

# Dr B J McKenna & Partners

## Quality Report

99 Amersall Road  
Scawthorpe  
Doncaster  
South Yorkshire  
DN5 9PQ

Tel: 01302 390490

Website: [www.petersgatemedicalcentre.nhs.uk](http://www.petersgatemedicalcentre.nhs.uk)

Date of inspection visit: 23 February 2016

Date of publication: 04/05/2016

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

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

# Summary of findings

## Contents

### Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10

### Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Dr B J McKenna & Partners	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr B J McKenna and partners on 23 February 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Feedback from patients about their care was consistently and strongly positive.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said they found it difficult to get through to the practice by telephone first thing in the morning.

Once their call was answered they told us it was easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.

- The practice implemented suggestions for improvements and made changes to the way it delivered services as a consequence of feedback from patients and from the patient participation group. For example, the waiting area was reviewed to promote access for patients in wheelchairs. Practice staff facilitated a talk for patients and people from the local area about diabetes in the community library adjacent to the practice. Patients told us this was very informative and were looking forward to the next one about asthma, scheduled in March 2016.
- 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.

We saw one area of outstanding practice:

# Summary of findings

- Practice staff facilitated a talk for patients and people from the surrounding areas about diabetes in the community library adjacent to the practice. Patients told us this was very informative and they were looking forward to the next one about asthma, scheduled in March 2016.

**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 there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and 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 showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality and 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 multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



### Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the National GP Patient Survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for almost all aspects of care. For example, 95% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 84%, national average 85%).
- Feedback from patients about their care and treatment was consistently and strongly positive.
- We observed a strong patient-centred culture.

Good



# Summary of findings

- Staff were motivated and inspired to offer kind and compassionate care and worked to overcome obstacles to achieving this. We found positive examples of staff going that extra mile to provide a caring service. For example, staff having taken certain elderly patients home who were unwell and were unable to make their own way.

## Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it difficult to get through to the practice by telephone first thing in the morning. Once their call was answered they told us it was 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.
- They had installed a bicycle rack outside the practice following requests from patients.
- The practice had a bicycle for staff to use to visit housebound patients. This was particularly useful for those staff who did not have a car.
- Practice staff facilitated a talk for patients and people from the local area about diabetes in the community library adjacent to the practice. Patients told us this was very informative and they were looking forward to the next one about asthma, scheduled in March 2016.

Good



## Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.

Good



# Summary of findings

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

- All had a named GP.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Each GP took the lead for the nursing and residential homes allocated to the practice. They each held a weekly clinic at the home incorporating medication and long term condition reviews along with regular appointments. They used laptops to record the consultations directly onto the patient record.

Good



### People with long term conditions

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

- Practice nursing staff had lead roles in long term condition management and those patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 90% which was 7% below the CCG average and 0.3% above the national average.
- 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.

Good



### Families, children and young people

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

- 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 accident and emergency attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.

Good



# Summary of findings

- The percentage of patients with asthma, on the register, who have had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months was comparable to local and national averages.
- 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 percentage of patients with asthma, on the register, who have had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months was comparable to the CCG average.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.
- Attendance at accident and emergency for patients registered at the practice was 15% below the local average.

## **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 was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

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 those who needed it.
- The practice regularly worked with multidisciplinary teams in the case management of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- The practice informed people how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Good



# Summary of findings

- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in 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).

- Of those patients diagnosed as living with dementia 77% had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is just below the national average of 84%.
- The practice regularly worked with multidisciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia. Staff had completed dementia friend awareness training.
- Attendance at accident and emergency for patients registered at the practice was 15% below the local average.

**Good**



# Summary of findings

## What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 7 January 2016 showed the practice was mostly performing above local and national averages. 295 survey forms were distributed and 120 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 65% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 69% and a national average of 73%.
- 87% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 83%, national average 85%).
- 94% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 83%, national average 85%).

- 88% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 76%, national average 78%).

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 very positive about the standard of care received.

