

Modbury Health Centre

Quality Report

Poundwell Meadow
Modbury
Devon
PL21 0QL

Tel: 01548 830666

Website: www.modburyhealthcentre@nhs.net

Date of inspection visit: 8 April 2015

Date of publication: 02/07/2015

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	8
Areas for improvement	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Modbury Health Centre	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Modbury Health Centre on 8 April 2015.

Overall the practice is rated as good.

Specifically, we found the practice to be good for providing safe well-led, effective, caring and responsive services. It was also good for providing services for the population groups.

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

- Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed.
- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered following best practice guidance. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and planned.

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

However there were areas of practice where the provider should

- Review the procedures for checking and recording emergency medicines and equipment.
- Consider ways that ensure vaccines are always stored at the correct temperature.

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. Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and report incidents and near misses. Lessons were learned and communicated widely to support improvement. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed. Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. Medicines were stored, managed and dispensed in line with national guidance. There were safeguards in place to identify children and adults in vulnerable circumstances. There was enough staff to keep people safe. Recruitment procedures and checks were completed as required to ensure that staff were suitable and competent. The practice was clean, tidy and hygienic. We found that suitable arrangements were in place that ensured the cleanliness of the practice was maintained to a high standard.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services. Supporting data obtained both prior to and during the inspection showed the practice had systems in place to make sure the practice was effectively run. The practice had a clinical audit system in place and audits had been completed. Care and treatment was delivered in line with national best practice guidance. The practice worked closely with other services to achieve the best outcome for patients who used the practice. Staff employed at the practice had received appropriate support, training and appraisal. GP appraisals and revalidation of professional qualifications had been completed. The practice had extensive health promotion material available within the practice and on the practice website.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services. Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in care and treatment decisions.

Accessible information was provided to help patients understand the care available to them. We also saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect ensuring confidentiality was maintained.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services. The practice reviewed and understood the needs of their local

Good



Summary of findings

population. The practice identified and took action to make improvements. Patients reported that they could access the practice when they needed. Patients reported that their care was good. The practice was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.

There was an accessible complaints system with evidence demonstrating that the practice responded appropriately and in a timely way to issues raised. There was evidence that learning from complaints was shared with staff.

Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as good for being well-led. The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver quality care and treatment and they were looking for ways to improve. Staff reported an open culture and said they could communicate with senior staff. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and regular governance meetings took place. There were systems in place to monitor and improve quality and identify risks. There were systems to manage the safety and maintenance of the premises and to review the quality of patient care.

The practice had an active virtual patient group (VPG) which was involved in the core decision making processes of the practice.

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

The practice is rated as good for providing care to older people. All patients over 75 years had a named GP. Health checks and promotion were offered to this group of patients. There were safeguards in place to identify adults in vulnerable circumstances. The practice worked well with external professionals in delivering care to older patients, including end of life care. Pneumococcal vaccination and shingles vaccinations were provided at the practice for older people on set days as well as during routine appointments. The practice supported the Modbury caring charity that provided transport arrangements and a sitting service for this client group. Staff recognised that some patients required additional help when being referred to other agencies and assisted them with this.

Good



People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for providing care to people with long term conditions. The practice managed the care and treatment for patients with long term conditions in line with best practice and national guidance. Health promotion and health checks were offered in line with national guidelines for specific conditions such as diabetes and asthma. Longer appointments were available for patients if required, such as those with long term conditions. The practice had a carers' register and all carers were offered an appointment for a carers' check with nursing staff. Patients were screened for depression if appropriate. All patients suffering with asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease had a care plan.

Good



Families, children and young people

The practice is rated as good for families, children and young people. Staff worked well with the midwife to provide prenatal and postnatal care. Postnatal health checks were provided by a GP. The practice provided baby and child immunisation programmes to ensure babies and children could access a full range of vaccinations and health screening. Information relevant to young patients was displayed and health checks and advice on sexual health for men, women and young people included a full range of contraception services and sexual health screening including chlamydia testing and cervical screening. The practice provided general health advice including a sexual health clinic to young people at the local college. In addition a drop in clinic was available to young people registered with the practice where they could receive health advice or treatment including sexual health services. The GPs training in safeguarding children from abuse was at the required level.

Good



Summary of findings

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The practice is rated as good for providing care to working age people.

