

# Durnford Medical Centre

## Quality Report

113 Long Street  
Manchester  
M24 6DL  
Tel: 0161 643 2011  
Website: [www.durnfordmc.nhs.net](http://www.durnfordmc.nhs.net)

Date of inspection visit: 12 January 2017  
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 | 4    |
| The six population groups and what we found | 7    |
| What people who use the service say         | 10   |

### Detailed findings from this inspection

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Our inspection team                   | 11 |
| Background to Durnford Medical Centre | 11 |
| Why we carried out this inspection    | 11 |
| How we carried out this inspection    | 11 |
| Detailed findings                     | 13 |

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Durnford Medical Centre on 12 January 2017. Overall the practice is rated as good.

The practice had been previously inspected on 20 January 2016. Following that inspection the practice was rated as requires improvement with the following domain ratings:

Safe – Requires Improvement

Effective – Requires improvement.

Caring – Good

Responsive – Requires improvement

Well Led – Requires Improvement

The practice provided us with an action plan detailing how they were going to make the required improvements.

The inspection on 12 January 2017 was to confirm the required actions had been completed and award a new rating if appropriate.

Following this re-inspection on 12 January 2017 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.
- The practice had increased its READ coding of the clinical system which had improved its achievement rates in the Quality Framework.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it difficult to get through to the surgery by telephone.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.

# Summary of findings

- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

**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.

Good



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- Since the last inspection 20 January 2016 the practice had introduced clearly defined systems, processes and practices to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

### Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national averages.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.
- After the last inspection 20 January 2016 one of the partners was designated lead for prescribing in the practice and had ensured that all clinicians were following NICE guidelines and offered training which ensured consistency in the practice and resulted in a reduction in the prescribing of antibiotics by 55%, benzodiazepines by 10%, NSAIDS by 5% and COX2s by 70%. The practice had prescribed within its budget for the first time and had improved by moving from the bottom in the CCG to sixth place in a table of 37 practices.

### Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



# Summary of findings

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice at or above others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

## 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.
- Patients said they found it difficult to get through to the surgery by telephone but when they did 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 told us that this was mainly due to more on the day appointments being made available in response to patient request. They also told us that they were in discussions with their telephone provider in looking at ways to improve access.
- The practice were part of a federation offering appointments with a GP and nurse at evenings, weekends and bank holidays.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

## Are services well-led?

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

Good



- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.

# Summary of findings

- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice sought feedback from patients through the family and friends test and the national survey. The patient participation group was newly established and had yet to have a meeting.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

# Summary of findings

## The six population groups and what we found

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

### Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Comfort calls were made by the practice for its vulnerable elderly patients.

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.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c was 64mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 75% compared to the CCG average of 77% and England average of 78%.
- One of the GPs was trained and held a weekly diabetic clinic with the practice nurse. This included the initiation of insulin.
- 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.
- Patients that had been diagnosed with asthma were offered personalised care plans for use in the case of an emergency.
- Since the last inspection the practice had shown an improvement in the number of patients who had had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months. The percentage had increased from 40% to 68% compared to the CCG average of 75%. The practice told us that this was due to an improvement and consistent READ coding by the clinicians.

Good



### Families, children and young people

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

Good



# Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. A member of staff had been identified to support the clinical lead for safeguarding and attended monthly meetings where patients at risk were discussed.
- 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.
- 80% of women aged between 25 and 64 had their notes recorded that a cervical screening test had been performed in the preceding five years which was comparable with the national average of 81%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

## Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age people (including those recently retired and students).

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- The practice had recently introduced a text message service to remind patients of their appointments. This had resulted in a reduction in patients not attending for their appointments.
- The practice had introduced electronic prescribing which enabled patients to nominate a pharmacy where the practice could send their prescriptions electronically making it more convenient for the patient.
- Telephone appointments were available for patients who were unable to attend the surgery.

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.

Good





# Summary of findings

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, military veterans and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- 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.
- Comfort calls were made by the practice for patients who were at risk or vulnerable.

## 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).

- 79% 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%.
- 81% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record in the preceding 12 months. Although this is lower than the national average of 89% the number had increased from 53% at the last inspection.
- 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.
- 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.

Good



# Summary of findings

## What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016 and showed mixed results when the practice was compared to local and national averages. 290 survey forms were distributed and 124 were returned. This was a response rate of 43% and represented 1.4% of the practice's patient list.

- 39% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 59% and the national average of 73%.
- 66% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 69% and the national average of 76%.

- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average and the national average of 85%.
- 88% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 79%.

The practice told us that they had increased their on the day appointments which had resulted in an increase of patients telephoning the practice however they were in discussions with their telephone provider to look at ways to improve access.

# Durnford Medical Centre

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### Our inspection team was led by:

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

## Background to Durnford Medical Centre

Durnford Medical Centre provides primary medical services in Middleton near Manchester from Monday to Friday. The practice is open between 8am and 6pm. The first appointment of the day with a GP is 8.40am and the last appointment with a GP is 5.10pm.

Durnford Medical Centre is situated within the geographical area of Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Commissioning Group (CCG).

The practice has a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract. The PMS contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities.

Durnford Medical Centre is responsible for providing care to approximately 9200 patients.

The practice consists of six GP partners one of whom is female, two practice nurses and two phlebotomists. The practice is supported by a practice manager and reception and administration teams. It is a training practice with two trainee GPs.

When the practice is closed patients are directed to the out of hour's service.

The practice are part of a local federation in providing 8am to 8pm, seven days a week access to a GP in the local area.

The practice were awarded the Pride in Practice Gold Award from the LGBT Federation.

## 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.

A previous inspection had been carried out on 20 January 2016 and as a result requirement notices had been issued to the practice. This inspection was also to check the required improvements had been made.

## 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 12 January 2017.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, practice nurse, practice manager and members of the administration team.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.

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

## Detailed findings

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

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

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions

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

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

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

### Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice.

### 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 GP for safeguarding and a member of staff identified to offer support. 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 protection or child safeguarding level 3.

- 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. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

### 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

## Are services safe?

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 adequate arrangements in place to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. On the day of the inspection the oxygen cylinder was empty, when this was shown to the practice a replacement supply was ordered. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan 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 patients' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

### Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 91% of the total number of points available with an exception rate of 3% (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).

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015/2016 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c was 64mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 75% compared to the CCG average of 77% and England average of 78%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was lower than the national average. For example 81% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record in the preceding 12 months compared to the national average of 89%. This had increased from the previous achievement score of 53%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been several clinical audits completed in the last two years where improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included a reduction of 10% in the prescribing of benzodiazepines. After the last inspection 20 January 2016 one of the partners was designated lead for prescribing in the practice and had ensured that all clinicians were following NICE guidelines and offered training which ensured consistency in the practice and resulted in a reduction in the prescribing of antibiotics by 55%, benzodiazepines by 10%, NSAIDs by 5% and COX2s by 70%. The practice had prescribed within its budget for the first time and had improved by moving from the bottom in the CCG to sixth place in a table of 37 practices.

### Effective staffing

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

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



# Are services effective?

## (for example, treatment is effective)

one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

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

### Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

### Consent to care and treatment

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

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

- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

### 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 then signposted to the relevant service.
- A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from the practice nurse.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80%, which was the same as the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 81%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer 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 above national averages. For example, 96% of under two year olds received the full course of recommended childhood immunisations compared to the national average of 91%. 95% of five year olds had received the full course of two MMR vaccinations compared to the national average of 88%.

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.

- Privacy screens 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.

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

- 92% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 93% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%.
- 96% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 92%.
- 95% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 96% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 86% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 87%.

### Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. P

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 above local and national averages. For example:

- 93% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 86%.
- 92% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 94% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that translation services, including British Sign language, 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 a larger format for patients who were visually impaired and in different languages for patients who did not have English as a first language.

### 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 201 patients as carers (2% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

## Are services caring?

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

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

## Our findings

### Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- The practice were part of a federation which offered appointments with a GP and nurse in the evenings, at weekends and bank holidays.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

### Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.40am to 11.30am every morning and 2.20pm to 5.10pm 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.

- 63% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 39% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of

73%. The practice told us that this was due to more on the day appointments being made available in response to patients comments. The practice were also in discussion with their telephone provider looking at ways in which access by telephone may be improved.

Patients told us 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.

Details of the request was passed to the on call GP who triaged the call and made an informed decision on prioritisation according to clinical need. 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 for example there were leaflets available in the waiting area.

We looked at all complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency when dealing with the complaint. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care.

# 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 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.
- The practice had a clear succession plan for clinical and non clinical staff.

### Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

### Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe 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.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

• The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the family and friends test and complaints received. The PPG was newly established and had yet to have its first meeting.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff 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 told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

### Continuous improvement

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