

Alverthorpe Surgery

Quality Report

Balne Lane
Wakefield
West Yorkshire
WF2 0DP
Tel: 01924 372 584
Website: www.alverthorpesurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 28 June 2016
Date of publication: 14/12/2016

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

Ratings

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

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Alverthorpe Surgery	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Alverthorpe Surgery on 28 June 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had 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 easy to make an appointment, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- 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.

- 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.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- The practice held a safeguarding register which was reviewed on a monthly basis.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national average in the majority of areas.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice had a carers' information board displayed in the waiting area which displayed information and promoted health checks for carers.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- Staff had received sensory impairment training and as a result had changed signage throughout the practice. The wording on the patient call screen had been slowed down to ensure it was visible for longer.
- There was a portable hearing loop to support patients who were hard of hearing, this could be used at the reception area and also taken into consultations.
- Interpretation services were available for non-English speaking patients.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.
- A room was available for patients wishing to speak to a member of staff in private.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example; the practice were involved in the avoiding unplanned admissions scheme which aimed at reducing avoidable unplanned admissions for vulnerable patients and those with complex physical or mental health needs, who are at high risk of hospital admission.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment, with urgent appointments available the same day. The practice were part of a hub of practices, which offered patient appointments from 6.30pm until 8pm each weekday and from 9am until 3pm on Saturdays.
- The practice also provided extended hours from 6.30pm until 7.15pm on Tuesday evenings when patient could access an appointment with the GP or practice nurse.
- The practice offered dedicated appointments for children/ young people and these could be accessed in person or via a telephone clinic. The practice nurse was also available during these sessions for any patient preferring to speak to a female member of staff.
- The practice offered a range of online services including booking appointments and repeat prescription requests.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice continually monitored the appointment system to ensure an adequate number of appointments were available. This resulted in many patients having access to same day appointments
- The practice took a holistic approach to patient reviews and all reviews were carried out during one appointment.
- 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.
- The practice actively monitored accident and emergency (A&E) attendances and engaged with patients to educate and discuss the most appropriate service to access. As a result the practice had the lowest A&E attendance rates across the district in 2014.
- Offered services led by pharmacists and physiotherapists. These staff were able to either directly support clinical staff or deliver services to patients which reduced the need to access these services at other locations and demand on primary and secondary care services.

Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to 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.
- 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 lead GP encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- The practice worked alongside Age UK and the local Health and Wellbeing Team to promote groups and services available.

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.
- Outcomes for diabetes related indicators were comparable or better than other practices. For example the percentage of patients on the register who had a flu immunisation in the preceding 12 months was 100% compared to the CCG average of 97% and national average of 94%.
- 91% of patients with diabetes, on the register, had a record of a foot examination and risk classification, compared to the CCG average of 89% and national averages of 88%
- 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.
- The practice used a risk stratification tool to aid management of diabetes and coronary heart disease. This aimed to improve consistency, quality and effectiveness of patient care at the point of care.

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. 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.
- The practice offered dedicated appointments for children/young people and these could be accessed in person or via a telephone clinic. The practice nurse was also available during these sessions for any patient preferring to speak to a female member of staff.
- The practice worked closely with the local youth project and involved them in reviewing the practice website and producing a survey aimed at younger patients.
- The percentage of eligible women, who had undergone a cervical screening test in the preceding five years, was 91% which was better than the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 82%.
- 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 were part of a local hub of practices who offered patient appointments from 6.30pm until 8pm each weekday and from 9am until 3pm on Saturdays.
- The practice offered a range of online services including booking appointments and repeat prescription requests.

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, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments or multiple appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who did not attend their appointment.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- 100% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was better than the CCG average of 83% and national average of 84%.
- 100% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months. This was better than the CCG average of 90% and national average of 88%.
- 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

- The practice used a risk stratification tool to aid identification and management of dementia. This aimed to improve consistency, quality and effectiveness of patient care at the point of care.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 7 July 2016. The results showed the practice performance was better than the local and national averages. A total of 243 survey forms were distributed and 123 (51%) were returned. This represented less than 5% of the practice's patient population.