We spoke with 16 patients during the inspection. Feedback from patients about their care was consistently and strongly positive. All patients we spoke with said they were very happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

# Dr B J McKenna & Partners

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### Our inspection team was led by:

A CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser, a practice manager specialist adviser and an expert by experience.

### Background to Dr B J McKenna & Partners

Dr B J McKenna and partners, or Petersgate Medical Centre as it is known locally, is located in Scawthorpe on the outskirts of Doncaster. The practice provides services for 8,663 patients under the terms of the NHS General Medical Services contract. The practice catchment area is classed as within the group of the fifth more deprived areas in England. The age profile of the practice population is similar to other GP practices in the Doncaster Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) area.

The practice has five GP partners, two female and three male who cover 4 whole time equivalent GP posts, a GP registrar, a foundation year two doctor and a regular GP locum working a session each week. In addition there are two other regular GP locums who cover holidays when needed. The surgery is a host practice to medical students from Sheffield University. They are supported by a nurse manager, two practice nurses, a healthcare assistant, a phlebotomist, two practice managers and a team of reception and administrative staff.

The practice was open between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday and offered booked appointments with GPs from 8am until 12.30pm on Saturday mornings. Appointments with GPs, practice nursing staff and the healthcare assistants were available throughout the day. The

phlebotomist held a walk in clinic three mornings a week. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

When the practice is closed calls were answered by the out-of-hours service which is accessed via the surgery telephone number or by calling the NHS 111 service.

### Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive inspection programme.

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 registered provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

### How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 23 February 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, GP registrar, foundation year two doctor, practice managers, nurse manager, administrative and reception staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.

# Detailed findings

- 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 living 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 practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, we were told how the process to check patient identity was reviewed following an incident. The incident record contained the investigations undertaken and reported how to avoid the situation happening again. We were told this was discussed at the practice meeting and shared with staff who attended. Staff who did not attend the meetings would be briefed accordingly following the meeting. Minutes of the meeting were kept on the practice intranet system which all staff could access. The managers approached another practice in the area and asked them to come and demonstrate their processes to share best patient record keeping practice.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

### 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 adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. 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 relevant to their role. GPs were trained to safeguarding children level three.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service check (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 nurse manager was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the IPC teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). 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. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow practice nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable healthcare assistants to administer vaccinations after specific training when a doctor or practice nurse were on the premises.
- We reviewed recruitment 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 DBS. We did observe the interview notes were missing from two files.

## Are services safe?

- 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.

### Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

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

### Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system 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 fit for use.

The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for utility companies.

# 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 peoples' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

### Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 98.2% of the total number of points available, with 5.9% exception reporting. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). Data from 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 90% which was 7% below the CCG average and 0.3% above the national average.
- All patients with hypertension were having regular blood pressure tests. This was 1% higher than the CCG average and 2% than the national average.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 4% above the CCG and 7% above the national average.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements. Practice nursing staff had identified how an increased number of complex wound dressings performed in the practice had an impacted providing other areas of patient care. Their workload was reviewed which resulted in providing employing a phlebotomist three mornings a

week to provide patients with open access clinics to have blood tests. Patients told us this service was really convenient as blood tests could be done after seeing the GP or practice nurse.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement. There had been four clinical audits completed in the last two years, all of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research. Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included reviewing patients who presented with symptoms of a cough for less than three weeks to ensure they were offered the correct medicines and follow up.

### 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. It 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 vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to 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 through teaching sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.

# Are services effective?

## (for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. 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. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence multidisciplinary team meetings took place at least every three months and care plans were routinely reviewed and updated. Monthly 'children in family' meetings were held with the health visitors and monthly review of patients at risk of admission to hospital took place.

### 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.

- These included those with palliative care needs, carers, those at risk of developing a long term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- Two counsellors held a weekly clinic at the practice to offer psychological and talking therapies to patients. Staff told us the service was popular with patients.
- Staff told us patients were provided with written information on their illnesses or conditions using the evidence based patient information leaflets.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the CCG average and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer.

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 92% to 100% and five year olds from 88% to 98%.

Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 77%, and at risk groups 57%. These were also above CCG and national averages.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people 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.

