is predominantly white British. The practice serves an above average population of those aged from 10 to 19 years, 40 to 59 years and 65 to 69 years. There is a lower than average population of those aged from 20 to 34 years.

The clinical team includes three male and three female GP partners, two male and two female salaried GPs, two trainee GPs, two nurse practitioners (also prescribers), five practice nurses and one healthcare assistant. The team is supported by a practice manager and 18 other administration, reception and secretarial staff. The practice provides services under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract (a nationally agreed contract).

Kings Langley Surgery is staffed with the phone lines and doors open from 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. There is extended opening until 8pm every Monday and Tuesday and from 7am every Wednesday. Long Meadow Surgery is staffed with the phone lines and doors open from 8am to

6.30pm on Monday, 7am to 6.30pm on Tuesday, 8.30am to 6.30pm on Wednesday and Thursday and 8.30am to 2pm on Friday. Appointments at both surgeries are tailored to each GP's working hours and variable depending on the doctor and the nature of the appointment. This system ensures that on all days except Wednesdays from 1.30pm to 3pm surgeries operate constantly throughout the day at both sites. An out of hours service for when the practice is closed is provided by Herts Urgent Care.

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 our inspection, we reviewed a range of information we held about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew about the practice. We carried out an announced inspection on 8 June 2016. On this occasion we only visited the Kings Langley Surgery premises. During our inspection we spoke with a range of staff including three GP partners, one nurse prescriber, one practice nurse, the practice manager and members of the reception and administration team. We spoke with seven patients and a representative of the Patient Participation Group (the PPG is a group of patients who work with the practice to discuss

Detailed findings

and develop the services provided). We observed how staff interacted with patients. We reviewed 35 CQC comment cards left for us by patients to share their views and experiences of the practice with us.

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.

- The staff we spoke with were clear on the reporting process used at the practice and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident 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 and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out an analysis of significant events. These were managed consistently over time.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and patient safety alerts and spoke with staff about how these were discussed and reviewed. Although the meetings where these were discussed were not formally documented we found that lessons learnt were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. The relevant staff we spoke with were aware of the outcome, lessons learnt and any changes in process required for all the incidents we spoke with them about. For example, following a patient being prescribed the wrong strength of medication, the investigating GP completed a learning module to inform their recommendations to the practice which updated its policy and changed its processes to prevent recurrence of the incident.

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 and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies

clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding who was trained to the appropriate level. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their roles. GPs were trained to an appropriate level to manage adult and child (level three) safeguarding concerns.

- Notices around the practice 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 saw the practice was visibly clean and tidy. Hand wash facilities, including hand sanitiser were available throughout the practice. There were appropriate processes in place for the management of sharps (needles) and clinical waste. The lead nurse practitioner was the infection control 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 a recent infection control audit was completed. We saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. A programme of infection control training was in place and all staff had completed this. The infection control lead was overdue their update training, but this was booked to be completed in the near future. All of the staff we spoke with were knowledgeable about infection control processes relevant to their roles.
- 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 (CCG) medicines management team, 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. Two of

Are services safe?

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 (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The Healthcare Assistant was trained to administer medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.

- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, 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 posters which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had recently completed a fire drill. Due to extensive recent building work and modifications to the practice the fire risk assessment was no longer current. An external contractor was booked to complete a new fire risk assessment and update the fire safety training for all staff in August 2016. 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 Legionella risk assessment in place (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings). Where risks were identified the practice

responded by completing all the necessary actions and maintained records to demonstrate this. Regular water temperature checks were completed; however we found that some hot water temperatures were below and above the required level.

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a system in place across all the different staffing groups to ensure that 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 and emergency buttons on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms that alerted staff to any emergency.
- Most staff had received basic life support training and a programme was in place to ensure the remaining staff completed the training.
- The practice had a defibrillator and emergency oxygen with adult and child masks available on the premises. These were checked and tested.
- 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 business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff to use.

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 people's needs. They explained how care was planned to meet identified needs and how patients were reviewed at required intervals to ensure their treatment remained effective.
- By using such things as risk assessments and audits the practice monitored that these guidelines were followed.

