

Hampstead Group Practice

Quality Report

75 Fleet Road

London

NW3 2QU

Tel: 020 7435 4000

Website: www.hampsteadgrouppractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 9 June 2016

Date of publication: 24/08/2016

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	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Hampstead Group Practice	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Hampstead Group Practice on 9 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 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.
- The practice provided a service to doctors and medical students who were in need of psychological services such as counselling and other therapies.
- The practice was supported by both a physical patient participation group (PPG) and a virtual PPG.
- 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 ran a residential enablement programme which provided care for patients that had left hospital before they were fit to return to their own home.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

Summary of findings

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

Look at ways to identify if patients are also carers.

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 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.

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 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.

Good



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



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- 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. For example providing specialist drug and alcohol clinics and a psychological service including counselling to doctors that worked at the local hospital.
- 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.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- 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.
- 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 people.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population. This included a named GP and care plan.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice undertook a weekly ward round of three care homes and was involved in monthly multi-disciplinary meetings to discuss patients in the homes.
- The practice managed a residential enablement programme which helped patients in the transition from hospital to returning to their own homes.
- An elderly care navigator was based at the practice and worked with the patients of the practice to access social prescribing services.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Ninety per cent of patients on the register had a blood pressure reading of 150/90mmHg or less compared to the national average of 91%. Eighty three percent of patients on the register had measured 5 mmol/l or less for total cholesterol compared to the national average of 80%. 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.
- The practice undertook a joint diabetic clinic with the local community teams.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 75%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 81%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.
- The practice worked with health visitors to review children that the practice was concerned about.

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 which included booking appointments, ordering repeat prescriptions and viewing medical records.
- The practice was proactive in offering a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder or other psychoses who have a record of blood pressure was 93% compared to the national average of 89%.
- Performance for dementia related indicators was comparable the national average. For example, 79% of patients on the register had received a face to face review compared to the national average of 84%.The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice had an on-site team from TAP (Team around the Practice) that provided psychological support to patients with complex mental health concerns. This also involved social prescribing and care navigation.
- 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 an 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 above local and national averages. Three hundred and seventy eight survey forms were distributed and 120 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 88% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 89% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%).

- 86% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 29 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients stated that they are treated with dignity in a caring environment and that they were involved in all of their care.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Look at ways to identify if patients are also carers.

Hampstead Group Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser, a practice nurse specialist adviser, a practice manager specialist adviser and an Expert by Experience.

Background to Hampstead Group Practice

Hampstead Group Practice is located in the London Borough of Camden. The practice has a patient list of approximately 15,000. Thirty two percent of patients are aged under 18 (compared to the national practice average of 15%) and 16% are 65 or older (compared to the national practice average of 17%). Forty five percent of patients have a long-standing health condition.

The services provided by the practice include child health care, ante and post-natal care, immunisations, sexual health and contraception advice and management of long term conditions.

The staff team comprises five GP partners (three male and two female), ten salaried GP's (seven female and three male), two female F2's and three female specialist trainee, two female practice nurses, and two healthcare assistants (one male and one female). The practice provided a total number of 181 sessions per week. Practice staff also consists of a practice manager, assistant practice manager, administrative and reception staff. Hampstead Group Practice holds a Personal Medical Service (PMS) contract with NHS England.

The practice's opening hours are:

Monday to Friday 8am to 7pm

Saturday from 9am to 12pm

Extended hours opening was offered on

Tuesday and Thursday 7pm to 8pm

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

Outside of these times, cover is provided by an out of hour's provider.

The practice is registered to provide the following regulated activities which we inspected: family planning, treatment of disease, disorder or injury; surgical procedures, diagnostic and screening procedures and maternity and midwifery services.

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.

This practice has not been previously inspected.

Detailed findings

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 9 June 2016. During our visit we:

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

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

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- If a serious event occurred staff were briefed on the details through email with any immediate actions outlined. Events were routinely discussed at weekly practice meetings.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of 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, when a child vaccination was erroneously administered twice, the matter was reviewed, policy changed and update training was given to the nursing staff.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended

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

- A notice on the TV screen in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. The latest audit was in July 2015. One of the issues identified that was a lack of space to accommodate staff in the practice which led to the use of "hot desking". The audit had identified untidy desks and the practice was in the process of addressing the issue.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. She received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the

Are services safe?

practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.

- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. The practice kept files for the locum GP's that worked at the practice which included all relevant checks.

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 (December 2015) 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). The latest legionella assessment took place in May 2015.

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan (last updated in August 2015) in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff and a buddying arrangement with another practice in case the premises became out of action.

