

Dr Oakenfull and Partners

Quality Report

The Surgery
Durham Road
Ferryhill
Co Durham
DL17 8JJ
Tel: 01740 651238
Website: www.ferryhillandchilton.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 12 September 2016
Date of publication: 02/02/2017

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	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	8
Areas for improvement	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Dr Oakenfull and Partners	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Oakenfull and Partners on 12 September 2016. The practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients 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.

- Patients said they were able to get same day appointments.
- 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.

The areas where the provider should/must make improvement are

Implement more formal systems to record actions taken with regard to health and safety systems within the practice. For example the actions taken in relation to the fire risk assessment, the maintenance of equipment and the monitoring of cleaning schedules.

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.
- Patients affected by significant events received a timely apology and were told about actions taken 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 people 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 showed patient outcomes were comparable to the local CCG and 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 staff.

Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP survey showed that 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. We observed a patient-centred culture.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice worked with the CCG and the community staff to identify their patients who were at high risk of attending accident and emergency (A/E) or having an unplanned admission to hospital. Care plans were developed to reduce the risk of unplanned admission or A/E attendances.
- Patients said urgent appointments were available the same day.
- Telephone consultations were available for working patients who could not attend during surgery hours or for those whose problem could be dealt with on the phone.
- 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 that 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 this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity.
- 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.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population. All patients over the age of 75 had a named GP.
- They were responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice was part of the Vulnerable Adults Wrap Around Service (VAWAS). This was a service provided to vulnerable patients living in nursing or care homes, the housebound or those at high risk of admission. They were cared for by a GP in conjunction with Advanced Nurse Practitioners and district nurses. This was a Federation initiative through the CCG to ensure the needs assessment of vulnerable patients remained up to date.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who have had influenza immunisation between 2014 and 2015 was 98%. This was 1% above the local CCG and 4% above the national average.
- Patients with LTCs had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GPs worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk. For example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances or who failed to attend hospital appointments.
- Immunisation rates were high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 75%. This was 3% below the local CCG average and 1% above the England average.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice has signed up to the 'Young Carers Charter'. (support systems for young people who are carers).
- We saw good examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

The practice monitored any non-attendance of babies and children at vaccination clinics and worked with the health visiting service to follow up any concerns.

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 reflected the needs for this age group.
- Telephone consultations were available every day with a call back appointment arranged at a time to suit the patient, for example during their lunch break.

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 registers of patients living in vulnerable circumstances which included those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for people with a learning disability.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- The practice told 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.
- Telephone interpretation services were available and information leaflets in different languages were provided when required.

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).

- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed 77% of people diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the preceding 12 months. This was 6% below the local CCG average and 7% below the England average.
- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive care plan documented in their record in the preceding 12 months was 82%. This was below the local CCG average of 90% and the England average of 90%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advanced care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in July 2016 showed the practice was performing above or similar to the local CCG and national averages. There were 273 survey forms distributed for Dr Oakenfull and Partners and 116 forms were returned, representing 0.7% of the practice's patient list.

89% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared with the local CCG average of 89% and national average of 87%.

- 84% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with the local CCG average of 84% and national average of 85%.
- 94% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as good compared with the local CCG average of 87% and national average of 85%.
- 93% said they would recommend their GP surgery to someone new to the area compared to the local CCG average of 82% and national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we asked for Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our visit. We received ten completed comment cards which were very positive about the standard of care received. We also received four patient questionnaires that had been distributed during the inspection. Patients said staff were polite and helpful and treated them with dignity and respect. Patients described the service as excellent and said there was a good level of care and attention at all times. They also said staff were very caring and always willing to help.

We spoke with three members of the Patient Participation Group. They also confirmed that they had received very good care and attention and staff treated them with dignity and respect.

Feedback on the comments cards and from patients we spoke with reflected the results of the national survey. Patients were very satisfied with the care and treatment received.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

Implement more formal systems to record actions taken with regard to health and safety systems within the practice. For example the actions taken in relation to the fire risk assessment, the maintenance of equipment and the monitoring of cleaning schedules.

Dr Oakenfull and Partners

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Inspector and included a second CQC Inspector and a GP Specialist Advisor.

Background to Dr Oakenfull and Partners

Dr Oakenfull and Partners, Durham Road, Ferryhill, Co Durham, DL17 8JJ is located in the centre of the town of Ferryhill and is close to public amenities and on a main bus route. There is another practice in the town of Chilton, which is two miles away (this is to become a branch practice).

The proportion of the practice population in the 65 years and over age group is above the England average. The practice population in the under 18 age group is below the England average. The practice scored three on the deprivation measurement scale, the deprivation scale goes from one to ten, with one being the most deprived. People living in more deprived areas tend to have a greater need for health services.