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 showed the practice achieved 96% of the total number of points available, with 6% exception reporting. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). The practice's overall exception reporting was lower than the CCG average of 8% and the national average of 9%. Data from 2014/2015 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. The practice achieved 87% of the points available with 7% exception reporting compared to the CCG average of 91% with 11% exception reporting and the national average of 89% with 11% exception reporting.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was similar to the CCG and national averages. The practice achieved 86% of the points available, with 2% exception reporting, compared to the CCG and national average of 84%, with 4% exception reporting.

- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the CCG and national averages. The practice achieved 100% of the points available with 12% exception reporting compared to the CCG average of 96% with 9% exception reporting and the national average of 93% with 11% exception reporting.

We discussed some areas of above CCG and national average exception reporting for the 2014/2015 year with senior clinical staff during our inspection. We also looked at individual examples of why patients had been exempted. The practice's exception reporting for dementia was 15%, compared to the CCG average of 7% and the national average of 8%. The practice's exception reporting for cardiovascular disease primary prevention was 78%, compared to the CCG and national average of 30%. There was also a higher than average exception reporting for rheumatoid arthritis. We found that in all the cases we looked at the exception reporting was clinically appropriate. Also, the practice was able to demonstrate there were discrepancies in some of the figures and that actual exception reporting was much lower or that exception reporting for the 2015/2016 year had considerably reduced.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- We looked at nine clinical audits completed since April 2015. Most of these were full cycle (repeated) audits or part of a full cycle programme (scheduled to be repeated) where the data was analysed and clinically discussed and the practice approach was reviewed and modified as a result when necessary.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, the practice completed an audit on the appropriate documentation of consent and sending of specimens for histological examination for the minor surgery completed at the practice. By analysing the results and modifying its approach, the practice improved its performance in both areas but notably in sending specimens for histological examination where clinically indicated.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.

Effective staffing

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. It covered such topics as infection prevention and control, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. Staff administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to online resources.
- 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 during clinical sessions, appraisals, mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. A programme was in place to ensure all staff received an appraisal on an annual basis. However, at the time of our inspection the system of appraisals for non-clinical staff was behind schedule.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, health and safety and basic life support. Most of the training was provided by the use of an e-learning facility or in-house on a face-to-face basis.

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 shared information systems.

- 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 services 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, when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that

multi-disciplinary team meetings to discuss the needs of complex patients, including those with end of life care needs, took place on a monthly basis. These patients' care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

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.
- We saw the process for seeking consent was well adhered to and examples of documented patient consent for recent procedures completed at the practice were available.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their smoking cessation and weight management. Patients were signposted to the relevant services when necessary.
- Smoking cessation advice was available at Kings Langley Surgery every Monday from a visiting Hertfordshire Smoking Adviser.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 87%, which was similar to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by ensuring a female sample taker was available. There were 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 consequence of abnormal results.

Bowel and breast cancer screening rates were similar to or above local and national averages. Data published in March 2015 showed that 63% of the practice's patients aged 60 to 69 years had been screened for bowel cancer in

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

the past 30 months compared to the CCG and national average of 58%. Data showed 73% of female patients aged 50 to 70 years had been screened for breast cancer in the past three years compared to the CCG and national average of 72%. These were nationally run and managed screening programmes and there was evidence to suggest the practice encouraged its relevant patients to engage with them and attend for screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to or below CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 92% to 98% and five year olds from 87% to 91%. We spoke with senior staff about the below average performance for vaccinations given to five

year olds during our inspection. We were told that the parents of children at a school within the practice's catchment area did not allow their children to be vaccinated on the grounds of their beliefs.

The practice participated in targeted vaccination programmes. This included the flu vaccination for children, people with long-term conditions and those over 65 years. The practice had 2,488 patients aged over 65 years. Of those 1,815 (73%) had received the flu vaccination in the 2015/2016 year.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40 to 74 years. 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 that members of staff were courteous and 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 area to discuss their needs.

The 35 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced and staff behaviours. The patients we spoke with said they felt the practice offered a very good service and staff were dedicated, pleasant and caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with a member of the Patient Participation Group. They also told us they were very satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Patient comments highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in January 2016 showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was mostly above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 94% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 89%.
- 90% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 88%, national average 87%).
- 94% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%).
- 92% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 87%, national average 85%).

