

Little Lever Health Centre

Quality Report

Mytham Road
Little Lever
Bolton
Lancashire
BL3 1JF

Tel: 01204 462988

Website: www.drjainanddr Gupta.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 25th April 2017

Date of publication: 02/06/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Good



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Little Lever Health Centre	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Little Lever Health Centre on 25 April 2017. 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.
- The practice had systems to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. However results were mixed when compared to the national average. The majority of patients we spoke with on the day were positive about their care and treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients we spoke with said they found it could be difficult to make a pre bookable appointment with a GP. We noted however the majority were able to access urgent same day appointments.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Look to incorporate full cycle clinical audits into the quality improvement systems.
- Look to continue monitoring and improving access for patients.

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



- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed, we found there was an effective system 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 were informed as soon as practicable, 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 systems, processes and practices to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff demonstrated that they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- The practice had arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were in line with the national average.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- The practice used data to effectively monitor and improve outcomes for patients, however they had not carried out any full cycle clinical audits.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge 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.
- End of life care was coordinated with other services involved.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients responses were mixed when compared to others for several aspects of care.

Summary of findings

- Speaking with patients and reviewing comment cards on the day of the inspection the majority of 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 accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting conditions, including patients with a condition other than cancer and patients living with dementia.
- Patient's feedback suggested at times it was difficult to make a pre bookable appointment with a GP, however urgent same day appointments were accessible.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and evidence from examples reviewed 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 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 policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- An overarching governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received inductions, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour.

Good



Summary of findings

- The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents and sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on. The practice engaged with the patient participation group.
- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels. Staff training was a priority and was built into staff rotas.

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

Good



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

- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified, at an early stage, older patients who may need palliative care as they were approaching the end of life. It involved older patients in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs.
- Where older patients had complex needs, the practice shared summary care records with local care services and signposted to relevant social care and voluntary organisations for additional support.
- Older patients were provided with health promotional advice and support to help them to maintain their health and independence for as long as possible.

People with long term conditions

Good



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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in long-term disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The practice offered longer appointments for those with multiple long term conditions, offering a holistic review.
- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- There were emergency processes for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.
- All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for a structured annual review to check their

Summary of findings

health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and social care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found there were systems 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 accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Immunisation rates were high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us, on the day of inspection, that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice worked with midwives, health visitors and school nurses to support this population group. For example, in the provision of ante-natal, post-natal and child health surveillance clinics.
- The practice had emergency processes for acutely ill children and young people and for acute pregnancy complications.

Good



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 these populations had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care, for example, appointments were available one evening a week until 8:30pm and the practice participated in a local extended hours hub where patients could access GP services in the evening and on Saturdays and Sundays.
- 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.
- Telephone consultations were available daily.

Good



Summary of findings

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

Good



- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- 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 had information available for vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed knew how to recognise signs of abuse in children, young people and adults whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. They were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

Good



- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- 82% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average.
- The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and dementia.
- The practice had a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving medicines for mental health needs.
- 76% of patients with poor mental health had a comprehensive care plan documented in the record agreed between individuals, their family and/or carers as appropriate. This was below the national average of 89%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.

Summary of findings

- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed 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 on 7 July 2016. The results were lower when compared with local and national averages. 264 survey forms were distributed and 103 were returned. This represented approximately 3% of the practice's patient list.

- 72% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 85%.
- 57% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 73%.
- 52% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to 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 36 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Comments included, treated with dignity and respect, staff are friendly and helpful, very good and sometimes have to wait to see the doctor.

We spoke with 9 patients during the inspection. The majority of patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. However six patients said it could be difficult to get an appointment and two commented on the length of waiting times once they had checked in to see a GP.

Information from the "Friends and Family Test" indicated that the vast majority of patients completing the form were extremely likely or likely to recommend the practice to others.

Little Lever Health Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Little Lever Health Centre

Little Lever Health Centre provides primary medical services in Bolton from Monday to Friday. The surgery is open Monday to Friday 8am to 6:30pm and extended hours Tuesday until 8:30pm. Appointments with a GP are available:

Monday 9:00 - 12:00 16:00 - 18:30

Tuesday 9:00 - 12:00 16:00 - 20:00

Wednesday 9:00 - 12:00 17:00 - 18:30

Thursday 9:00 - 12:00 16:00 - 18:30

Friday 9:00 - 12:00 16:00 - 18:30

Additionally patients can access GP services in the evening and on Saturdays and Sundays through a local extended hours hub.