The practice has eight GP partners and two salaried GP. There were seven male and three female GP's. There is three nurse practitioners, one practice nurse, two treatment room nurses and a team of five health care assistants (HCA). There is a practice manager, deputy practice manager and an administration team of 22 staff and four cleaners. (this staff team works at the Ferryhill surgery and the practice in Chilton)

The practice is a training practice and trains third and fifth year medical students as well as student nurses.

Dr Oakenfull and Partners is open between 8.15am to 8.00pm on Mondays. Between 8.15am and 6.00pm Tuesday to Friday. It is also open between 8am and 12pm on Saturdays. Appointments on Mondays are a 'walk in service' with patient being seen on the day.

The practice, along with all other practices in the Durham, Darlington, Easington and Sedgefield CCG area have a contractual agreement for the Out of Hours provider to provide OOHs services from 6.00pm. This has been agreed with the NHS England area team.

The practice has opted out of providing out of hours services (OOHs) for their patients. When the practice is closed patients use the NHS 111 service to contact the OOHs provider. Information for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is available in the waiting area, in the practice information leaflet and on the practice website.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our comprehensive inspection programme. We carried out an announced inspection 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.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

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

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

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

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

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We reviewed policies, procedures and other information the practice provided before and during the inspection. We carried out an announced visit on 12 September 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, the nurse practitioner, practice nurse and a health care assistant. We also spoke with the practice manager and members of the receptionist/administration and secretarial staff.
- Spoke with three members of the patient participation group (PPG).
- Reviewed ten comment cards where patients shared their views and experiences of the service. We also reviewed four patient questionnaires that had been distributed during the inspection.
- Observed how staff spoke to, and interacted with patients when they were in the practice and on the telephone.

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- Patients affected by incidents received a timely apology and were told about actions taken to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of incidents and they were discussed at the practice meetings.
- Lessons were shared with individual staff involved in incidents to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Staff confirmed that lessons were shared at relevant meeting to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. The practice summarised all significant events, however, we found that they did not carry out a full analysis to determine if there were any specific themes.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined systems, processes and practices in place to keep people safe, which included:

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard adults and children from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies and procedures 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 staff told us

they had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to safeguarding children level three. All staff had received safeguarding training to the appropriate levels.

- Information telling patients that they could ask for a chaperone if required was visible in the consulting rooms however there was no notice in the waiting room. 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. One of the practice nurses was the infection prevention and control (IPC) lead who liaised with the local IPC teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received training. It was identified that there was the need for more formal development of infection and prevention control audits. Also, the need to include monitoring of the cleaning records. We noted that not all sharps bins were off the floor and not all taps were lever operated within clinical areas. The practice were taking steps to address this.
- At the time of the inspection the arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines in the practice kept patients safe and oxygen cylinders were checked regularly. The practice had identified there had been a period when these had not been checked, on investigation this had occurred due to changes in staff and information not communicated. Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. 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 prescription or direction from a prescriber.

Are services safe?

- We reviewed five personnel files and found that appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. Care was needed just to ensure consistency, particularly in the completion of the interview checklist and exploration of gaps in employment.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patients and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available and a poster with details of responsible people. The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment, however we noted that there were a number of recommendations and no records to demonstrate that these had been carried out. We did however check a sample of the recommendations for example the liquid nitrogen storage and fire blanket and found that the recommendations had been actioned.
- Regular fire drills were carried out.
- At the time of the inspection there was no formal system for ensuring that all of the required servicing and maintenance had taken place. The practice manager said they were in the process of reviewing all of the health and safety procedures. They said as part of this review they would develop a matrix to detail when equipment was last serviced and when it was next needed. Up to date certificates that were not available on the day of the inspection were forwarded to CQC following the inspection. This included for example the fire extinguisher certification. We were also provided with information to show that action was being taken in respect of recommendations relating to legionella and any associated risks. (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 system in place for the different staff groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty. Staff we spoke with told us they provided cover for sickness and holidays and locums were engaged when required.

Arrangements to deal with 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 basic life support training.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen, with adult and children's masks.
- There was a first aid kit and accident book available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. We checked medicines were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

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. One of the GP's summarises the NICE guidelines and circulates to relevant staff.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

The practice actively engaged in CCG quality improvement schemes such as prescribing and referral management.

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 for 2014/2015 showed the practice achieved 94.2% of the total number of points available. This compared to the local CCG average of 97% and the England average of 95%. There was a 19.5% 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). Lower exception reporting rates are more positive. The exception rate was being reviewed by the practice.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed;

- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who have had influenza immunisation in the preceding 12 months was 98%. This was 1% above the local CCG average and 4% above the England average.