The practice provided appointments on the same day, or up to two days in advance. Emergency appointments for the same day were available. The practice operated extended opening hours three mornings a week to assist patients that worked. Patients could book appointments and order repeat prescription on line. Smoking cessation appointments were available. The practice website invited all patients aged between 40 years to 75 years to arrange to have a health check with a nurse if they wanted. A cervical screening service was available.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The practice is rated as good for people whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. The practice had a vulnerable patient register to identify these patients. Vulnerable patients were reviewed at team meetings. Referral to a counselling service was available. The practice did not provide primary care services for patients who are homeless as none were known, however, staff said they would not turn away a patient if they needed primary care and could not access it. Patients with interpretation requirements were known to the practice and staff knew how to access these services. Patients with learning disabilities were offered a health check every year during which their long term care plans were discussed with the patient and their carer if appropriate. Reception staff were able to identify vulnerable patients and offer longer appointment times where needed.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The practice is rated as good for people experiencing poor mental health, including people with dementia. The practice is aware of their aging population group. Staff were aware of the safeguarding principles and GPs and nurses had access to safeguarding policies. The nurses had received training in the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and were aware of the principles and used them when gaining consent. There was signposting and information available to patients. The practice referred patients who needed mental health services and community psychiatric nurses visited the practice. Patients suffering poor mental health received annual health checks as recommended by national guidelines. Longer appointment times were available and volunteers offering transport was used for patients to access the practice.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

We looked at patient experience feedback from the national GP survey from 2014. The patient's survey received 144 responses and showed 91% of patients found that GPs gave them the time they needed with 95% saying that GPs were good at explaining treatment and tests to them. 96% of patients said that the nursing staff were very helpful and explained their treatment well and 88% of the patients found the reception staff helpful.

We spoke with three patients during the inspection and collected 38 completed comment cards which had been left in the reception area for patients to fill in before we visited. All of the comment cards gave positive feedback. Patients told us the staff were friendly, they were treated

with respect, their care was very good, and they were always able to get an appointment. The comment cards also told us how they felt listened to by the staff and how supportive staff were.

Patients were satisfied with the facilities at the practice. Patients commented on the building being clean and tidy. Patients told us staff used gloves and aprons where needed and washed their hands before treatment was provided.

Patients found it easy to get repeat prescriptions from the practice.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

Review the procedures for checking and recording emergency medicines and equipment.

Consider ways that ensure vaccines are always stored at the correct temperature.

Modbury Health Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC lead inspector. The team also included a GP specialist advisor, a CQC pharmacist and a practice manager specialist advisor.

Background to Modbury Health Centre

The Modbury Health centre provides primary medical services to people living in the village of Modbury and surrounding villages.

At the time of our inspection there were approximately 4,100 patients registered at Modbury Health Centre. There were four GP partners, three female and one male, who held managerial and financial responsibility for running the business. The GPs were supported by three registered nurses, one being a nurse prescriber, a healthcare assistant, a practice manager, and additional administrative and reception staff. Patients using the practice also had access to community staff including district nurses, health visitors, and midwives.

The Modbury Health Centre open from 8 am until 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are available from 8am to 1pm and then from 2pm until 6pm. There were extended hours on two mornings a week to accommodate patients that had difficulty accessing the practice during the day. During evenings and weekends, when the practice is closed, patients are directed to an Out of Hours service delivered by another provider.

The practice is a training practice for qualified doctors undertaking training to become a GP.

The practice also has a dispensary that is open Monday to Friday between 8am to 6pm.

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. This 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 conducting our announced inspection of the Modbury Health Centre, we reviewed a range of information we held about the service and asked other organisations to share what they knew about the service. Organisations included the local Health watch, NHS England, and the local Cornwall Clinical Commissioning Group.

We requested information and documentation from the provider which was made available to us either before, during or 48 hours after the inspection.

We carried out our announced visit on 8 April 2015. We spoke with three patients, three GPs, two of the nursing team and four of the management and administration team. We also spent time with the dispensary staff. We

Detailed findings

collected 38 patient responses from our comments box which had been displayed in the waiting room. We observed how the practice was run and looked at the facilities and the information available to patients.

We looked at documentation that related to the management of the practice and anonymised patient records in order to see the processes followed by the staff.

We observed staff interactions with other staff and with patients and made observations throughout the internal and external areas of the building.

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 are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks 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)

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record

The practice used a range of information to identify risks and improve patient safety. For example, reported incidents and national patient safety alerts as well as comments and complaints received from patients. The staff we spoke with were aware of their responsibilities to raise concerns, and knew how to report incidents and near misses.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports and minutes of meetings where these were discussed for the last eighteen months. This showed the practice had managed these consistently over time and so could show evidence of a safe track record over the long term.