Little Lever is situated within the geographical area of Bolton Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract. The GMS contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities. It offers direct enhanced services for meningitis provision, the childhood vaccination and immunisation scheme, extended hours access, facilitating

timely diagnosis and support for people with dementia, influenza and pneumococcal immunisations, learning disabilities, rotavirus and shingles immunisation and unplanned admissions.

Little Lever Health Centre is responsible for providing care to 3020 patients

The practice consists of two full time male GPs. The practice also has a full time, female nurse specialist practitioner and health care assistant. The practice is supported by a practice manager, assistant manager and reception administrators.

When the practice is closed patients are directed to the out of hours service.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 25 April 2017. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff including the lead GP, practice manager, nurse, reception and administration staff.
- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area and talked with patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver care and treatment plans.

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 living 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 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).
- From the sample of 20 documented significant events we reviewed we found these were appropriately investigated and actions and outcomes shared. We saw that where appropriate, when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed. The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events. The practice also monitored trends in significant events and evaluated any action taken.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to minimise risks to patient safety.

- Arrangements for safeguarding 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.
- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs 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 had a system for managing safety alerts from external agencies. For example those from the medicines and healthcare products regulatory agency (MHRA). These were reviewed at practice meeting by the GPs, practice nurse and practice manager and action was taken when required.

The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene.

- We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- The practice nurse was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.

The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice minimised risks to patient safety (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal).

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. Repeat prescriptions were signed before being given to patients and there was a reliable process to ensure this occurred. The practice carried out regular medicines audits. There was a pharmacist from the CCG who worked with the practice to support regular medicines audits and 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 to monitor their use.
- Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health care assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines and patient specific prescriptions or directions from a prescriber were produced appropriately.

Are services safe?

We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment for new staff. For example, proof of identification, evidence of satisfactory conduct in previous employments in the form of references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the DBS.

Monitoring risks to patients

There were procedures for assessing, monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety.

- There was a health and safety policy available.
 - The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.
 - All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.
 - The practice had a variety of other risk assessments 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).
- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system to ensure enough staff were on duty to meet the needs of patients.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had adequate arrangements 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 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

Clinicians were aware of relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 94% of the total number of points available, in line with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average and national average.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators were below the CCG and national average at 75%. (13% below the CCG average and 15% below the national average). During the inspection the practice provided data for 2016/17 which showed improved performance with all indicators achieved.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was comparable to the CCG and national average at 100% (1% above the CCG average and 3% above the national average.)
- Performance for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) related indicators were below the CCG and national average at 79% (16% below the CCG and national average.) We reviewed data provided by the practice in year 2016/17 and noted the practice had now achieved 100%

There was evidence of quality improvement:

- The practice used data to effectively monitor and improve outcomes for patients for example, access to appointments, monitoring prescribing data and QOF on a regular basis, however they had not carried out any full cycle clinical audits. We were provided with one single cycle audit looking at the prescribing of Liothyronine medication to patients within the practice.
- The practice participated in, national and local benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research. Findings were used by the practice to improve services.
- A CCG pharmacist provided support to the practice. They ran prescribing safety checks and audits, where any issues were highlighted these were passed to a GP to act on.
- The practice also worked with set performance indicators set by the local CCG and met with the CCG and other local GPs to benchmark, monitor and review quality on a quarterly basis.

Effective staffing

Evidence reviewed showed that staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and to nurse and clinical leads within the CCG.
- 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, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs and nurses. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.
- Staff were supported with professional development, this included the practice nurse undertaking advanced nurse practitioner training and the health care assistant in training to achieve a level 3 diploma health and social 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.

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. Information was shared between services, with patients' consent, using a shared care record. Regular meetings took place with other health care professionals when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

The practice ensured that end of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of different patients, including those who may be vulnerable because of their circumstances.

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 and signposted them to relevant services. 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.
- A Health trainer working with the practice supported patients in the community with healthy lifestyle advice.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 87%, which was above the national average of 81%. We also noted a higher than average exception reporting in relation to cervical screening 15%, 9% above the England average.
- Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given were comparable with CCG and national averages. For example, NHS England figures showed that in 2016 94% of children, registered with the practice aged 5 years had received the full measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccination above the national average of 88%.

There was a policy to offer telephone or written 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. There were failsafe systems 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.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed members of staff were courteous and helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect. We saw a strong patient-centred culture:

- Staff were motivated and inspired to offer kind and compassionate care and worked to overcome obstacles to achieving this.
- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.
- The practice had two male GPs, a female nurse specialist practitioner and health care assistant. Should a patient specifically want to see a female GP this could be arranged via the local hub.

