

Berkeley Place Surgery

Quality Report

11 High Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6DA

Tel: 01242 513975

Website: www.berkeleyplacesurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 8 September 2016

Date of publication: 07/11/2016

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 | 8 |
| What people who use the service say | 12 |
| Areas for improvement | 12 |

Detailed findings from this inspection

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Our inspection team | 13 |
| Background to Berkeley Place Surgery | 13 |
| Why we carried out this inspection | 13 |
| How we carried out this inspection | 13 |
| Detailed findings | 15 |

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Berkeley Place Surgery on 8 September 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 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 a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- The patient participation group (PPG) were well engaged and represented across a diverse range of professional backgrounds. The PPG suggestions for changes to the practice management team had been acted upon and as well as this, the group had raised awareness about patient services. For example, PPG members suggested rewording questions on the practice's in-house patient survey, and information displayed on its waiting room screens, to make them easier to understand. The content of both areas has been changed as a result.
- 90% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 84% and the national average of 76%.
- The practice worked closely with local services including a homeless shelter and volunteer transport schemes.

Summary of findings

- The practice offered to the most appropriate patients the use of information and communication technologies in their homes, to support and self-manage long term conditions such as diabetes, epilepsy and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, which causes long term breathing problems.
 - The practice is participating in a social prescribing scheme to support people who attend their GP surgery but do not necessarily require medical care. Social prescribing supports people with issues such as social isolation and coping with caring responsibilities, to connect to services and groups that can help improve their wellbeing and meet their wider needs.
 - Staff had lead roles that improved outcomes for patients such as a care co-ordinator and a carers champion. Patients had access at the practice to drop-in clinics from outside agencies such as Cruse Bereavement Care.
 - The practice was proactive in ensuring that vulnerable patients who did not attend their scheduled appointments were visited by the practice nurse, assessed and, if necessary, booked for a same day appointment at the practice.
 - 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.
 - When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We found two areas where the provider should make improvement:
- Continue to conduct clinical audits and embed these into its processes so that improvements made are implemented and monitored.
 - Review the process through which carers are identified to enable the practice to engage with and support a larger proportion of the patient practice list.
- 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.
- 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 for April 2015 to March 2016 showed patient outcomes were at or slightly above average for the locality and compared to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- We saw a few examples of clinical audits that included improvements for patient care. It is important that the practice continue to conduct clinical audits and embed these into its processes so that improvements made are implemented and monitored.
- 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 multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.
- The practice provides medical services for a local independent school, and its concussion protocol guidelines have been implemented and used as part of a national assessment tool.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



Summary of findings

- Data from the national GP patient survey (January 2016) showed patients rated the practice as either comparable with or better than other local practices 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.
- The practice had identified patients who were carers and alerted them whenever a local carers group met. This provided an opportunity for carers to gain support and raised awareness of carers services locally. It is important that the practice review the process through which carers are identified to enable the practice to engage with and support a larger proportion of the patient practice list.

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 (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice is participating in an online clinical support service which aims to relieve the pressure on hospital accident and emergency departments. Where relevant, the service signposts patients to other providers, such as walk in clinics, that might be more appropriate for their health issue.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with regular appointments available the same day.

The practice implemented suggestions for improvements and made changes to the way it delivered services as a consequence of patient feedback. 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 the practice responded quickly when issues were raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.
- The practice increased the length of individual appointment times for patients with complex medical conditions.
- Telephone appointments were offered where appropriate, as an alternative to face-to-face consultations.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice was proactive in responding to patients' needs and tailored services accordingly. For example:
 - The practice liaised with local voluntary organisations such as Age UK to provide support;
 - The practice worked with other health professionals to minimise unnecessary hospital admissions;
 - A specialist mental health nurse, from a mental health trust, ran a weekly clinic for patients in the practice who needed this service;
 - Patients were able to access the practice by telephone, emails and face to face.
 - The practice sent text reminders for appointments
 - The practice offered health advice and support for clinically obese patients followed by referral (after six weeks) to a reputable weight loss organisation.
 - Appropriate patients were offered the use of technology in their homes, to self-manage long term conditions such as diabetes, epilepsy and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
- The practice recruited patients for a volunteer car service due to poor transport links, to enable more physically impaired patients to attend the surgery.

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 provider encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about 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.

