

# Dr Alistair Partnership

## Quality Report

7 Brooks Medical Practice

21 Church Street

Atherton

M46 9DE

Tel: 01942 483250

Website: [www.7brookspractice.co.uk/](http://www.7brookspractice.co.uk/)

Date of inspection visit: 16 August 2016

Date of publication: 08/09/2016

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

## Ratings

### Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

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	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

### Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Dr Alistair Partnership	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Alistair Partnership on 16 August 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and a 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.
- Some patients said they found it difficult to make a routine appointment with a named GP however there were 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 leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure that key members of staff have a copy of the "Buddy Plan" for business continuity at their disposal at home.
- Review the system for recording information from significant events analysis.

# Summary of findings

- Continue with the ongoing plan to improve patient access.

**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 a 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.
- 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 generally at or above average compared to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- 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.

### Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice generally below 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.

# Summary of findings

## 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.
- Some patients said they found it difficult to make a routine appointment with a named GP however there were urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



## Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a 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 leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular practice 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 practice 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.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Good



# Summary of findings

## The six population groups and what we found

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

### Older people

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

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

Good



### People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



### Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.

Good



# Summary of findings

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

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

Good



## **People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable**

The practice is rated as good for the care of people whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people 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.

Good



## **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).

- A GP was the lead for mental health in the practice.
- 88% of patients diagnosed with dementia, who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, was above the CCG average of 84% and national average of 84%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.

Good



# Summary of findings

- 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.

# Summary of findings

## What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing generally below local and national averages. 316 survey forms were distributed and 109 were returned. This represented about 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 63% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 73%.
- 79% 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 85% and the national average of 85%.

- 80% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 85%.
- 68% 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 the 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 33 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received however several patients commented that at times it was very difficult to get a routine appointment.

## Areas for improvement

### Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure that key members of staff have a copy of the "Buddy Plan" for business continuity at their disposal at home.
- Review the system for recording information from significant events analysis.
- Continue with the ongoing plan to improve patient access.

# Dr Alistair Partnership

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### Our inspection team was led by:

A CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser and an Expert by Experience.

## Background to Dr Alistair Partnership

Dr Alistair Partnership (also known as 7 Brooks Medical practice) provides primary care services to its registered list of 4093 patients. The practice is situated and the inspection was conducted at Seven Brooks Medical Centre, Atherton. There is a second GP practice also located in this building and some facilities, such as the waiting area, are shared.

This is a purpose built GP Surgery with disabled access and a hearing loop. There are parking facilities on site, including disabled spaces, and it is accessible by local transport links.

There are two GPs, one male and one female, and they are supported by a female nurse practitioner/prescriber and a female practice nurse. There is also a practice manager and supporting administration staff.

The age profile of the practice is very similar to the CCG and national averages. The male life expectancy for the area is 77 years compared with the CCG averages of 77 years and the national average of 79 years. The female life expectancy for the area is 81 years compared with the CCG averages of 81 years and the national average of 83 years.

The practice delivers commissioned services under the Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract with NHS England and is part of Wigan Clinical Commissioning Group. It offers direct enhanced services for the childhood vaccination and immunisation scheme, extended hours access, facilitating

timely diagnosis and support for people with dementia, influenza and pneumococcal immunisations, improving patient online access, patient participation, minor surgery, rotavirus and shingles immunisation and unplanned admissions.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday, Tuesday and Friday, and Wednesday and Thursday between 8am and 8pm. On a Wednesday the surgery will be closed between 12pm and 1.30pm for staff training.

Patients requiring a GP outside of normal working hours are advised to contact the surgery and they will be directed to the local out of hours service which is provided by Bridgewater NHS Foundation Trust –through NHS 111. Additionally patients can access GP services in the evening and on Saturdays and Sundays through the Wigan GP access alliance at locations across Wigan Borough.

## 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.

# Detailed findings

## 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 16 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Reviewed information available to us from other organisations e.g. NHS England.
- Reviewed information from CQC intelligent monitoring systems.
- Spoke with clinical and non-clinical staff, members of the Patient Participation Group (PPG) and patients.
- Reviewed patient survey information.
- Observed how people were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- 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 are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks like for them. The population groups are:

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

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

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

### Safe track record and learning

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

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

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 member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on

safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and the nurse practitioner/prescriber 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 had completed the "General Practice Preventing Infection Together" (GP PIT Programme) overseen by Wigan Borough CCG. This is an Infection Prevention Programme aimed at enabling Primary Medical Care Practices to meet the requirements the Health and Social Care Act. 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, there was a lock on the computer paper tray where blank prescriptions were held in the consultation rooms, and there were systems in place to monitor their use. The nurse practitioner had qualified as an independent prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. They received mentorship

## Are services safe?

and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.