Learning and improvement from safety incidents

The practice had a system in place for reporting, recording and monitoring significant events, incidents and accidents. There were records of significant events that had occurred during 2014/15 and we were able to review these. Significant events were a standing item on the practice meeting agenda. There was evidence that the practice had learned from these and that the findings were shared with relevant staff. Staff, including receptionists, administrators and nursing staff, knew how to raise an issue for consideration at the meetings and they felt encouraged to do so.

Staff used incident forms on the practice intranet and sent completed forms to the practice manager. We were shown the system used to manage and monitor incidents. We tracked three incidents and saw records were completed in a comprehensive and timely manner. We saw evidence of action taken as a result. For example a patient had been told by a receptionist blood results were within normal limits but later found that the result was abnormal. Staff said that not all blood test results arrived at the same time. As a result of this the practice produced a leaflet to be given to the patient asking them to allow seven days before phoning for results. Where patients had been affected by something that had gone wrong, in line with practice policy, patients were given an apology and informed of the actions taken.

National patient safety alerts were disseminated by the practice manager. Non medicine alerts were emailed to all practice staff. Medicines alerts were emailed to the GPs and if action was required this was documented and recorded. All alerts were discussed at practice meetings.

Reliable safety systems and processes including safeguarding

The practice had systems to manage and review risks to vulnerable children, young people and adults. We looked at training records which showed that all staff had received relevant role specific training on safeguarding. We asked members of medical, nursing and administrative staff about their most recent training. Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in older people, vulnerable adults and children. They were also aware of their responsibilities and knew how to share information, properly record documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact the relevant agencies in working hours and out of normal hours. Contact details were easily accessible.

The practice had appointed dedicated GPs as leads in safeguarding vulnerable adults and children. They had been trained to level three and could demonstrate they had the necessary training to enable them to fulfil this role. All staff we spoke with were aware who these leads were and who to speak with in the practice if they had a safeguarding concern.

There was a system to highlight vulnerable patients on the practice's electronic records. This included information to make staff aware of any relevant issues when patients attended appointments; for example children subject to child protection plans.

There was a chaperone policy, which was visible on the waiting room noticeboard and in consulting rooms. (A chaperone is a person who acts as a safeguard and witness for a patient and health care professional during a medical examination or procedure). All nursing staff, including health care assistants, had been trained to be a chaperone and understood their responsibilities when acting as chaperones, including where to stand to be able to observe the examination.

Medicines management

We checked how medicines were stored in the dispensary, and found that they were stored securely and were only accessible to authorised staff. The temperatures in the

Are services safe?

medicines refrigerator was monitored to show that these medicines were stored within the recommended ranges. There were no records of room temperature monitoring kept, however the temperature felt acceptable at the time of our inspection. Systems were in place to check that medicines were within their expiry date and suitable for use. Expired and unwanted medicines were disposed of in line with waste regulations. Systems were in place to deal with any medicines alerts or recalls, and records kept of any actions taken.

There were clear operating procedures in place for dispensary processes. Systems were in place to ensure all prescriptions were signed before the medicines were dispensed and handed out to patients. Dispensary staff explained the procedure for generating repeat prescriptions, and how the system highlights medicines approaching their review dates and those that have passed this date. Systems were in place to handle high risk medicines, to help make sure that any necessary monitoring and tests had been done and were up to date.

Medicines were scanned using a barcode system to help reduce any dispensing errors, and controlled drugs were checked by a second trained dispenser or doctor. Any incidents were recorded, monitored and actions put in place to reduce the risks of any recurrence. The practice had signed up to the Dispensing Services Quality Scheme, which rewards practices for providing high quality services to patients of their dispensary. We saw records showing that dispensary staff had received appropriate training and had regular appraisals of their competence.

The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage arrangements because of their potential for misuse) and had in place standard procedures that set out how they were managed. There were suitable arrangements in place for the storage, recording and destruction of controlled drugs, and regular checks of stock levels were undertaken and recorded. Staff were aware of how to raise concerns around controlled drugs with the controlled drugs accountable officer in their area.

Blank prescription printer forms were held securely on arrival in the practice, before use. Records were held of forms received, and of those taken for use in consulting rooms, which were locked when not in use. This enabled an audit trail to be maintained, of the whereabouts of these forms, and showed that prescriptions were stored securely.

