

Mayfield Surgery

Quality Report

246 Roehampton Lane, London, Wandsworth
SW15 4AA

Tel: 02087805650

Website: www.mayfieldsurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 15 September 2016

Date of publication: 19/12/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Mayfield Surgery	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13
Action we have told the provider to take	24

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Mayfield Surgery on 15 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 generally assessed and well managed, with the exception of those related to infection prevention and control training, emergency medicines, patient specific directions and prescription security.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with 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.
- 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.

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- The practice must provide infection prevention and control training for all staff.

Summary of findings

- The practice must securely store emergency medicines and blank prescription forms, providing and recording appropriate checks.
- The practice must ensure patient specific directions for influenza vaccines include the dose, route and frequency to be administered to a named patient and a record that the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis.

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 requires improvement for providing safe services.

Requires improvement



- Risks to patients were generally assessed and well managed, however;
- Actions identified in infection prevention and control audits had not been addressed to provide infection prevention and control training for all staff;
- Emergency medicines were not stored securely and regular checks were not thoroughly conducted or recorded;
- Patient specific directions (PSD) from a prescriber for the healthcare assistant (HCA) to administer influenza vaccines in a flu clinic were not clearly documented;
- Blank prescriptions were not managed or stored to maintain their security.
- 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, including systems for identifying, reporting and supporting victims of female genital mutilation (FGM).

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



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

Summary of findings

- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- 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.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- All patients aged over 75 years had a named GP responsible for their 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 diabetes related indicators was comparable to the local and national average.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- The practice nurse was engaged in work to prevent and support victims of female genital mutilation (FGM), including providing advice and guidance on a local and national level and working

Good



Summary of findings

overseas. The practice supported and encouraged this work and had robust arrangements in place to identify, report, prevent from harm, and support vulnerable individuals and families at risk of FGM.

- 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's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

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

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



Summary of findings

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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the local and national average.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice held GP led mental health clinics monthly for patients of the practice as well as telling patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and fifty two survey forms were distributed and one hundred and eleven were returned. This represented 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 79% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 76% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 96% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 88% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 38 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients comments included that staff were caring, reception staff were helpful and patients were treated with dignity and respect.

We spoke with four patients during the inspection. All four patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The practice participated in the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT) and the most recently available data showed that 80% of patients would recommend the practice to a friend or family member.

Mayfield Surgery

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 a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Mayfield Surgery

Mayfield Surgery provides primary medical services in Wandsworth to approximately 6,000 patients and is one of 44 member practices in the NHS Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The practice operates under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract and provides a number of local and national enhanced services (enhanced services require an increased level of service provision above that which is normally required under the core GP contract).

The practice population is in the fourth more deprived decile with income deprivation affecting children and adults higher than national averages.

The practice operates from purpose built premises over two floors with off street car parking facilities. The practice has step free access into the ground floor which comprises reception and waiting areas, staff and patient accessible facilities including baby change facilities and space available for breast feeding mothers. The ground floor has seven clinical rooms and practice management facilities. The first floor comprises a large meeting room, offices and a staff kitchen.

The practice clinical team consists of two male and two female GP partners together providing 22 sessions per

week, two female and one male salaried GPs together providing 13 sessions per week, and one female GP registrar providing 10 sessions per week. The practice employs one part time female nurse practitioner and one part time female healthcare assistant. The practice non-clinical team consists of one practice manager and six administrative and reception staff.

The practice opens between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Telephone lines are operational between the hours of 8.30am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are available in one morning and one afternoon session daily. Extended hours are available on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday evenings from 6.30pm until 8.00pm and on Saturday mornings from 9.00am until 11.00am for pre booked appointments.

The provider has opted out of providing out-of-hours (OOH) services to their own patients between 6.30pm and 8.00am when the practice directs patients to seek assistance from the locally agreed out of hours provider.

The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to provide the regulated activities of treatment of disease, disorder or injury, surgical procedures, family planning, diagnostic and screening procedures, and maternity and midwifery services.

The practice has not previously been inspected by CQC.

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

Detailed findings

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 15 September 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, the nurse practitioner, practice manager and administrative and reception staff.
- Spoke with 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 comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, the practice recorded an incident whereby a contractor did not ensure the vaccine fridge was turned back on after completing electrical equipment tests. The practice responded immediately, following their procedure and notifying the relevant external agencies, and ensured that vaccines were removed from the fridge and were not used, and that none had been used during the time the power was off. The vaccines were replaced and the practice informed the electrical contractor to ensure similar incidents were prevented. The practice also discussed the incident internally and put up signs to keep the power switched on. The practice had not recorded any similar events after these measures were put in place.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and the practice nurse practitioner were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3, the practice health care assistant was trained to level 2 and non-clinical staff were trained to level 1.
- The practice nurse was heavily engaged in work to prevent and support victims of female genital mutilation (FGM), including providing advice and guidance on a local and national level and working overseas. The practice supported and encouraged this work and had robust arrangements in place to identify, report, prevent from harm, and support vulnerable individuals and families at risk of FGM.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place, however staff had not received up to date training. Infection control audits were undertaken. We saw evidence that some action had been taken to make improvements where identified, however other actions, including infection prevention and control training for staff, had not been addressed.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice did not always keep patients safe (including obtaining,

Are services safe?

prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Emergency medicines had checks recorded but these did not include stock levels. Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored on delivery, however blank prescriptions were left in printers overnight and there were no systems in place to monitor prescription forms use.

- Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment).
- Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific direction (PSD) from a prescriber, however this instruction was not always clearly documented with regards to influenza vaccination clinics. (PSDs are written instructions from a qualified and registered prescriber for a medicine including the dose, route and frequency or appliance to be supplied or administered to a named patient after the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis).
- We reviewed two personnel files and electronic records for all staff and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the

reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had adequate arrangements in place to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff, but not in a secure area of the practice, and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date, however they were not stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 96% of the total number of points available, compared to the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and the national average of 95%. The practice had an exception reporting rate of 5% (CCG 7%, national 9%). (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:

Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the local and national average. For example:

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c (a specific blood glucose level test) is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 68%, compared to the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 75% and the national average of 78%.

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 66% (CCG 74%, national 78%).
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, who have had influenza immunisation in the preceding 1 August to 31 March was 91% (CCG 92%, national 94%).
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) is 5 mmol/l or less was 77% (CCG 78%, national 81%).
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 89% (CCG 88%, national 88%).

Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the local and national average. 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 91% compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 88%.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 92% (CCG 89%, national 90%).
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 86% (CCG 87%, national 84%).

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been 14 clinical audits carried out in the last two years, five of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits and national benchmarking. Findings were used by the practice to improve services and outcomes for patients. For example:

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice carried out an audit to evaluate and identify improvement in pneumococcal vaccination in patients diagnosed with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), who are at increased risk of developing pneumococcal pneumonia. The first audit cycle found that 59% of COPD patients had received a pneumococcal vaccine. The practice discussed the results and put in place an action plan to improve uptake. Actions included GP advice during COPD clinics and booking of nurse appointments for vaccine, alerts for patients on the practice computer system, and opportunistic vaccine promotion from the practice nurse. In the second audit cycle the number of patients receiving pneumococcal vaccine had increased to 67%.
- The practice also carried out audits to determine how well guidelines were being met for requesting tests for Vitamin D and Vitamin B12 levels. In both audits, adherence to local and national prescribing guidelines improved following discussion and information sharing among prescribers in the practice. There were also fewer unnecessary re-tests for both Vitamin D and Vitamin B12.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality, however not all staff had received infection control training on their induction.
- 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, training had been undertaken in spirometry, used to monitor and diagnose a range of respiratory conditions including asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance, but staff had not received up to date infection prevention and control training. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- Diet and lifestyle and smoking cessation advice was available on site with additional support available from local support services.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated

how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 0% to 96% (CCG 5% to 93%, national 73% to 95%) and five year olds from 80% to 98% (CCG 67% to 93%, national 81% to 95%).

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening and had uptake for these schemes which were in line with local and national averages.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 38 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

We spoke with two members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

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

- 94% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and the national average of 89%.
- 86% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%.
- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 95%.
- 91% 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%.

- 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%.
- 89% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback from the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views. We also saw that care plans were personalised.

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

- 93% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 86%.
- 85% 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%.
- 88% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format and languages other than English.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Are services caring?

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 99 patients as

carers (1.6% of the practice list). Carers were offered longer appointments, annual health and wellbeing reviews and influenza vaccinations as well as written information directing them to additional support services.

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

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 offered in house phlebotomy services, reducing the need for patients to be referred elsewhere for blood tests.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on a Monday, Wednesday and Thursday evening until 8.00pm and Saturday mornings between 9.00am and 11.00am for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and other patients identified as at risk through the CCG Planning All Care Together (PACT) scheme. These patients had an annual health and wellbeing review of up to 40 minutes with a Nurse or Healthcare assistant and/or a GP whereby a comprehensive multi agency care and treatment plan was put in place.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice. The practice contracted a GP home visit service for urgent home visits.
- The practice contributed to transport support schemes for vulnerable patients unable to travel into the surgery and engaged with local pharmacies to provide home delivery of medications for housebound patients living more than one mile away from the surgery.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were available in two sessions daily. Pre booked extended hours appointments were offered on a Monday, Wednesday and Thursday

evening until 8.00pm and Saturday mornings between 9.00am and 11.00am. In addition to pre-bookable routine appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 89% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 79%.
- 79% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

A GP would telephone the patient or carer in advance to gather information to allow for an informed decision to be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. Urgent home visits were referred to a GP home visiting service for assessment and a visit within two hours. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

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

We looked at eight complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way and with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a patient complained that the counselling service they were referred to was a paid for service when they were told it was free. The practice contacted the counselling service which confirmed there had been a mistake and the

service was indeed free of charge for service users. The patient received an apology and full explanation from the practice and counselling services were rebooked. The practice had also received a number of complaints from patients who had difficulty finding parking space for their appointment. The practice had engaged with the building management company and neighbouring businesses to explore opportunities for extending the carpark to increase availability.

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 vision and values.
- The practice vision and values had been developed by staff with engagement from the practice patient participation group (PPG).
- The practice had a 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 in place and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- An understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of 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, however these were not always effective with regards to infection prevention and control audit actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, 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 in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology.
- The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

There was a clear leadership structure in place and staff felt supported by management.

- Staff told us the practice held regular clinical, non-clinical and whole practice 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. We noted whole practice team away days were held annually and additional away days were held annually for partners.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG had requested that the practice installed a blood pressure

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

monitor in the reception area. Blood pressure measurements was a commonly asked of patients in consultations and the PPG and practice believed inviting patients to take their own blood pressure before the consultation would save time. The blood pressure monitor also gave patients an opportunity to monitor their blood pressure between appointments.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff away days and generally 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.

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment</p> <p>How the regulation was not being met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The procedures for managing blank prescriptions did not keep them safe and secure.• The procedures for managing emergency medicines did not keep them safe and secure.• The provider did not provide infection prevention and control training for all staff in order to assess the risk of, prevent, detect and control the spread of, infections, including those that are health care associated.• The provider did not ensure patient specific directions for influenza vaccines included the dose, route and frequency to be administered to a named patient and a record that the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis. <p>This was in breach of regulation 12(1) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.</p>