- 99% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 92%, national average 91%).
- 95% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 89%, national average 87%).

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The patients we spoke with or who left comments for us told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They said their questions were answered by clinical staff and any concerns they had were discussed. 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.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in January 2016 showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were similar to or above local and national averages. For example:

- 92% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 86%.
- 88% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 82%, national average 82%).
- 86% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 86%, national average 85%).

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting areas informed patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Links to such information were also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 246 patients on the practice list as carers. This was approximately 1.8% of the practice's patient list. Of those, 133 (54%) were invited for and 26 (11%) had accepted and received a health review in the past 12 months.

Are services caring?

A dedicated carers' notice board in the waiting area provided information and advice including signposting carers to support services. Considerable information was also available online (through the practice website) to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. One of the GPs was the practice's carers' lead (or champion) responsible for providing useful and relevant information to those patients. The practice had hosted a carers' event in October 2015 and all patients identified as carers were invited to attend.

We saw that the practice notified staff of all recent patient deaths. From speaking with staff, we found there was a practice wide process for approaching recently bereaved patients. Depending on the circumstances, the GPs phoned bereaved families offering an invitation to approach the practice for support and signposting them to local bereavement services. The practice manager sent the recently bereaved a condolence card including information on local advice and counselling services.

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.

- All newly diagnosed patients with type two diabetes were referred for diabetic eye screening and to the DESMOND programme in adherence with National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines. (DESMOND is an NHS training course that helps patients to identify their own health risks and set their own goals in the management of their condition).
- 83% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months. This was similar to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 84%.
- The practice provided an enhanced service in an effort to reduce the unplanned hospital admissions for vulnerable and at risk patients including those aged 75 years and older. (Enhanced services are those that require a level of care provision above what a GP practice would normally provide). As part of this, each relevant patient received a care plan based on their specific needs, a named GP and an annual review. At the time of our inspection, 229 patients (2% of the practice's patient population over 18) were receiving such care.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- There were named GPs for each of the three local nursing and residential homes, some of which accommodated high dependency residents including those with dementia. Each home was routinely visited once each week to ensure continuity of care for those patients.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- At both Kings Langley and Long Meadow surgeries there were accessible toilet facilities for all patients, hearing loops were provided and translation services including British Sign Language (BSL) were available.

- The waiting areas were accessible enough to accommodate patients with wheelchairs and prams and allowed for manageable access to the treatment and consultation rooms.
- There were male and female GPs in the practice and patients could choose to see a male or female doctor.
- There were six week post-natal checks for mothers and their children.
- Counselling services were available for patients with mental health issues and there was a GP lead for those patients. Mental health trust well-being workers were based at Kings Langley Surgery every day except Tuesday. Patients could self-refer to these. An NHS counsellor was also available on Monday, Wednesday and Friday every week at Kings Langley Surgery. Patients could access this service to obtain psychological and emotional counselling and advice through referral from the GPs.
- A hearing aid technician provided by the Hertfordshire Hearing Advisory Service was based at Kings Langley Surgery on a Wednesday once every other month. Patients could access this service to have any issues or faults with their hearing aids checked and to obtain new batteries.
- The practice was participating in a one year trial scheme in which an external company provided Kings Langley Surgery with an Atrial Fibrillation machine. (Atrial Fibrillation is a heart condition that causes an irregular and often abnormally fast heart rate). Patients could use the machine and the results of the tests would be passed to the practice within 24 hours. Any abnormal results were followed up by the practice's cardiovascular GP lead. A system was in place and adhered to for patient information and confidentiality to be protected during this process.

Access to the service

Kings Langley Surgery was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday with extended opening until 8pm every Monday and Tuesday and from 7am every Wednesday. At Long Meadow Surgery the practice was fully open (phones and doors) between 8am and 6.30pm on Monday, 7am to 6.30pm on Tuesday, 8.30am to 6.30pm on Wednesday and Thursday and 8.30am to 2pm on Friday. Appointments at both surgeries were tailored to each GP's working hours and variable depending on the doctor and the nature of the appointment. This system ensured that on all days except Wednesdays from 1.30pm to 3pm surgeries operated

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

constantly throughout the day at both sites. 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 published in January 2016 showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was similar to or considerably above local and national averages.