- 95% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 70% and national average of 73%.
- 94% 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 83% and national average of 85%.
- 93% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 85%.

- 90% 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 79% and national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 37 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients used words such as 'fantastic, outstanding and brilliant' to describe the service.

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

Alverthorpe Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The lead inspector was supported by a GP specialist adviser.

Background to Alverthorpe Surgery

The Alverthorpe Surgery is located on Balne Lane, Wakefield, West Yorkshire, WF2 0PD, and provides services for 2,655 patients.

The surgery is situated within the Wakefield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The surgery provides services under the terms of a personal medical services (PMS) contract. This is a contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering services to the local community.

There is a higher than average number of patients between the ages of 45 and 74 years. The practice provides services for a predominantly white British and Irish (72%) with a smaller number of patients from Asian (10%), Eastern European (6%), Middle Eastern (4%) and Afro-Caribbean (8%) backgrounds.

There is a male lead GP who is supported by two locum GPs (male). The practice also has a female practice nurse. Although there was no female GP at the practice, patients had access to a chaperone. The clinical team is supported by a practice manager and a team of administrative staff.

The practice catchment area is classed as being within one of the fourth most deprived areas in England. People living in more deprived areas tend to have a greater need for health services.

Alverthorpe Surgery is situated within a single storey purpose built building with car parking available. It has disabled access and facilities.

The practice is open from 8am until 6.30pm from Monday to Friday, with a range of appointments being offered between these hours.

When the practice is closed out-of-hours services are provided by Local Care Direct, which can be accessed via the surgery telephone number or by calling the NHS 111 service.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 28 June 2016. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff including the lead GP, the practice nurse, the practice manager and the reception manager.
- We also spoke with five patients who used the service, three of who were also members of the patient involvement group.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.'

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

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

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

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions
- Families, children and young people
- Working age people (including those recently retired and students)
- People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable
- People experiencing poor mental health (including people 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. For example, an incident had been identified when an urgent cancer referral had been made but the patient had been seen by the hospital outside of the two week wait period. Although the practice procedure for urgent referrals had been followed this was reported as a significant event. As a result of the incident the practice had changed the procedure to follow-up all urgent referrals and ensure they had been received by the hospital.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended

safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. The GPs and practice nurse were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (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 prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local IPC teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. The most recent audit had been undertaken in March 2016 and had demonstrated an improvement with the practice achieving a score of 92% compliant, this had increased from 85% when the audit was previously undertaken in March 2015.
- 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 (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. PGDs are documents permitting the supply of prescription-only medicines to groups of patients, without individual prescriptions.

Are services safe?

- We reviewed two 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 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 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. A first aid kit and accident book were also available.
- The practice did not hold a supply of oxygen on the premises and had carried out a risk assessment to support this decision. This had been rated as low risk due to the close proximity to the accident and emergency department (A&E) and the response rate of ambulances attending the practice.
- 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. All staff had been involved in producing this document and all staff held a copy.

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 showed the practice had achieved 99% of the total number of points available, which was better than the CCG average of 96% and national average of 95%.

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

- Performance against the diabetes related indicators was better than the CCG and national averages. For example; 100% of patients newly diagnosed with diabetes, on the register, in the preceding 12 months had a record of being referred to a structured education programme within 9 months after entry onto the diabetes register. Compared to the CCG average of 94% and national average of 90%.
- 100% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a record of blood pressure in the preceding 12 months. This was better than the CCG average of 92% and national average of 90%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- We reviewed two clinical audits completed in the last 12 months. The audits demonstrated where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research. Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, the practice carried out an audit to identify patients at risk of developing diabetes. The audit identified 20 patients as having a score of 50% or above which indicated a high risk of developing diabetes. Of those, 17 patients agreed to attend for a review. A total of 11 patients were confirmed not diabetic and six patients were identified at risk of developing the condition. These patients were advised regarding lifestyle advice, including smoking, exercise, alcohol and stress factors. The practice planned to continue this audit and review patients with a score of 40% and over.