Emergency medicines were held at the practice, and we were told that checks were undertaken to make sure that they were available and suitable for use if needed. We found that some of these medicines were checked by dispensary staff and some by nursing staff, and there were no records kept to show when these checks were undertaken.

Vaccines were stored appropriately and there were systems in place to ensure that the cold chain was maintained, ensuring that these products would be safe and effective to use. One of the two vaccines refrigerators had no warning sticker attached to the plug, and the switch was in an easy position to be accidentally unplugged or switched off. Consideration should be given to the switchless wiring of the refrigerator, in line with guidance from Public Health England on storing vaccines.

Cleanliness and infection control

We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. We saw there were cleaning schedules in place and cleaning records were kept. Patients we spoke with told us they always found the practice clean and had no concerns about cleanliness or infection control.

The practice had a lead for infection control who had undertaken further training to enable them to provide advice on the practice infection control policy and carry out staff training. All staff received induction training about infection control specific to their role and received annual updates. We saw evidence that the lead had carried out monthly audits for the practice and met with the practice manager to discuss findings. For example following an audit the practice changed systems to use disposable tourniquets (equipment used when taking blood).

An infection control policy and supporting procedures were available for staff to refer to, which enabled them to plan and implement measures to control infection. For example, personal protective equipment including disposable gloves, aprons and coverings were available for staff to use and staff were able to describe how they would use these to comply with the practice's infection control policy. There was also a policy for needle stick injury and staff knew the procedure to follow in the event of an injury.

Notices about hand hygiene techniques were displayed in staff and patient toilets. Hand washing sinks with hand soap, hand gel and hand towel dispensers were available in treatment rooms.

Are services safe?

The practice had a policy for the management, testing and investigation of legionella (a bacterium that can grow in contaminated water and can be potentially fatal). We saw records that confirmed the practice was carrying out regular checks in line with this policy to reduce the risk of infection to staff and patients. The last test was carried out in February 2015.

Equipment

Staff we spoke with told us they had equipment to enable them to carry out diagnostic examinations, assessments and treatments. They told us that all equipment was tested and maintained regularly and we saw equipment maintenance logs and other records that confirmed this. All portable electrical equipment was routinely tested and displayed stickers indicating the last testing date was November 2014. A schedule of testing was in place. We saw evidence of calibration of relevant equipment; for example weighing scales, spirometers, blood pressure measuring devices and the fridge thermometer had been tested in June 2014.

Staffing and recruitment

Records we looked at contained evidence that appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and criminal records checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). The practice had a recruitment policy that set out the standards it followed when recruiting clinical and non-clinical staff.

Staff told us about the arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. We saw there was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty. There was also an arrangement in place for members of staff, including nursing and administrative staff, to cover each other's annual leave. Newly appointed staff had this expectation written in their contracts.

Staff told us there were usually enough staff to maintain the smooth running of the practice and there were always enough staff on duty to keep patients safe. The practice manager showed us records to demonstrate that actual staffing levels and skill mix were in line with planned staffing requirements.

Monitoring safety and responding to risk

The practice had systems, processes and policies in place to manage and monitor risks to patients, staff and visitors to the practice. These included annual and monthly checks of the building, the environment, medicines management, staffing, dealing with emergencies and equipment. The practice also had a health and safety policy. Health and safety information was displayed for staff to see and there was an identified health and safety representative.

Identified risks were included on a risk log. Each risk was assessed and rated and mitigating actions recorded to reduce and manage the risk. We saw that any risks were discussed at GP partners' meetings and within team meetings. For example, the practice manager had shared the recent findings from an infection control audit with the team.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had arrangements in place to manage emergencies. Records showed that all staff had received training in basic life support. Emergency equipment was available including access to oxygen and an automated external defibrillator (used to attempt to restart a person's heart in an emergency). When we asked members of staff, they all knew the location of this equipment and records confirmed that it was checked regularly. The practice also had a well stocked accessible first aid kit.

Emergency medicines were available in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. These included those for the treatment of cardiac arrest, and anaphylaxis.

A business continuity plan was in place to deal with a range of emergencies that may impact on the daily operation of the practice. Risks identified included power failure, unplanned sickness and access to the building. The document also contained relevant contact details for staff to refer to. For example, contact details of a heating company to contact if the heating system failed.