- 79% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 76% and national average of 75%.
- 93% of patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 78%, national average 73%).
- 75% of patients said they always or almost always saw or spoke to the GP they preferred (CCG average 63%, national average 59%).

Almost all of the patients we spoke with or who left comments for us were positive about access to the practice and appointments. Two out of 35 patients who left comments for us and one patient we spoke with said there was occasionally a longer wait than they'd like to get a pre-bookable appointment. They also said that access to urgent appointments was good.

Information was available to patients about appointments on the practice website. Patients were able to make their appointments and repeat prescription requests at the practice or online through the practice website.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- A complaints procedure was available and adhered to.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice. This was the practice manager.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. The practice's complaints procedure was detailed on its website and displayed on a notice board in the practice.

We looked at the details of six complaints received since March 2015. We saw these were all dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care or patient experience. For example, as a result of an episode with an older patient the practice reviewed, discussed and amended its process for approaching and consulting family members in certain circumstances.

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 statement of purpose detailing its aims and objectives. These included endeavouring to provide patient centred, high quality personal healthcare and to improve the health status of the practice population by being responsive to the needs of patients.
- The weekly practice meeting attended by the GPs and the practice manager was used to monitor the strategic direction of the practice throughout the year. The main strategic focus of the practice in the past year was the renovation and development of the Kings Langley Surgery to meet the needs of patients and secure the provision of high quality healthcare. At the time of our inspection the work was ongoing and progressing well.

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. All of the staff we spoke with were clear on the governance structure in place.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- There was a comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice through the use and monitoring of the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) data and other performance indicators.
- There was a programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care.

They prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff. There was a clear protocol in place for how decisions were agreed and the meeting structure supported this.

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). The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unexpected safety incidents:

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

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

- There was a regular schedule of meetings at the practice for individual staff groups and multi-disciplinary teams to attend.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise and discuss any issues at the meetings and felt confident in doing so and supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and well supported and knew who to go to in the practice with any concerns. 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.
- There were named members of staff in lead roles. We saw there were nominated GP leads for safeguarding, women's health and patients with diabetes, learning disabilities, mental health issues and dementia. There were also nurse led clinics for patients with respiratory conditions such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. The leads showed a good understanding of their roles and responsibilities and all staff knew who the relevant leads were.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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

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

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the Patient Participation Group (the PPG is a community of patients who work with the practice to discuss and develop the services provided) and through comments and complaints received. Although the PPG had not met since October 2015, it had previously submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team and there was evidence those proposals were acted on. During October 2015 the PPG had participated in a carers' event at the practice. Due to the personal circumstances of a key member of the group, at the time of our inspection the PPG was running as a virtual group, but was still active.

The practice made use of the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT). The FFT provides an opportunity for patients to feedback on the services that provide their care and treatment. The results from December 2015 to March 2016 showed that all of the 27 respondents were likely or extremely likely to recommend the practice to friends and family if they needed similar care or treatment.

We saw there was an online comments facility for patients to use accessible through the practice website. Any comments and suggestions made were reviewed by the practice manager.

The practice had gathered feedback from staff through meetings and discussions. Staff told us they were able to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. They said they felt involved and engaged in how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice was a GP training practice and maintained high standards for supporting its trainees. Two GPs were qualified GP trainers and two GPs were associate trainers.

The practice team was forward thinking and had developed an appointments system that was both tailored to the working hours of its GPs and attempted to meet the demand of its patients. The use of a three GP sessions a day system instead of the usual two sessions operated at most practices ensured that on all days except Wednesdays from 1.30pm to 3pm surgeries operated constantly throughout the day at both Kings Langley and Long Meadow surgeries. The positive feedback from patients about the impact this had on their ability to access the practice and appointments was reflected in the practice's above local and national average National GP Patient Survey results.

Throughout 2015 and 2016 the practice had renovated and developed the Kings Langley Surgery to meet the current and future needs of patients and secure the provision of high quality healthcare. The work had resulted in the provision of additional and upgraded consulting and treatment rooms and further ongoing work would ensure a more accessible reception area.