

Tooting South Medical Centre

Quality Report

22 Otterburn Street
Tooting
London
SW17 9HQ

Tel: 020 8682 0521





Website: www.tootingsouthmedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 5 April 2016

Date of publication: 22/07/2016

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

Ratings

| | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|---|
| Overall rating for this service | | Good |  |
| Are services safe? | | Good |  |
| Are services effective? | | Good |  |
| Are services caring? | | Requires improvement |  |
| 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 Tooting South Medical 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 Tooting South Medical Centre on 5 April 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with 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 should make improvement are:

- The practice should consider reviewing recall processes for patients with long term conditions and poor mental health where management criteria are lower than national averages.

Summary of findings

- The practice should consider reviewing action points in audits to ensure that they are more specific and lead to improved patient outcomes.
- In view of patient feedback the practice should consider reviewing how patients are involved in their care and responding to patient feedback in the national GP patient survey.
- The practice should consider retaining a log of complaints made in person rather as well as those received in writing.

Professor Steve Field CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Good



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events. We saw that significant events were regularly discussed and reviewed.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were similar to the national average in most areas, and slightly lower in some.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated some quality improvement, although action plans following the first audit of cycles were at times not specific enough.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as requires improvement for providing caring services.

Requires improvement



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice in line with national averages in most aspects of care. In some areas the practice was rated by patients as below average. The practice had not addressed these areas.

Summary of findings

- 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.

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.
- 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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.

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 similar to the national average. Total QOF achievement for diabetic indicators was 81%. The percentage of patients with diabetes on the register who had well controlled diabetes (IFCCHbA1c of 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months) was 73%, similar to the national average of 77%. Some diabetes indicators were slightly lower than national averages. For example, the percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 77%, slightly lower than the national average of 88%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 82%.
- < >ppointments 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- 59% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is lower than the national average.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. Total QOF achievement for mental health related indicators was 79%. The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 78%, slightly lower than the national average of 88%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results for 2014/5 showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages in some areas, but beneath those levels in others. 412 survey forms were distributed and 93 were returned. This represented less than one per cent of the practice's patient list.

- 64% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 81% 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%.
- 77% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%).

- 66% 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 16 comment cards most of which positive about the standard of care received. In particular they reported that staff were friendly, helpful and courteous. The three patients that were not universally positive also reported that staff were helpful, but reported that waits at the practice could be lengthy.

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

Tooting South Medical 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, a second CQC inspector, a practice nurse specialist adviser, a practice manager specialist adviser and an Expert by Experience.

Background to Tooting South Medical Centre

Tooting Medical Centre is based in the London Borough of Wandsworth. The practice is run by six partners, five of whom are doctors at the practice, with the practice manager being the managing partner. Three of the clinical partners are female and two male. The practice is in a purpose built premises which the practice moved to in 2007 having previously been based in a different building. The address of the practice is 22 Otterburn Street, Tooting, London, SW17 9HQ.

The practice is in an area with a mixed demographic. It is in the sixth most deprived decile of practices in the UK. The practice population includes 25.6% patients who are either from Asia or Asian background, 16.4% black and 5.4% mixed race. Approximately 50% of the patients at the practice are white English or white other. The practice has a large number of patients who either do not speak English or for whom it is not their first language. The practice has a higher than average population of patients between the ages of 20 and 39, and the number of patients aged between zero and four is significantly higher than the national average. By contrast, the number of patients aged over 60 is less than half of the national average.

The practice has a list size of approximately 10,500. Further to the partner GPs, there is one salaried GP (female) and two sessional locums. In total there are 45 GP sessions per week. There are also three practice nurses, two healthcare assistants, the practice manager (who is managing partner), a deputy practice manager, three administrators, and seven receptionists.

The practice is contracted to provide Personal Medical Services (PMS) and is registered with the CQC for the following regulated activities: treatment of disease, disorder or injury, maternity and midwifery services, surgical procedures, and diagnostic and screening procedures at one location.

The practice is open between 8:00am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. The practice also had extended hours Monday to Friday from 6:30pm until 8:00pm and on Friday morning from 7:30am until 8:00am. Appointments with a GP, nurse or healthcare assistant are all available outside of normal opening hours. Scheduled appointments are available throughout the day, and a duty doctor is on call daily to manage emergencies and home visits.

The practice had not previously been inspected by the 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 requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 5 April 2015. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (including GP partners, practice nurses, one healthcare assistant, the practice manager, deputy practice manager, an administrator, the senior receptionist and receptionists) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or 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).
- The practice held quarterly meetings where serious events were discussed.
- 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, following an incident where a patient had become distressed and would not leave the doctors room when medicine had not been provided, we saw that the practice had put a new system in place. We saw that this incident had been reflected on with all staff at the quarterly significant event review.