The practice had carried out a fire risk assessment that included actions required to maintain fire safety. Records showed that staff were up to date with fire training and that they practised regular fire drills.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The GPs and nursing staff we spoke with could clearly outline the rationale for their approaches to treatment. They were familiar with current best practice guidance, and accessed guidelines from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and from local commissioners. We saw minutes of practice meetings where new guidelines were disseminated, the implications for the practice's performance and patients were discussed and required actions agreed. The staff we spoke with and the evidence we reviewed confirmed that these actions were designed to ensure that each patient received support to achieve the best health outcome for them. We found from our discussions with the GPs and nurses that staff completed thorough assessments of patients' needs in line with NICE guidelines, and these were reviewed when appropriate.

The GPs told us they lead in specialist clinical areas such as minor surgery, dispensary, acupuncture, substance misuse and family planning. The practice nurses supported this work, which allowed the practice to focus on specific conditions. Clinical staff we spoke with were open about asking for and providing colleagues with advice and support.

Discrimination was avoided when making care and treatment decisions. Interviews with GPs showed that the culture in the practice was that patients were cared for and treated based on need and the practice took account of patient's age, gender, race and culture as appropriate.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

Staff across the practice had key roles in monitoring and improving outcomes for patients. These roles included data input, scheduling clinical reviews, and managing child protection alerts and medicines management. The information staff collected was then collated by the practice manager and deputy practice manager to support the practice to carry out clinical audits.

The practice showed us seven clinical audits that had been undertaken in the last two years. The GPs told us clinical audits were often linked to medicines management information, safety alerts or as a result of information from the quality and outcomes framework (QOF). (QOF is a

voluntary incentive scheme for GP practices in the UK. The scheme financially rewards practices for managing some of the most common long-term conditions and for the implementation of preventative measures). For example, we saw an audit regarding the prescribing of pain relieving and blood thinning medicines. Following the audit, the GPs carried out medication reviews for patients who were prescribed these medicines and altered their prescribing practice, in line with the guidelines. GPs maintained records showing how they had evaluated the service and documented the success of any changes.

The practice also used the information collected for the QOF and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. For example, 93.3% of patients with diabetes had an annual foot examination, and the practice met all the minimum standards for QOF in diabetes/asthma/ chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (lung disease) and treating patients with osteoporosis. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF clinical targets.

The team was making use of clinical audit tools, clinical supervision and staff meetings to assess the performance of clinical staff. The staff we spoke with discussed how, as a group, they reflected on the outcomes being achieved and areas where this could be improved. Staff spoke positively about the culture in the practice around audit and quality improvement, noting that there was an expectation that all clinical staff should undertake at least one audit a year.

Effective staffing

Practice staffing included medical, nursing, managerial and administrative staff. We reviewed staff training records and saw that all staff were up to date with attending mandatory courses such as annual basic life support. All GPs were up to date with their yearly continuing professional development requirements and all either have been revalidated or had a date for revalidation. (Every GP is appraised annually, and undertakes a fuller assessment called revalidation every five years. Only when revalidation has been confirmed by the General Medical Council can the GP continue to practise and remain on the performers list with NHS England).

All staff undertook annual appraisals that identified learning needs from which action plans were documented. The nurses received appraisal from the practice manager and a GP. The practice manager appraised all the

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

administrative staff. Our interviews with staff confirmed that the practice was proactive in providing training and funding for relevant courses, for example, a nurse told us that they had completed a diploma in Asthma.

Practice nurses were expected to perform defined duties and were able to demonstrate that they were trained to fulfil these duties. For example, administration of vaccines. Those with extended roles, for example seeing patients with long term conditions such as asthma and diabetes, were also able to demonstrate that they had appropriate training to fulfil these roles.

The practice had a policy that where poor performance had been identified appropriate action would be taken to manage this.

Working with colleagues and other services

The practice worked with other service providers to meet patient's needs and manage those of patients with complex needs. It received blood test results, X ray results, and letters from the local hospital including discharge summaries, out-of-hours GP services and the 111 service both electronically and by post. The practice had a policy outlining the responsibilities of all relevant staff in passing on, reading and acting on any issues arising from communications with other care providers on the day they were received. The GP who saw these documents and results was responsible for the action required. All staff we spoke with understood their roles and felt the system in place worked well.

The practice was commissioned for the new enhanced service and had a process in place to follow up patients discharged from hospital. (Enhanced services require an enhanced level of service provision above what is normally required under the core GP contract). We saw that the policy for actioning hospital communications was working well in this respect. The practice undertook a yearly audit of follow-ups to ensure inappropriate follow-ups were documented and that no follow-ups were missed.