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 patients in its population.
- Older patients with complex care needs or those at risk of hospital admissions had personalised care plans which were shared with local organisations to facilitate continuity of care.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice care-co-ordinator worked closely with district nurses, occupational therapists and social services agencies to avoid unplanned hospital admissions for older patients.
- The practice referred patients to local community health improvement schemes.
- Patients had access at the practice to drop-in clinics from outside agencies such as Cruse Bereavement Care.

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.
- Performance for patients with long-term conditions compared with national averages. For example, 75% of patients with asthma, on the register, had had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months, compared to the national average of 75%. The review included three patient-focused outcomes that act as a further prompt to review treatment.
- 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 routinely offered longer appointments for patients with complex medical needs.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice offered patients the use of information and communication technologies in their homes, to self-manage long term health conditions.

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. The practice assessed the capability of young patients using Gillick competencies. These competencies are an accepted means to determine whether a child is mature enough to make decisions for themselves.
- The percentage of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test had been performed in the preceding 5 years was 77%, comparable to 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.
- The practice provides medical services for a local independent school. A senior GP partner is the Chief Medical Officer for the school's health centre and has produced concussion protocol guidelines for the Medical Officers Schools Association. These guidelines have been implemented and used as part of a national assessment tool, from June 2015. GPs answer calls from the school's staff 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The practice has also set up an email address for students who may find it difficult to access medical care for personal reasons, particularly relating to sexual and other health issues. We saw evidence that in a recent (2016) survey, 90% of pupils rated the health centre as excellent.
- The practice set up an email address for students from a local school who may find it difficult to access medical care for personal reasons, particularly relating to sexual and mental health issues.

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.
- Patients were able to order repeat prescriptions on-line.
- The practice offered text reminders for appointments.
- Patients were able to book and attend appointments throughout the day.
- Telephone appointments were offered where appropriate, as an alternative to face-to-face consultations.

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 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.
- The practice was proactive in ensuring that vulnerable patients who did not attend their scheduled appointments were visited by the practice nurse, assessed and if necessary, booked for a same day appointment at the practice.

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).

Good



Summary of findings

- 87% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 84%.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their records in the preceding 12 months was 93%, which compared with the national average of 88%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out 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.
- A specialist mental health nurse, from a mental health trust, ran a weekly clinic for patients in the practice who needed this service.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The latest national GP patient survey results were published on 7 January 2016. The results showed the practice performance was either better than or comparable with local and national averages. For the survey 274 survey forms were distributed and 121 were returned, representing around 1.6% of the practice's patient list.

- 83% of patients found it easy to get through to the practice by telephone compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 83% and national average of 73%.
- 90% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with the CCG average of 84% and national average of 76%.
- 89% of patients described the overall experience of their GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 89% and national average of 85%.
- 82% of patients said they would recommend their GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area, compared with the CCG average of 84% and national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards to be completed by

patients prior to our visit. We reviewed the six comment cards we had received which were positive about the service experienced. Patients described GPs and reception staff as being caring and respectful, and taking the time to listen to their concerns. Patients told us they were given advice about their care and treatment which they understood and which met their needs. We spoke with two patients during the inspection who told us they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

We looked at the latest submitted NHS Friends and Family Test results, where patients are asked if they would recommend the practice. The practice submitted data for 2016 which showed that 27 of 51 respondents (around 53%) would recommend the practice to family and friends, whilst 11 of 51 respondents (around 22%) would not recommend the practice. When we spoke to the practice, we were made aware that staff absence through long term illness and an increased demand for appointments due to a growing list size, had had an impact on patient satisfaction. The practice is aiming to relocate to a large, purpose-built, shared facility in the next 24 months, and expects staffing levels to increase proportionately.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

We found two areas where the provider should make improvement:

- Continue to conduct clinical audits and embed these into its processes so that improvements made are implemented and monitored.

- Review the process through which carers are identified to enable the practice to engage with and support a larger proportion of the patient practice list.

Berkeley Place Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC lead inspector and included a GP specialist advisor.

Background to Berkeley Place Surgery

Berkeley Place Surgery is located in Cheltenham, a spa town and borough of Gloucestershire. The current practice has occupied a Grade II-listed, four-storey building since 1963. Rooms for consulting, treatment and phlebotomy services are located throughout the building. Waiting rooms are on the ground and first floors, with a medical records room in the basement. There is one treatment room on the ground floor. The practice does not have a passenger lift, due to restrictions on the modification of listed buildings, but arrangements were in place to see patients with limited mobility on the ground floor.