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 very positive about the standard of care received. The less positive comments referred to getting through to the practice by telephone first thing in the morning.

We spoke with three members of the patient participation group. They also told us they were also very 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, which represented 1% of the patient population, showed patients felt they were treated with much compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and practice nurses. For example:

- 94% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 89%.
- 96% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 85%, national average 87%).
- 99% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 94%, national average 95%).
- 95% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 84%, national average 85%).

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

We found positive examples of staff going that extra mile to provide a caring service. We observed staff interacting with patients in a compassionate way and arranging taxis for those who needed one. Practice staff told us on occasions they had taken patients home if they were too unwell to make their own way.

### 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 on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

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 just above and in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 92% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 86%.
- 87% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 79%, national average 82%).
- 83% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 86%, national average 85%).

Staff told us interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.

### Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

## Are services caring?

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us if families experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them. This call was either followed by a meeting at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

## Our findings

### Responding to and meeting 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, the practice was working with the other GPs in their locality group to offer Saturday morning GP appointments to patients who contacted the out-of-hours service and needed to be seen. This negated the need to travel to the out-of-hours contact centre in Doncaster.

- The practice offered extended opening on Saturday mornings for booked appointments with GPs from 8am until 12.30pm.
- There were longer appointments available for patients who needed them.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and interpretation services available.
- They had installed a bicycle rack outside the practice following requests from patients.
- The practice had a bicycle for staff to use to visit housebound patients. This was particularly useful for those staff who did not have a car.
- Practice staff facilitated a talk for patients and people from the surrounding areas about diabetes in the community library adjacent to the practice. Patients told us this was very informative and were looking forward to the next one about asthma, scheduled in March 2016.
- The practice referred patients to the social prescribing project in Doncaster. The GPs and practice nurses had the option to prescribe non-medical support to patients. This included for loneliness and social isolation, housing or advice on debt.
- Attendance at accident and emergency for patients registered at the practice was 15% below the local average.

### Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday and offered booked appointments with GPs from 8am until 12.30pm on Saturday mornings. Appointments with GPs, practice nursing staff and the healthcare assistants were available throughout the day. The phlebotomist held a walk in clinic three mornings a week. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 82% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 74% and national average of 75%.
- 65% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 69%, national average 73%).
- 56% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 56%, national average 59%).

People told us on the day of the inspection they were able to get appointments when they needed them but they sometimes had difficulty getting through to the practice by telephone first thing in the morning. The practice had identified telephone access first thing in the morning as an issue and had completed a review of telephone calls to the practice. They had scheduled further analysis and told us they would then review the findings.

### Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system.

We looked at complaints received in the last 12 months and found lessons were learnt from concerns and

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

complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, staff had reviewed their contact with patients to reflect how the patient perceived them.

# 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. An acronym of 'Petersgate' was used by practice staff to represent the following words in delivering care to patients. Patients, effort, training and trainees, environment, respect, staff, good listeners, attitude, targets, effective. This 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 on the computers.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained which was regularly reviewed using different sources such as the primary care web tool, the national GP patient survey and the information from the health and social care information centre.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

### Leadership and culture

The partners in the practice had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff. A GP partner was the CCG locality lead and also the CCG cancer network lead. Another partner is a Training Programme Director for the Doncaster GP training scheme. We were told the practice was very

active in encouraging medical students and doctors in training to join general practice. Of those foundation year 2 doctors having placements at the practice, 85% proceeded to apply with success to GP training schemes. The majority of the GP trainees remained in the Doncaster area following their training. The practice demonstrated their commitment to training and supporting the future GP workforce.

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

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

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

- GPs and practice nurses took the lead for specialist areas and staff were aware who the leads were. Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident in doing so and felt supported if they did. We noted team away days were held every months.
- 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 other feedback received. There was

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

an active PPG which met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, it submitted feedback to review accessibility in the waiting room area. PPG members had also completed dementia friendly training awareness.

- 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 to improve how the practice was run.

## Continuous improvement

There was a strong 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 a GP partner was developing a number of patient pathways to be shared with other practices in the CCG to promote quality and consistency within the care processes.