The practice held multidisciplinary team meetings bi monthly meetings to discuss the needs of complex patients, for example those with end of life care needs or children on the at risk register. These meetings were attended by district nurses, social workers, palliative care nurses and decisions about care planning were documented in a shared care record.

The practice also met weekly with a social worker and a carer support worker to support patients with these specific needs. Staff felt this system worked well and remarked on the usefulness of the forum as a means of sharing important information.

Information sharing

The practice used several electronic systems to communicate with other providers. For example, there was a shared system with the local GP out-of-hours provider to enable patient data to be shared in a secure and timely manner. Electronic systems were also in place for making referrals through the Choose and Book system. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital). The practice had recognised the importance of timely referrals and employed a staff member for this specific role.

The practice had systems to provide staff with the information they needed. Staff used an electronic patient record to coordinate, document and manage patients' care. All staff were fully trained on the system, and commented positively about the system's safety and ease of use. This software enabled scanned paper communications, such as those from hospital, to be saved in the system for future reference.

Consent to care and treatment

We found that staff had received training in and were aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and their duties in fulfilling it. All the clinical staff we spoke with understood the key parts of the legislation and was able to describe how they implemented it in their practice. Staff had accessed MCA training available on the eLearning system used.

There was a practice policy for documenting consent for specific interventions. For example, the nurses obtained signed consent for ear syringing; the consent form listed any complications that occur as well as when the procedure should not be carried out.

Patients with a learning disability and those with dementia were supported to make decisions through the use of care plans, which they were involved in agreeing. These care plans were reviewed annually or more frequently if changes in clinical circumstances dictated it. When interviewed, staff gave examples of how a patient's best interests were taken into account if a patient did not have capacity to

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

make a decision. All clinical staff demonstrated a clear understanding of Gillick competencies. These are used to help assess whether a child has the maturity to make their own decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions.

Health promotion and prevention

The practice had met with the Public Health team from the local authority and the CCG to discuss the implications and share information about the needs of the practice population identified by the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). The JSNA pulls together information about the health and social care needs of the local area. This information was used to help focus health promotion activity.

It was practice policy to offer a health check with the health care assistant or practice nurse to all new patients registering with the practice. The GP was informed of all health concerns detected and these were followed up in a timely way. We noted a culture among the GPs to use their contact with patients to help maintain or improve mental, physical health and wellbeing. For example, by offering chlamydia screening to patients aged 18 to 25 years and offering smoking cessation advice to smokers.

The practice had numerous ways of identifying patients who needed additional support, and it was pro-active in offering additional help. For example, the practice kept a register of all patients with a learning disability and 100% were offered and received an annual physical health check in the past year. The practice had also identified the

smoking status of 96% of patients over the age of 16 and actively offered nurse-led smoking cessation clinics to these patients. Similar mechanisms of identifying 'at risk' groups were used for patients who were obese and those receiving end of life care. These groups were offered further support in line with their needs.

The practice's performance for cervical smear uptake was 85%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for cervical smears and the practice audited patients who do not attend. There was also a named nurse responsible for following up patients who did not attend screening.

The practice offered a full range of immunisations for children, travel vaccines and flu vaccinations in line with current national guidance. Last year's performance for all immunisations was above average for the CCG, and again there was a clear policy for following up non-attenders by the named practice nurse.

A travel consultation service was available. This included a full risk assessment based on the area of travel and used the 'Fit for travel' website. Vaccinations were given where appropriate or patients were referred on to private travel clinics for further information and support if needed.

There was information on various health conditions and self-care available in the reception area of the practice. The practice website contained information on health advice and other services which could assist patients. The website also provided information on self-care.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

Patients told us they felt well cared for at the practice. Patients we spoke with on the day of the inspection told us they were communicated with in a caring and respectful manner by all staff. Patients spoke highly of the staff and GPs. We did not receive any negative comments about the care patients received or about the staff.

We reviewed the most recent data available for the practice on patient satisfaction. This included a national survey performed in 2014. Evidence from these sources showed patients were satisfied with how they were treated and that this was with compassion, dignity and respect. For example, data from the patient survey showed the practice was rated high for all outcomes including consideration, reassurance, and confidence in ability and respect. Patients reported on consultations with doctors and nurses with 95% of practice respondents saying the GP was good at listening to them and 95% saying the GP gave them enough time.