Berkeley Place Surgery has around 7,789 registered patients, most of whom live within a five mile radius of the practice. The practice has lower than national average patient populations for all age groups from 0 to 14 years, and 40 to 79 years. The patient population from 15 to 19 years, and those aged from 25 to 39 years, are all higher than the national average. Berkeley Place Surgery is one of 85 GP practices in the NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) area.

The practice population is 98% white, with the largest minority ethnic population (around 1.6%) being Asian or Asian British. A measure of deprivation in the local area recorded a score of 8, on a scale of 1-10. A higher score indicates a less deprived area. (Note: an area itself is not

deprived, it is the circumstances and lifestyles of the people living there that affect its deprivation score. Not everyone living in a deprived area is deprived and not all deprived people live in deprived areas).

The practice team consists of four GP partners (three male, one female) and three salaried GPs (all female). In addition there is one lead nurse, one practice nurse, and one health care assistant employed. The clinicians are supported by a practice manager, a deputy practice manager, a pharmacy advisor, a secretary and a team of notes summarisers (administrative staff with some clinical training, who transfer hard copies of patient's notes onto the practice's electronic data system) and receptionists. The practice has a General Medical Services contract with NHS England (a locally agreed contract negotiated between NHS England and the practice).

Berkeley Place Surgery is open from 8.15am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday, and GP appointments are available from 8.30am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. The practice will take calls from 8.30am. Nursing team appointments were available between 8.30am and 5.30pm, Monday to Friday. All appointments can be pre-booked up to four weeks in advance.

The practice has opted out of providing Out Of Hours services to its own patients. Outside of normal practice hours, to 8.30am, patients can access NHS 111 and an Out Of Hours GP service. Information about the Out Of Hours service was available on the practice website, and as an answerphone message.

Berkeley Place Surgery provides regulated activities from its sole location at 11 High Street, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL52 6DA.

Detailed findings

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive inspection programme.

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

We reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice in advance of the inspection and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 8 September 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nurses and administrative staff and two patients who used the service;
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and family members;
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients;

- Reviewed six Care Quality Commission 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 Care Quality Commission 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. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. Discussions took place immediately following a significant event, at one of the (daily) clinical meetings. Information was cascaded to staff through circulated minutes. We saw evidence that lessons learnt were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, an administrative error concerning GP availability resulted in the cancellation of patient appointments. The practice has now reorganised and reassigned its administrative tasks to ensure that GP rotas are subject to a thorough checking process.

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. All staff had received the appropriate safeguarding training. A GP partner was the lead member of staff for safeguarding adults and children. 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 adults relevant to their role. All GPs and the lead nurse were trained to safeguarding level three, and the practice manager and other non-clinical staff were either trained to level one or level two.

- A notice at the reception desk and in all the consulting rooms advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones had received a Disclosure and Barring Service check (DBS check). (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. A lead nurse was the infection control lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up-to-date with current 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 clinical commissioning group (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.

Are services safe?

- Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health care assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.
- The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse) and had procedures in place to manage them safely. There were also arrangements in place for the destruction of controlled drugs.
- We reviewed five 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.
- The practice used a total of 12 locum GPs in the past year, primarily due to extended staff absence through long term illness, to cover a GP's retirement, and as a response to a growing list size and the increased demand for appointments. We found that appropriate recruitment checks were in place.
- 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 that 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.

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 in the practice manager's room 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.
- 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, fit for use and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met peoples' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 96% of the total number of points available, with 8% exception reporting overall. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

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

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 86% compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and national average of 88%.
- The percentage of patients with high blood pressure having regular blood pressure tests was comparable with local and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with high blood pressure in whom the last blood pressure reading was a satisfactory level was 82%, compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was either better than or comparable with local and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with

schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record in the preceding 12 months was 93%, compared to the CCG average of 93% and national average of 88%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been three clinical audits undertaken in the last year, none of these were completed second-cycle audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. When we spoke to the practice, they explained that this was mainly due to staff absence through long term illness and other staff absences. The practice has since highlighted that audits need to be followed up as a 'second cycle' on the results of the original audits. To address this issue, the practice have appointed the lead nurse to oversee and administer all audits, to ensure that these are completed as a matter of routine.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Although the second cycle of clinical audits had not been carried out, findings from the first cycle were used by the practice to improve services. For example, the practice undertook an audit to identify those patients who had been prescribed a medicine used to treat superficial fungal infections of the skin and nails, and to review the clinical advice documented. The audit showed that in the vast majority of cases, patients who were started on the medicine were appropriately monitored as per the accepted prescribing guidelines. The audit also found that whilst clinicians counselled patients about the possible side-effects of the medicine, this conversation was only documented in 50% of cases; and that the number of patients who did not have a follow-up blood test was high. The practice have now set up an automatic consultation alert, after the patient is prescribed a limited supply of the medicine. A further prescription will prompt the practice to check if the patient has had their follow-up blood tests to ensure future safe prescribing. The practice intends to publicise this as an example of good clinical practice, and will repeat the audit in a year to find out whether there has been improvement in documentation and continued adherence to prescribing guidance.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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. They covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes. For example, by accessing on-line resources and discussion at practice nurse 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 during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.
- The practice nurses regularly attend multi-disciplinary team meetings to review patients' care.

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.

- The practice provided medical services for a local independent school. A senior GP partner was the Chief Medical Officer for the school's health centre and had produced concussion protocol guidelines for the Medical Officers Schools Association. These guidelines have been implemented and used as part of a national assessment tool. GPs were available to answer calls from the school's staff 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

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 patient consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

- Staff had undertaken 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 records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition, those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation and those aged over 75 years. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.

Are services effective? (for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice nurses and health care assistants offered support with health and well-being issues for patients. We saw evidence that this support included self-managing a long term health condition or changing health behaviours.
 - The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 77%, which was comparable with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 84% and national average of 82%. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using a system of alerts for those patients with an identified learning disability, by using information in different languages, and by ensuring whenever possible that a female sample taker was available.
 - The practice also encouraged patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. Bowel cancer screening rates in the last 30 months for those patients aged between 60 and 69 years of age were 66%, which was comparable with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 63% and the national average of 58%.
 - 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 following abnormal results.
 - Childhood immunisation rates were comparable with CCG averages. For example, vaccines given to under two year olds at the practice ranged from 94% to 97% compared with 94% to 96% for the CCG. Vaccines given to under five year olds at the practice ranged from 83% to 93% compared with the CCG range from 90% to 95%.
- Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patient 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 and could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.
- We noted that the practice had installed an electronic booking-in system to speed up the process and help maintain patient privacy.

All of the six 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 and caring, and treated them with dignity and respect. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. For example, patients suggested that the practice's patient survey questions, and information displayed on its waiting room screens be rewritten, to make it easier to understand. The content of both areas has been changed as a result. We spoke with two members of the patient participation group. 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 (January 2016) also showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was comparable with or below the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) and national averages for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 87% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 91% and national average of 89%.

- 83% of patients said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 89%, national average 87%).
- 91% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 97%, national average 95%).
- 81% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 88%, national average 85%).
- 87% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 92%, national average 91%).
- 91% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 90%, national average 87%).

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They 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 on the comment cards we received was positive and aligned with these views.

Results from the national GP patient survey (January 2016) showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results compared with local and national averages. For example:

- 86% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 89% and national average of 86%.
- 80% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 85%, national average 82%).
- 81% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 87%, national average 85%).

Staff told us translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

- The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 59 patients

Are services caring?

as carers (less than 1% of the practice list). The practice should review the process through which carers are identified to enable the practice to engage with and support a larger proportion of the patient practice list.

- A practice receptionist acted as 'Carers Champion'. The carers champion reviewed the carers register at all staff meetings, and outlined the different support groups available to carers, such as Carers Gloucestershire's

'Positive Caring Programme'. We saw patient records were flagged for those identified as carers, and that the practice offered more flexibility around appointment times.