The majority of the 36 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered a good service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice results were however mixed when compared with others for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs. Results for nurses were however in line with others. For example:

- 70% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average and national average of 89%.
- 64% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG and national average of 87%.
- 93% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG and national average of 95%
- 75% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.

- 95% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and the national average of 91%.
- 95% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 92%.
- 99% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 97%.
- 92% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 79% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The majority of 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 aligned with these views. Comments included , treated with dignity and respect, staff are friendly and helpful and very good

Children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and recognised as individuals.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responses were mixed with regard to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were below the local and national averages for GPs. For example:

- 69% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG and national average of 86%.
- 65% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 91% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 90%.
- 81% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%

Are services caring?

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

- Staff told us that interpretation 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.
- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital. The practice monitored and peer reviewed referrals made by clinicians to ensure they were appropriate and carried out in appropriate time frames.

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. Support for isolated or house-bound patients was monitored and these patients were included within the practice 'important patient' list

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 71 patients as carers (approximately 2% of the practice list). Carers were provided with an annual health review and where it was difficult for carers to attend the practice for appointments due to caring responsibilities home visits were available. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. Older carers were offered timely and appropriate support.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population:

- The practice offered extended hours on a Tuesday evening until 8.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions. There were early and ongoing conversations with these patients about their end of life care as part of their wider treatment and care planning.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice sent text message reminders of appointments and test results.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were accessible facilities, which included a hearing loop, and interpretation services available.

Access to the service

The surgery was open Monday to Friday 8am to 6:30pm and extended hours Tuesday until 8:30pm. Appointments with a GP were available:

Monday 9:00 - 12:00 16:00 - 18:30

Tuesday 9:00 - 12:00 16:00 - 20:00

Wednesday 9:00 - 12:00 17:00 - 18:30

Thursday 9:00 - 12:00 16:00 - 18:30

Friday 9:00 - 12:00 16:00 - 18:30

Extended hours appointments were offered one evening a week until 8:30pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them. Additionally patients could access GP services in the evening and on Saturdays and Sundays through a local extended hours hub.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was mixed when compared to local and national averages.

- 76% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 81% and the national average of 76%.
- 70% of patients said they could easily get through to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 81% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.
- 85% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG and the national average of 92%.
- 57% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 73%.
- 47% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 59% and the national average of 58%.

The practice were aware of the lower than average satisfaction scores and were due to pilot a new book on the day system to see if this helped improved access and patient experience. They were also monitoring patients feedback in relation to access on a monthly basis, for example in March 2017, 39 patients provided feedback. When asked 'Overall, how would you describe your experience of making an appointment', 51% stated very good, 42% fairly good, 5% neither good nor poor and 2% fairly poor.

The practice had a system to assess:

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

This was achieved by the GP triage, in which a GP would telephone the patient or carer in advance to gather information to allow an informed decision to be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

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 a system for handling complaints and concerns.

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

- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system.

We looked at two formal complaints received in the last 12 months and found they were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency. Compliments and complaints were also discussed routinely within practice meetings. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs and nurses had lead roles in key areas.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. These were updated and reviewed regularly.
- An understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- Practice meetings were held monthly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.
- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.
- We saw evidence from minutes of meetings a structure that allowed for lessons to be learned and shared following significant events and complaints.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the lead GP, nurse and practice manager demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems 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 organisation encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. 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 and staff felt supported by management.
- The practice held and minuted a range of multi-disciplinary meetings including meetings with district nurses and social workers to monitor vulnerable patients. GPs, where required, met with health visitors to monitor vulnerable families and safeguarding concerns.
- 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. Minutes were comprehensive and were available for practice staff to view.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the managers and lead GP in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the practice 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 and staff. It proactively sought feedback from:

- Patients through the virtual patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received.
- The PPG were newly formed but one of their first tasks was to give feedback via questionnaire following a visit to see a GP. Analysis of the results from January 2017 by the practice showed from the 12 responses that the majority of patients were very satisfied with their last visit to the practice; 58% found it very easy, 42% somewhat easy to make an appointment that was convenient for them.
- The NHS Friends and Family test, complaints and compliments received and via the suggestion box.
- As a result of feedback from patients the practice were introducing more on the day appointments alongside the urgent appointments already offered.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- Staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. The team continued to look at ways to improve access and were looking to pilot a new, book on the day system to see if this improved access and patient experience.