Patients completed CQC comment cards to tell us what they thought about the practice. We received 38 completed cards and the majority were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were efficient, helpful and caring.

Staff and patients told us that all consultations and treatments were carried out in the privacy of a consulting room. Dignity curtains were provided in consulting rooms and treatment rooms so that patients' privacy and dignity was maintained during examinations, investigations and treatments. We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations and that conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.

We saw that staff were careful to follow the practice's confidentiality policy when discussing patients' treatments so that confidential information was kept private. The practice switchboard was located at the reception desk, staff had received training on how to maintain confidentiality whilst conversing on the telephone. We observed this in operation during our inspection and noted that it enabled confidentiality to be maintained.

There was a clearly visible notice in the patient reception area stating the practice's zero tolerance for abusive behaviour. Receptionists told us that referring to this had helped them diffuse potentially difficult situations.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The patient survey information we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment and generally rated the practice well in these areas. For example, data from the national patient survey showed 94% of practice respondents said the GP involved them in care decisions and 95% felt the GP was good at explaining treatment and results.

Patients we spoke with on the day of our inspection told us that health issues were discussed with them and 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 they wished to receive. Patient feedback on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

Translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. Notices in the reception areas informed patients this service was available. A hearing loop was available for patients that were hard of hearing.

Patient/carers support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

The survey information we reviewed showed patients were positive about the emotional support provided by the practice and rated it well in this area. For example, 94% of respondents to the patient survey said they had received help to access support services to help them manage their treatment and care when it had been needed. The patients we spoke with on the day of our inspection and the comment cards we received were also consistent with this survey information. For example, these highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Notices in the patient waiting room and patient website also told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. The practice's computer system

Are services caring?

alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. We were shown the written information available for carers to ensure they understood the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP sent a letter of condolence with leaflets giving

advice on how to find a support service. Patients we spoke with who had had a bereavement confirmed they had received this type of support and said they had found it helpful.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

We found the practice was responsive to patients' needs and had systems in place to maintain the level of service provided. The needs of the practice population were understood and systems were in place to address identified needs in the way services were delivered.

The practice welcomed feedback from patients and external bodies and used significant events, complaints and near misses to improve the services provided. To obtain additional feedback from patients, a virtual patient's group (VPG) of fifty members to undertake surveys and these were to consult about opening times, making routine and urgent appointments, telephone access, environment and the overall opinion of the practice.

The practice had implemented suggestions for improvements and made changes to the way it delivered services in response to feedback from the virtual patient group (VPG). For example, the practice was experiencing increased usage of the telephone system resulting in longer waits for patients. As a result of this feedback the practice recruited additional staff and increased the number of telephone lines into the practice which has improved the service.

Many of the patients registered at the practice lived in the surrounding villages. The staff at the practice supported a local charity called Modbury caring; the charity collected patients for their appointments and delivered prescriptions if patients had no means of transport. We spoke with a patient who had used this service to attend an appointment at the practice and they told us that the service was invaluable to them.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had recognised the needs of different groups in the planning of its services. Staff said no patient would be turned away. The practice staff knew how to access language translation services if information was not understood by the patient, to enable them to make an informed decision or to give consent to treatment.

The practice provided equality and diversity training. Staff we spoke with confirmed that they had completed the equality and diversity training in the last 12 months and that equality and diversity was regularly discussed at staff appraisals and team meetings.

The practice had level access for patients using wheelchairs and patients with pushchairs. The front door and corridors were wide and all consultation and treatment rooms were on the same floor level allowing easy access for wheelchair users. Toys were available for younger children. We saw that the waiting area was large enough to accommodate patients with wheelchairs and prams and allowed for easy access to the treatment and consultation rooms. Accessible toilet facilities were available for all patients attending the practice including baby changing facilities.

The practice had the medical equipment it required to provide the services it offered. Clinical treatment rooms had the equipment required for minor surgery and other procedures which took place.

Access to the service

Opening times and out of hours arrangements were displayed on the front door of the practice and in all Practice leaflets and relevant posters, practice website, and on NHS Choices website. Appointments were available from 8am to 1pm and then from 2pm until 6pm. There were extended hours on two mornings a week to accommodate patients that had difficulty accessing the practice during the day.