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 or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

- The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and clinical commissioning group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice is participating in a social prescribing scheme to support people who attend their GP surgery but do not necessarily require medical care. Social prescribing supports people with issues such as social isolation and coping with caring responsibilities to connect to services and groups that can help improve their wellbeing and meet their wider needs.
- Home visits were available for patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- The practice system alerted staff to patients with a learning disability who would benefit from flexibility around length and times of appointments.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS. Those vaccines only available privately were referred to other clinics.
- Receptionists dealt with all queries both in person and on the phone, and were responsible for booking appointments.
- Patients with a long term condition were offered an annual review.
- We saw evidence that the practice was working to the Gold Standards Framework for those patients with end of life care needs.
- The practice was proactive in responding to patients' needs and tailored services accordingly. For example:
 - The practice liaised with local voluntary organisations such as Age UK to provide support;
 - The practice worked with other health professionals to minimise unnecessary hospital admissions;
 - A specialist mental health nurse, from a mental health trust, ran a weekly clinic for patients in the practice who needed this service;
 - Patients were able to access the practice by telephone, emails and face to face. The practice sent text reminders for appointments;
 - Telephone appointments were offered where appropriate, as an alternative to face-to-face consultations.

- The practice offered health advice and support for clinically obese patients followed by referral (after six weeks) to a reputable weight loss organisation;
- Appropriate patients were offered the use of technology in their homes, to self-manage long term conditions such as diabetes, epilepsy and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
- The practice recruited patients for a volunteer car service due to poor transport links, to enable more physically impaired patients to attend the surgery.
- The practice worked closely with local services including a homeless shelter and volunteer transport schemes.
- We noted that the practice had installed an electronic booking-in system, to speed up the process and help maintain patient privacy. The booking-in screen displayed a range of national flags to guide patients to instructions in their own language. As well as a hearing loop, interpreting and translation services were available for patients who were either deaf or had a hearing impairment. Practice leaflets could be made available in large print and Easy Read format, which makes information easier to access for patients with learning disabilities.

Access to the service

Berkeley Place Surgery is open from 8.15am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday, and GP appointments are available from 8.30am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. Nursing team appointments were available between 8.30am and 5.30pm, Monday to Friday. All appointments can be pre-booked up to four weeks in advance.

The practice has opted out of providing Out Of Hours services to its own patients. Outside of normal practice hours, patients can access NHS 111 and an Out Of Hours GP service. Information about the Out Of Hours service was available on the practice website, and as an answerphone message.

Results from the national GP patient survey (January 2016) showed that patient satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment were comparable with or worse than local and national averages.

- 81% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 80% and national average of 78%.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- 83% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone (CCG average 83% and national average 73%).
- 47% of patients said they usually get to see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 66% and national average 59%). When we spoke to the practice, they explained that the building's Grade II-listed status made the cost of installing a lift prohibitive. All treatment rooms except one are located on the upper floors. This means that appointment waiting times are partly dependent on a patient's capacity to negotiate the stairs in the building. We were made aware of plans to relocate to a much larger, purpose-built medical facility in the coming year.
- 90% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with the CCG average of 84% and national average of 76%.
- The Practice Manager was the designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. For example, through feedback forms available at reception and in the waiting area, and comment cards on the practice website. A Friends and Family Test suggestion box and a patient suggestion box were available within the patient waiting area which invited patients to provide feedback on the service provided, including complaints.

We looked at two complaints received by the practice in 2016. These were both discussed and reviewed, and learning points noted. We saw that these were handled and dealt with in a timely way. Complaints were a standing agenda item at monthly meetings. We saw evidence of lessons learnt from patient complaints and action taken to improve the quality of care. For example, a patient complained that their health problem was not dealt with adequately, and was instead mistakenly attributed to a mental health issue which the patient did not believe was applicable to them. We saw evidence that the practice discussed the issue with the patient. The practice now ensures that it communicates with patients in an empathetic and polite manner, and books a double appointment if appropriate.

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- The complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values. The practice mission aimed to deliver high quality primary health care for patients that was equitable and sustainable.
- The practice had a strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and was 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:

- There was a clear 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 arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- 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. The practice manager was described as engaged, professional, dynamic and extremely competent in their role.

- Staff told us that partners meetings and meetings with the lead nurse and lead receptionist were held weekly, and clinical team meetings daily. The practice also held annual away days, where staffing levels, staff skill mix and long term aims and objectives were discussed.
- 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 in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported. 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. The practice proactively sought patient feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service.

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. We also looked at the latest submitted NHS Friends and Family Test results, where patients are asked if they would recommend the practice. Data from 2016 showed that around 53% of respondents would recommend the practice to family and friends.

Continuous improvement

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. For example, the practice is signed up to the 'Choice+' system, which enables the booking of additional urgent appointments for patients, at two separate locations locally.