- The percentage of patients with asthma, who had had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that included an assessment of asthma control, was 90%. This was 15% above the local CCG average and 15% above the England average.
- The percentage of patients his was 3% above the local CCG average and 7% above the England average.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia who had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the preceding 12 months was 77%. This was 6% below the local CCG average and 5% below the England average.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- We saw the practice had completed a range of audits. We looked at a sample of audits that had been completed. These included an audit in respect of referral to hospital for plastic surgery. There was an audit in 2015 and a second audit in 2016. The audit was carried out to see if there could be a reduction in the number of referrals. The findings were that there had been three less referrals in 2016 as a result of managing referrals more appropriately. It was also noted that more use could have been made in respect of the GP with a special interest in dermatology.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

training to meet these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during staff meetings, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, supervision and support for the revalidation of the GPs and nurses.

- Two of the partners were GPs with special interests (GPSI's). Two in dermatology (combining both a practice and hospital role) and one in no-scalpel vasectomy.
- 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.
- The practice was committed to upskilling their staff. An example included one of the existing practice nurses undertaking additional training to become a nurse practitioner.
- A number of staff also had dual roles, for example a member of the reception team was also a health care assistant.

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 test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets was also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when people were referred to other services.

Staff worked together, and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary

guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005. Staff had access to MCA prompt cards in the consulting rooms, these provided guidance for staff on issues relating to the MCA.

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, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- Staff sought patients' consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance. The process for seeking consent had not been monitored through records or minor surgery audits to ensure it met the practices responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives by the practice.

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition, those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation and those with mental health problems. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- The practice referred and sign posted people who needed support for alcohol or drug problems to local counselling services.

The practice had a comprehensive screening programme. Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%. This was 1% below the local CCG average and 2% below the England average. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice had also introduced a coloured letter reminder for cervical screening with reminders being printed on pink paper. The practice ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Consent to care and treatment

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Data from 2014/2015 showed childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were high and were above or comparable to the local CCG and national averages for children aged 12 months, two and five years. For example, rates ranged from 95% to 100%.

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. Nationally

reported data from 2014/2015 showed the percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months is 150/90mmHg or less was 88%, this was 4% above the local CCG average and 4% above the England average. Appropriate follow-ups on 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 throughout the inspection that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and they were treated 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 and that confidential 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 the opportunity to discuss their needs in private.

Feedback on the patient CQC comment cards and questionnaires we received was very positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

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

We saw during the inspection that there was an extremely distressed patient in the waiting area. This was dealt with swiftly and professionally which ensured the patients dignity was maintained.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in July 2016 showed patients were very satisfied with how they were treated and that this was with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice results were above or comparable to the local CCG and national average for questions about how they were treated by the GPs, nurses and receptionists. For example:

- 93% said the last GP they saw was good at giving them enough time compared to the local CCG average of 89% and national average of 87%.

- 94% said the last GP they saw was good at listening to them compared to the local CCG average of 90% and national average of 89%.
- 91% said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the local CCG average of 88% and national average of 85%.
- 100% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw or spoke to compared to the local CCG average of 97% and national average of 95%.
- 94% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at giving them enough time compared to the local CCG average of 94% and national average of 92%.
- 97% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at listening to them compared to the local CCG average of 94% and national average of 91%.
- 95% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the local CCG average of 94% and national average of 91%.
- 100% said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw or spoke to compared to the local CCG average of 98% and national average of 97%.
- 89% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the local CCG average of 79% and national average of 87%.

We looked at the results of the most recent Friends and Family (F&F) test survey. Of the 25 respondents, 20 said they would be extremely likely to recommend the practice.

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.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in July 2016 showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were above or comparable to the local CCG and national averages. For example:

Are services caring?

- 93% said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the local CCG average of 88% and national average of 86%.
- 87% said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the local CCG average of 85% and national average of 82%.
- 93% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the local CCG average of 93% and national average of 90%.
- 91% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the local CCG average of 90% and national average of 85%.

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. There was a hearing loop available for patients if they needed this.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

There was information available for patients in the waiting room and on the practice website about how to access a number of support groups and organisations. This included information for young carers.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 218 patients as carers (1.4% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

There was a range of health and support related information leaflets available within the main waiting area of the practice. This included information about flu vaccination and cervical screening.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, the named GP contacted the patient or their family. The GP also offered support and signposted the patient/family to bereavement support groups and other agencies if appropriate.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice worked with the local CCG to plan services and to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, the practice worked with the CCG and the community staff to identify their patients who were at high risk of attending accident and emergency (A/E) or having an unplanned admission to hospital.