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. In addition; the practice manager had been supported to undertake a business administration degree.
- 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 online 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 were signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 91%, which was better than the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. 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. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, the practice had achieved 100% for childhood immunisation given to under two year olds, compared to the CCG average of 95% and national average of 96%. Childhood vaccination rates given to five year olds ranged from 95% to 100% (CCG and national averages of 92%).

.Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40 to 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.

- 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.

All of the 37 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were 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 five patients, three of who were members of the patient involvement group. They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 95% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) and national average of 89%.
- 88% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.
- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG and national averages of 95%.
- 85% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 85%.
- 94% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG and national averages of 91%.

- 94% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG and national averages 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. Patient feedback from the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views. We also saw that care plans were personalised.

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

- 92% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG and national averages of 86%.
- 88% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 83% and national average of 82%.
- 91% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% 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.
- Staff had received sensory impairment training and as a result had changed signage throughout the practice. The wording on the patient call screen had been slowed down to ensure it was visible for longer.
- There was a portable hearing loop to support patients who were hard of hearing, this could be used at the reception area and also taken into consultations.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Are services caring?

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 70 patients as

carers (3% of the practice list). The practice had a carers' information board displayed in the waiting area which displayed information and promoted health checks for carers.

Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent them a sympathy card. 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 Wakefield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example; the practice were involved in the avoiding unplanned admissions scheme which aimed at reducing avoidable unplanned admissions for vulnerable patients and those with complex physical or mental health needs, who are at high risk of hospital admission.

- 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.
- The practice offered dedicated appointments for children/young people and these could be accessed in person or via a telephone clinic. The practice nurse was also available during these sessions for any patient preferring to speak to a female member of staff.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice continually monitored the appointment system to ensure an adequate number of appointments were available. This resulted in many patients having access to same day appointments
- 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.
- The practice offered a range of online services including booking appointments and repeat prescription requests.
- The practice took a holistic approach to patient reviews and all reviews were carried out during one appointment.
- The practice actively monitored accident and emergency (A&E) attendance and engaged with patients to educate and discuss the most appropriate service to access. As a result the practice had the lowest A&E attendance rates across the district in 2014.

- Offered services led by pharmacists and physiotherapists. These staff were able to either directly support clinical staff or deliver services to patients which reduced the need to access these services at other locations and demand on primary and secondary care services.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8am until 6.30pm from Monday to Friday, with a range of appointments being offered between these hours. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them. The practice also provided extended hours from 6.30pm until 7.15pm on Tuesday evenings when patient could access an appointment with the GP or practice nurse.

The service was provided by a male lead GP who was supported by two locum GPs (male). However, the practice also had a female practice nurse and patients could access a female chaperone. We were informed by the practice following our inspection that a female GP had been employed and provided appointments at the practice on a daily basis.

The practice were part of a local hub of practices which offered patient appointments from 6.30pm until 8pm each weekday and from 9am until 3pm on Saturdays.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was better than local and national averages.

- 86% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 78% and national average of 76%.
- 95% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 70% and national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

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.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found these had been handled appropriately, dealt with in a timely way showing openness and transparency when dealing with the complaint.

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 and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a strategy in place and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- 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 lead GP and practice manager demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the GP and practice manager 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. This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The lead GP 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. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the GP encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient involvement group (PIG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PIG met regularly, helped to produce patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the group had been involved in improving the appearance of the practice website. The practice also shared significant events and complaints with the group to get feedback.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through discussion, staff meetings and appraisals. 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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example; the practice worked closely with the Wakefield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) medicines optimisation team to improve practice prescribing.