

The Sides Medical Practice

Quality Report

Moorside Road

Swinton

Manchester

M27 0EW

Tel: 0161 7941604

Website: www.sidesmedicalcentre.co.uk/

Date of inspection visit: 18 August 2016

Date of publication: 20/09/2016

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?

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to The Sides Medical Practice	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12
Action we have told the provider to take	21

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Sides Medical Centre on 18 August 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 but there was not an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.

- Some patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.
- The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity, but some were overdue a review.

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- Ensure all staff are aware of what constitutes a significant event and that it is recorded using the practice significant event system.
- Ensure recruitment records relating to people employed include information relevant to their employment.

Summary of findings

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Identify a staff member to be responsible for ownership of recruitment information.
- Introduce regular team meetings for non-clinical staff.
- Ensure all staff are aware of how to access medical emergency equipment and drugs.
- Ensure all staff are working within their skill set and are encouraged to seek support when being asked to do something that they are not yet prepared for.

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 requires improvement for providing safe services.

- There was an ineffective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons learned were not communicated widely enough to support improvement.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- The practice had an induction programme for new starters, however it did not cover essential topics, such as how to access practice policies.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Good



Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



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

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity, however some were out of date.
- Staff told us there was an open culture, however there was evidence to suggest that not all staff felt comfortable to discuss support and training related issues.
- 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.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

The practice is rated as good for the care of older people.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- 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 A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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 those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good



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

- 83% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 84%
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Summary of findings

- 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.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing generally above local and national averages. There were 244 survey forms were distributed and 115 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 60% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73% and the CCG average of 72%.
- 87% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 85% and the CCG average of 81%.
- 92% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85% and the CCG average of 85%.

- 85% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 78% and the CCG average of 77%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received four comment cards, three of which were positive about the standard of care received. One comment card expressed concern over being able to give feedback to the practice.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

- Ensure all staff are aware of what constitutes as a significant event and that it is recorded using the practice significant event system.
- Ensure recruitment records relating to people employed include information relevant to their employment.

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Identify a staff member to be responsible for ownership of recruitment information.
- Introduce regular team meetings for non-clinical staff.
- Ensure all staff are aware of how to access medical emergency equipment and drugs.
- Ensure all staff are working within their skill set and are encouraged to seek support when being asked to do something that they are not yet prepared for.

The Sides Medical Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to The Sides Medical Practice

The Sides Medical Centre is located in Salford. The address of the practice is Moorside Road, Swinton, Manchester, M27 0EW. The practice has good parking facilities and has good public transport links with bus stops nearby.

The practice is a partnership with three male GPs and four female GPs with one salaried male GP. There is also a nurse practitioner (female) two practice nurses (female), a health practitioner, a healthcare assistant, a practice manager, and a team of reception/administration staff. The practice uses locum GPs. The Sides Medical Centre is a training practice that takes on GP registrars and foundation year two doctors.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are from 8.30am to 11am every morning and 3pm to 5.40pm daily. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that can be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments are also available for people that needed them.

Outside of opening hours, patients are directed to the 111 out of hour's service.

The practice has approximately 12700 patients and operates under a general medical services (GMS) contract. The practice has an above average number of working age and older people compared to the CCG average.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 18 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, a practice nurse, a practice manager and reception staff, and spoke with patients who used the service.
- 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?

Detailed findings

- 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)

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 a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We discovered that not all incidents were being documented as a significant event in line with the practice's significant event policy. For example, we became aware of an incident where a prescription error occurred. The patient complained which led to an investigation, and the patient was offered a full apology. The practice made improvements to prevent a reoccurrence but there was limited evidence that learning had been disseminated fully to all relevant staff but the incident had not been recorded as a significant event.
- We saw evidence that some significant events were discussed in practice meetings as well as externally in neighbourhood meetings.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had

concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child safeguarding level three and nurses had child safeguarding level two.

- 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 (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training with the exception of one GP. Annual infection control audits were undertaken by Salford CCG and there was evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- Reception and administration staff who handle clinical samples had not been offered immunisation against hepatitis B. We discussed this with the practice and we were informed that a risk assessment had been performed and a decision was made that the immunisation was not required as clinical samples would be in a sealed bag. We discussed the risk of a spillage with the practice and the practice took this feedback on board.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy

Are services safe?

teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use.

- Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific direction from a prescriber.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken for two members of staff prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. We requested personnel files for two GPs but the practice was only able to provide us with a DBS check and references for the GPs. We received conflicting information about who was responsible for recruitment checks when the practice employed a new partner.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to

monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had some 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 but not all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage but the plan had not yet been completed by the practice. Not all senior staff were aware of the business continuity plan.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The practice assessed needs and delivered care in line with relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.

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 97 % of the total number of points available with 9% exception reporting (exception reporting allows practices to pursue the quality improvement agenda and not be penalised, where, for example, patients do not attend for review, or where a medication cannot be prescribed due to a contraindication or side-effect).

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

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 82% compared to the national average of 88%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 87% which was above the national average of 84%.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 84% which was the same the national average of 84%

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- We reviewed two clinical audits completed in the last two years, both of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. One improvement made led to a reduction of antibiotics prescribed in sore throats.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research. The practice was a research centre for diabetes.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included a review of the practices repeat prescribing policy. The improvements led to an increase in patient satisfaction and an increase in clinical output.

Effective staffing

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. However, some staff told us that certain things were not covered such as how to access the practice policies. The induction covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice did not have a system in place to assess the learning needs of new starters. We identified that the practice had reduced the clinical appointment times of a new starter without any discussion to ascertain if the individual felt comfortable.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment and the practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, training was being organised for a practice nurse to be able to take the lead in long term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was above the CCG average of 77% and comparable to 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 ensuring a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 87% to 99% and five year olds from 97% to 99%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

Out of the four patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received, three were positive about the service experienced and one expressed concern over difficulty in leaving feedback to the practice. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

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

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

- 91% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 91% and national average of 89%.
- 84% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 89%, national average 87%).
- 97% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%).
- 87% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 88%, national average 85%).

- 85% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 92%, national average 91%).
- 90% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 86%, national average 87%).

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 89% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 86%.
- 84% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 85%, national average 82%).

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

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 189 patients as carers (1.5% of the practice list). Written information was

Are services caring?

available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them and the practice also had a carers link who would keep up to date with services available for carers.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent them a sympathy card. This call was followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.

- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS and were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.30am to 11am every morning and 3pm to 5.40pm daily. 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 below local and national averages.

- 67% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and national average of 76%.

- 60% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 72%, national average 73%).

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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 including a notice in reception.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, and with openness and transparency with dealing with the complaint etc. Lessons were learnt from complaints and concerns within the practice and actions were taken to prevent reoccurrence, however we found that complaints were not effectively communicated throughout the practice to relevant team members.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This outlined the structures and procedures in place and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure but not all staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities as there was some confusion over who was responsible for certain aspects of recruitment.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff but not all staff knew how to access them.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- Arrangements to record risks and SEAs were not robust enough, or in line with practice policies.

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings however administration and reception staff did not participate in team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture, however there was evidence to suggest that not all staff felt comfortable to discuss support and training related issues.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the practice is planning a health event with a focus on mental health which was suggested by the PPG.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Most 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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity

Diagnostic and screening procedures
Family planning services
Maternity and midwifery services
Surgical procedures
Treatment of disease, disorder or injury

Regulation

Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment

Arrangements to deal with medical emergencies in the practice were not robust enough as not all staff were aware of the location of certain medical emergency drugs.

This was in breach of regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

Regulated activity

Diagnostic and screening procedures
Family planning services
Maternity and midwifery services
Surgical procedures
Treatment of disease, disorder or injury

Regulation

Regulation 17 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Good governance

Not all staff were aware of their responsibilities relating to recruitment and recruitment files for partner GPs did not contain information relevant to their employment.

Significant events were not always correctly identified and recorded in line with practice policies.

This was in breach of regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

Regulated activity

Diagnostic and screening procedures
Family planning services
Maternity and midwifery services
Surgical procedures
Treatment of disease, disorder or injury

Regulation

Regulation 18 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Staffing

Not all staff had received the correct level of support and supervision in order to safely fulfil the requirements of their role.

This was in breach of regulation 18 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.