- We reviewed eight 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 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. 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, called a "buddy plan" in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff. However key staff did not keep a copy of this at home.

# 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.
- There were regular clinical team meetings for GP and nursing staff and some that included the colocated practice. The agenda for these meetings included specific cases, clinical significant events and alerts.

### 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 94% of the total number of points available. The practice had an overall exception report of 15% (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). For example data from 2014/2015 showed:

- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5 mmol/l or less was 85% which was above the CCG average of 82% and national average of 81%.
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 70% which was below the CCG average of 87% and national average of 88%. We saw evidence the practice had improved the results in the latest year.

- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 91% which was above the CCG average of 81% and national average of 78%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- We saw evidence that the practice acted upon the results of clinical audits, and that they undertook follow up audits to ensure the management and monitoring of services to improve outcomes for patient was effective. Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result of an audit of antibiotics resulted in a 20% reduction of prescriptions for these.

### 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. We saw evidence that the nursing staff had received recent updates and training on chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) management and treatment.
- 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 supported with a training plan.

- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness and basic life support. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training. Staff were given protected time for training.
- The practice had operated an apprentice scheme. This involved an apprenticeship to gain a national vocational qualification (NVQ) in business administration. This scheme had led to employment post scheme in this practice.
- The practice focussed on staff development and a member of the administrative team was being supported to become a healthcare assistant in the practice.

### 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, investigations, and test results.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.
- The practice worked cooperatively with the colocated practice and held regular clinical meetings with them.

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 signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 77%, which was just below the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 75% to 98% and five year olds from 81% to 96%.

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.

The practice worked with the community link worker (CLW). The CLW took self-referrals for patients who need extra help, but not necessarily medical help. It varied from advice on benefits to social issues such as loneliness and not

## Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

knowing which services were available and how they can be accessed. This service worked in co-operation with Age UK so that patients over 65 will be linked to the services available through them.

# Are services caring?

## Our findings

### Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 33 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. However several patients commented that at times it was very difficult to get a routine appointment.

We spoke with two members of the patient participation group (PPG) and ten other patients. They 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 generally in line with the CCG and national averages for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 85% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and the national average of 89%.
- 90% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 87%.
- 93% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.
- 80% 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%.

- 92% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 93% and national average of 91%.
- 94% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% 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. 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 variably to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were generally below the local and national averages. For example:

- 84% 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%.
- 71% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to CCG average of 84% and the national average of 82%.
- 80% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to CCG average of 89% and the national average of 85%.

We noted the practice had recognised the shortfall and had discussed the results at practice meetings.

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

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

## Are services caring?

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

Staff told us that if families had suffered 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. Staff had also attended the funeral of patients.

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

## Our findings

### Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

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

### Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday, Tuesday and Friday, and Wednesday and Thursday between 8am and 8pm. On a Wednesday the surgery was closed between 12pm and 1.30pm for staff training. 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 generally comparable to local and national averages.

- 79% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to CCG average of 81% and the national average of 76%.
- 63% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 78% and national average of 73%.

Patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get emergency appointments when they needed

them but at times could not get a routine appointment at a convenient time. The practice had introduced a "message board" facility if there were no appointments available that day. This had details of the medical condition reported, was reviewed by a senior clinician and the patient was informed. The outcome was a delayed, emergency or telephone consultation, prescription or referral to another service such as a walk in centre.

The practice had also reviewed their booking system and had changed how patients booked appointments. Patients could no longer book an appointment for the next day after 6pm and were now required to book on the day from 8am. This had resulted in a reduction of patients who did not attend booked appointments.

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

### Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

We looked at all eight complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, and dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints 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 vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

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

### Governance arrangements

The practice had a 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 staffing structure and 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 all staff in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the management team 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 GPs 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 proactively sought patients' feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service.

• The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG), the friends and family test and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG had highlighted the difficulties with the current appointment system and was working with the practice management team to look at ways to improve this. There was also a suggestion box in the reception area.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through the away day, 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.

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

## 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.