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 were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3, nurses to level 2 and administrative staff to level 1. Quarterly meetings with the health visitors where safeguarding was discussed were attended by doctors, nurses, managers and administrative staff.

- 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 and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of

Are services safe?

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 prescription or direction from a prescriber. (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 five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. The practice told us that at present the only administrative staff who were subject to a DBS check were those that chaperoned. However, they told us that this was being extended to all staff.

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. The practice manager reported that he had worked with other practices in the area to determine adequate staffing levels and he showed us that these levels were formally audited every six months.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All but one of the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely. We noted that adrenaline had expired by four days. We were told that this was because the monthly review of drugs had been postponed by a week while preparing for the CQC inspection visit. The practice immediately ordered further stock.
- 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 (2014/5) were 89% of the total number of points available. This is slightly below the national average of 94%, although exception reporting at the practice was relatively low at 4%. (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 a significant outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from QOF and other performance data showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. Total QOF achievement for diabetic indicators was 81%. The percentage of patients with diabetes on the register who had well controlled diabetes (IFCCHbA1c of 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months) was 73%, similar to the national average of 77%. Some diabetes indicators were slightly lower than national averages. For example, the percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 77%, slightly lower than the national average of 88%.
- Performance for hypertension related indicators was similar to the national average. The total QOF achievement for these indicators was 82%. The percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months was 150/90mmHg or less was 76%, slightly lower than the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. Total QOF achievement for mental health related indicators was 79%. The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 78%, slightly lower than the national average of 88%.

The practice reported that results were lower than they would like in part because the practice had a high level of annual turnover (7%), and in part because many of the practice population travelled to home countries for a significant part of the year.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- We saw three audits that had been completed in the past year. These had completed two cycles where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation and peer review.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, we saw a recent audit for the management of patients with iron deficiency. Following the first audit cycle it showed that the practice was not following its own policies in relation to testing and recall. The second audit showed an improvement in recall as well as following the testing protocol. There were further learning points identified and a third audit cycle was planned.
- The practice also provided an audit of the management of hypothyroidism. There was a list of actions, specifically an improvement in blood testing as only three of the thirty patients had tests in line with NICE guidance. The objectives following the audit lacked

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

specificity. The second cycle showed marginal improvement in that six of the patients now had blood tests in line with guidance, but this is not a substantial improvement in practice.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff.
- 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. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support. For example, patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet or smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 82% 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

women who were referred as a result of abnormal results. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 85% to 95% and five year olds from 85% to 92%.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain 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 16 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards made positive comments about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with six patients. They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 86% 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%.
- 80% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 87%.
- 94% 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%.
- 73% 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%.

- 78% 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 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 below local and national averages. For example:

- 71% 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%.
- 70% 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%.
- 72% 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 manager said that no action had been taken in addressing these results, but that he had planned to do so.

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.

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 177 patients as carers (1.6% of the practice list). The practice offered carers

longer appointments and health checks. They were also provided with details of support groups. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their GP contacted them to offer a patient consultation at a flexible time and to give 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 had determined that diabetes rates were high within the practice and had responded by training one of the nurses to be a diabetes specialist, and they had ensured that a specialist diabetes nurse from a local community team attended the practice once per month.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' every week day evening until 8.00pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability, carers and those with multiple long term conditions.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice was based over several floors, and a patient lift was in place to enable wheelchair users and patients with restricted mobility access.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8:00am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were available throughout the day. Extended hours appointments were offered daily from 6:30pm until 8:00pm and on Fridays from 7:30am until 8:00am. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was comparable to local and national averages, although patients felt telephone access could be improved:

- 81% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 64% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%).

The practice manager showed us that the appointment system had been changed to allow for longer consultations and more telephone consultations in light of feedback relating to appointment availability.

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.

The practice achieved this with a duty doctor who managed home visit requests and triaged whether or not there was a need for a home visit. This was supported by policies and protocols.

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 on the website, in the reception area and in the patient leaflet.

We looked at six complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, with apologies from the practice where required. 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. However,

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

we noted in one case that a response from the member of staff who was the subject of the complaint was included in the response to the patient. This was not appropriate given the nature of the complaint.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust 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.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality although we notes that improvements made following audits were limited.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating 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 did not keep written records of verbal interactions along with written correspondence.

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

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