Patients were able to telephone to pre-book an appointment with a GP up to three weeks in advance, and six weeks for nurse and healthcare assistant appointments. Patients could also book an appointment up to two weeks in advance on-line via the practice website using 'The Waiting Room'; which was available twenty four hours a day. Patients were able to telephone the Practice to make an appointment on the day with a GP, nurse or health care assistant. Comprehensive information was available to patients about appointments on the practice website. This included how to arrange urgent appointments and home visits and how to book appointments through the website. There were also arrangements to ensure patients received urgent medical assistance when the practice was closed. If

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

patients called the practice when it was closed, an answerphone message gave the telephone number they should ring depending on the circumstances. Information on the out-of-hours service was provided to patients.

Longer appointments were also available for patients who needed them and those with long-term conditions. This also included appointments with a named GP or nurse. Home visits were made to two local care homes by a GP for those patients who needed one.

Patients were generally satisfied with the appointments system. They confirmed that they could see a GP on the same day if they needed to. They also said they could see another GP if there was a wait to see the GP of their choice. Comments received from patients showed that patients in urgent need of treatment had often been able to make appointments on the same day of contacting the practice.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system in place for handling complaints and concerns. Its complaints policy and procedures were in

line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England. The practice manager was the designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.

We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. The procedure was displayed as well as information about advocacy services. Complaints forms were readily available on the reception desk. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint. None of the patients we spoke with had ever needed to make a complaint about the practice.

The practice reviewed complaints annually to detect themes or trends. We looked at the report for the last review and observed that themes had been identified, for example, difficulty in making an appointment in the morning. The practice had acted on this information and reviewed their telephone systems.

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

Staff were able to describe the vision, values, strategic and operational aims of the practice. Staff said one of the main strengths of the practice was the morale and team atmosphere. There were clear lines of accountability and areas of responsibility. Staff knew what their responsibilities were in relation to these.

Governance arrangements

The practice had a number of policies and procedures in place to govern activity and these were available to staff on the desktop on any computer within the practice. We looked at these policies and procedures and most staff had completed a cover sheet to confirm that they had read the policy and when. All the policies and procedures we looked at had been reviewed annually and were up to date.

There was a clear leadership structure with named members of staff in lead roles. For example, there was a lead nurse for infection control and a partner was the lead for safeguarding. We spoke with members of staff and they were all clear about their own roles and responsibilities. They all told us they felt valued, well supported and knew who to go to in the practice with any concerns.

The practice used the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) to measure its performance. The QOF data for this practice showed it was performing in line with national standards. We saw that QOF data was regularly discussed at monthly team meetings and action plans were produced to maintain or improve outcomes.

The practice had an ongoing programme of clinical audits which it used to monitor quality and systems to identify where action should be taken. For example the practice were auditing medicines being prescribed in the practice.

The practice held monthly governance meetings. We looked at minutes from the last two meetings and found that performance, quality and risks had been discussed.

Leadership, openness and transparency

We saw from minutes that team meetings were held regularly, at least monthly. Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity and were happy to raise issues at team meetings.

The practice manager was responsible for human resource policies and procedures. We reviewed a number of policies, for example disciplinary procedures, induction policy, and management of sickness which were in place to support staff. We were shown the electronic staff handbook that was available to all staff, which included sections on equality and harassment and bullying at work. Staff we spoke with knew where to find these policies if required.

Seeking and acting on feedback from patients, public and staff

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through patient surveys and complaints received. We looked at the results of the annual patient survey and patients were making reference to the sometimes delay in receiving repeat prescriptions from the dispensary. We saw as a result of this the practice had looked into the reasons why this might have happened and introduced system one online repeat ordering for patients to reduce the delay.

The practice had virtual patient group (VPG). These members were regularly asked to comment on areas where they believed the practice could improve upon the services they deliver. The results and actions agreed from these surveys are available on the practice website.

The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged in the practice to improve outcomes for both staff and patients.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy which was available to all staff in the staff handbook and electronically on any computer within the practice.

Management lead through learning and improvement

Staff told us that the practice supported them to maintain their clinical professional development through training and mentoring. We looked at five staff files chosen at random and saw that regular appraisals took place which included a personal development plan. Staff told us that the practice was very supportive of training and they had staff away days and protected time to carry out any learning.

The practice had recently been approved to become a GP training practice.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Staff told us that the practice supported them to maintain their clinical professional development through training and mentoring. We looked at four staff files and saw that

regular appraisals took place which included a personal development plan. Staff told us that the practice was very supportive of training and that they had staff away days where guest speakers and trainers attended.