Services were planned and delivered to take into account the needs of different patient groups and to help provide flexibility, choice and continuity of care. For example;

- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- Appointments could be made on line, via the telephone and in person.
- Telephone consultations were available for working patients who could not attend during surgery hours or for those whose problem could be dealt with on the phone.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Urgent access appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities available and all the consulting and treatment rooms were on the ground floor.
- There was a hearing loop for patients who had hearing problems.
- A CCG pharmacist was attached to the practice and they were supporting the GPs with medication reviews.
- There was a facility on the practice website to translate the information into different languages.
- The Care Home Scheme' ensured patients living in care homes had structured annual reviews which included a review of medication, clinical care and advanced care planning and discussion of 'Do Not Resuscitate' decisions. These were undertaken by an advance nurse practitioner.
- The practice also provided a teledermatology service.

- An anticoagulation service (blood testing) was also provided and if needed home visits would be undertaken to provide this service. This service was available for patients who lived within a 10 mile radius of the service.
- In addition, they had a contract with the local CCG to provide a vasectomy service by two GP's with special interests.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in July 2016 showed that patient's satisfaction with the service was above the local CCG and national average. This reflected the feedback we received on the day. For example:

- 94% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as good compared to the local CCG average of 87% and national average of 85%.
- 93% said they would recommend their GP surgery to someone new to the area compared to the local CCG average of 82% and national average of 78%.

Access to the service

Dr Oakenfull and Partners was open between 8.15am to 6.00pm Tuesday to Friday and until 7.30pm on Mondays. On Mondays all appointments were 'see on the day' or walk in appointments, with no pre bookable appointments. The practice opened on a Saturday morning from 8am to 12pm, this was funded by South Durham Health Federation. There was also a walk-in service for blood tests on Tuesday pm, Wednesday am and Friday am.

In addition, the 111 service has access to three appointments each weekday morning and 28 slots on a Saturday morning.

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to two weeks in advance for GP and six weeks in advance for nurses. Urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them. If patients needed to be seen urgently they would where possible be provided with an appointment that day.

The practice has recently changed the appointment system to offer more flexibility. This included having a telephone triage system.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Results from the national GP patient survey published in July 2016 showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above or comparable to the local CCG and national average. This reflected the feedback we received on the day. For example:

- 80% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the local CCG average of 79% and national average of 75%.
- 81% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to the local CCG average of 79% and national average of 73%.
- 87% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the local CCG average of 78% and national average of 73%.
- 84% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the local CCG average of 84% and national average of 85%.

The results from the practice survey and from feedback we received on the comment cards and questionnaires reflected the national GP survey;

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

The practice 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.
- Information was available to help patients understand the complaints system in the complaints and patient information leaflets. These were available in the waiting room.
- There was a suggestion box in the waiting area for patients to use to give feedback to the practice.

We looked at 11 complaints that had been received in the last 12 months. We found they were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way.

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 values were outlined on the practice website and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a strategy for the following 12 months regarding how they would continue to deliver their vision, however the strategy and supporting business plan were not documented.
- Their mission statement detailed the importance of delivering safe and effective care, with a high quality service, whilst ensuring patients were treated with dignity and respect.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the practice standards to provide 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.
- There was a comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit and monitoring was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.

Leadership and culture – this is another heading that has changed

The partners and practice manager 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 and practice manager were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. This requires any patient harmed by the provision of a healthcare service to

be informed of the fact and an appropriate remedy offered, regardless of whether a complaint has been made or a question asked about it. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents:

- Patients affected by significant events received a timely apology and were told about actions taken to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- They kept records of written correspondence and verbal communication.

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

- Staff told us that regular team meetings were held, both formal and informal.
- Staff told us that 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. They talked about the inclusiveness and friendliness of the practice.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, by the GPs and practice manager. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice. The GPs and practice manager 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 a small patient participation group.
- The practice had also gathered feedback from staff, generally through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff we spoke with told us they were definitely listened to.

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 strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and looked to improve outcomes for patients in the area.

We saw evidence of on-going review of the staff skill mix, with training needs identified and additional training taking place. This would further enhance the skill mix within the team. Examples included the practice manager completing a practice managers' development programme and the training of a further practice nurse to become a nurse practitioner.

One of the partners was a member of County Durham Local Medical Committee. Another was a board member of the local CCG and had recently received an award for exceptional service to the CCG. One of the partners was also an appraiser. The practice manager represented the South Durham Health Federation at one of the county wide meetings.