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 clinical staff met each lunch time to discuss cases and the use of guidelines in their daily patient lists.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 98% of the total number of points available.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/2015 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the national average. For example, 90% of patients on the register had a blood pressure reading on 150/90mmHg or less compared to the national average of 91%. Eighty three percent of patients on the register had measured 5 mmol/l or less for total cholesterol compared to the national average of 80%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was above the national average for example the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder or other psychoses who have a record of blood pressure was 93% compared to the national average of 89%.
- Performance for dementia related indicators was comparable to the national average. For example, 79% of patients on the register had received a face to face review compared to the national average of 84%. The

practice were aware of the low results and explained that a contributing factor was that many patients were residents of one of the three care homes that they oversee and that their care was additionally overseen by a multidisciplinary care team within the homes.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been five clinical audits conducted in the last two years, two 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. In 2012 the practice reviewed the number of patient deaths and found that of the 15 recorded deaths, 6 (40%) were on the palliative care register and 5 (33%) could have been on the palliative care register. Three had their preferred place of death documented (60% of the 15 recorded deaths). Following on from the audit, the practice started a 'Co-ordinate my care' clinical service aimed at improving integration between services and allowing patients or their carers to express wishes for their care or treatment. The practice followed up the audit in 2015 and found of the 14 recorded deaths, 8 (57%) were on the palliative care register, 5 (36%) could have been on the register and 8 (57%) had their preferred place of death recorded. This showed that there was an increase in the palliative care register and that there was more awareness within the practice of patients wishes which had helped to provide a better service for palliative care patients.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 75%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 81%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice was aware that results for cervical screening were below the national average and had carried about an audit to identify the reason. It was found that many of the patients had received the test privately or at a previous NHS GP and a large number were unaware of the procedure. The practice took action to ensure that patients who received the test at another location were correctly coded so that the date of their next test could be established and recorded. The practice was also looking at ways to work with other practices to provide a more joined up service.

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 74% to 94% (CCG average range of 77% to 93%) and five year olds from 76% to 99% (CCG average range of 76% to 93%).

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

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

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

- 90% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 89%.
- 84% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 83% and the 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 95% and the national average of 95%.

- 84% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 86% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 88% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback from the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views. We also saw that care plans were personalised.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 90% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 86%.
- 86% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 82% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that interpreting services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- Patient services were displayed on the TV monitor in the reception area.

Are services caring?

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 233 patients as carers (2% of the practice list). The practice used the

register in order to provide carers health checks and to signpost carers to a local carers association for help and support. 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 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 people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, in response to increased need in the area, the practice ran a twice weekly drug and alcohol clinic in association with local substance misuse services.

- The practice offered an out extended hours service on a Tuesday and Thursday evening until 8pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours. The practice also opened on a Saturday morning for pre booked appointments.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice conducted a ward round for three local care homes. Monthly multi-disciplinary meetings were held to manage the care of patients within the homes.
- The practice managed a local residential reablement programme which helps patients leaving hospital to adjust before returning back to their own home.
- The practice worked with an elderly care navigator to help patients access social prescribing services.
- All older people had a named GP and active care plan.
- The practice worked closely with community teams to provide a joint diabetic clinic.
- The practice set up a tele dermatology service which reviewed skin lesions of patients rather than referring on to hospital. This reduced the hospital waiting times for patients in need of the treatment registered with the practice.
- The practice met regularly with health visitors to review children that the practice was concerned about.

- The practice had an on-site team from TAP (Team around the Practice) that provided psychological support to patients with complex mental health concerns. This also involved social prescribing and care navigation.
- The practice provided psychological support to the doctors and consultants at the local hospital who were suffering with stress and other mental health conditions. This included counselling and psychotherapy.

Access to the service

The practice's opening hours are:

Monday to Friday 8am to 7pm

Saturday from 9am to 12pm

Extended hours opening was offered on

Tuesday and Thursday 7pm to 8pm

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

Outside of these times, cover is provided by an out of hour's provider.

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.

- 78% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 88% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system on the TV monitor in the reception area. Information was also available from the website and through the complaints leaflet.
- The practice had a comments and feedback book open on the reception desk where patients could note down their concerns. These were responded to by the practice on a daily basis and the responses were attached to the book for all patients who wished to read them.

We looked at the 34 complaints received in the last 12 months and found they had been responded to in line with the practice policy. All written and verbal complaints were logged and assessed in the complaints review. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, following a patient complaining that they were told they were not eligible for the flu vaccination, the medical records were reviewed by a second GP to confirm the position before the patient was sent a written response. The matter was discussed and the guidelines for giving vaccinations were reviewed.

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
- Clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. The practice also had a virtual PPG where discussions could take place outside of the meeting times. This was the practice's way of engaging with those patients who would not be able to attend the meetings. The PPG had its own designated email address for patients to communicate directly with the group. Suggestions by the PPG that had been carried out by the practice included installing a bicycle rack,

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

improving the seating in the waiting area, introducing a comments and feedback book and implementing an NVQ for reception staff. The PPG were currently looking at ways to increase the uptake of the friends and family test.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through annual appraisals and staff meetings. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. For example ensuring that administrative staff were fully equipped to cover each other in times of absence through a system of cross training for roles. 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 piloting a tele dermatology service (a system of photographing skin lesions and sending the images securely to a Consultant Dermatologist to diagnose whether further treatment was necessary or not) to help reduce hospital waiting times.