

City Health Care Partnership CIC - Newington Health Centre

Quality Report

Plane Street
Hull
Humberside
HU3 6BX
Tel: 01482 336111
Website: www.chcpcic.org

Date of inspection visit: 24 November 2015
Date of publication: 11/02/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to City Health Care Partnership CIC - Newington Health Centre	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Newington Health Centre on 24 November 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

This practice initially registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in June 2015 and as a result of this did not take part in the national GP patient survey. Some data included in the report is based on the findings of the practice following monitoring of patient experiences and may not include comparisons with local and national data.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that 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.

In addition the provider should:

- Review the systems in place to ensure the confidentiality of patient information in the waiting area.
- Patient suggestions and comments should be monitored on a regular basis.

Summary of findings

- Ensure policies are readily available at all times to staff that need them.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)
Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, people received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data showed patient outcomes were below average for the locality.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- However, data showed that patients rated the practice as lower than others for some aspects of care. For example:
 - 68% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 91%.
 - 69% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 82% and national average of 85%.
 - 60% said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 86%.

Good



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 also saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- It 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. The practice worked with the CCG and the community professionals to identify their patients who were at high risk of attending accident and emergency or having an unplanned admission to hospital.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed that 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.

- It 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 this.
- 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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was not currently active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- It 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 (LTCs).

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Nationally reported data for 2014/2015 showed that outcomes for patients with long term conditions were generally good. However, performance for diabetes related indicators was 40.7%, this was below the local CCG 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 that their health and medicines needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk. For example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances.
- Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.

Good



Summary of findings

- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 95.0%, which was 3.6% below the local CCG average and 2.6% below the national average.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

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.
- It offered longer appointments for people with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- It had told vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

Good



Summary of findings

- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed 32.0% of people diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months. This was significantly lower than other practices.
- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months was 37.1%. This was significantly lower than other practices.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- It 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 people with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

Results from the practice survey we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. The practice contracted a third party to complete the survey between June and July 2015 and 150 surveys were completed over this period. The results were below local CCG and national averages, for example:

- 80% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with a CCG average of 82% and a national average of 85%.
- 83% said the last appointment they got was convenient compared with a CCG average of 93% and a national average of 91%.
- 65% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 82% and national average of 86%.
- 61% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 79% and national average of 81%.

Further questions from the practice survey included the key question 'How good was the health professional that you saw at each of the following', The results were as follows:

- 77% said the practice was good at ensuring conversation were kept private.
- 73% said the practice was good at respecting their needs.

- 72% said the practice was good at taking patient problems seriously.
- 72% said the practice was good at taking problems seriously.
- 73% said the practice was good at asking about symptoms.
- 64% said the practice was good at taking personal circumstances into consideration.

Although the results of the survey showed significant lower results to local and national data, the practice demonstrated progress in increasing their performance data. Patients we spoke to told us that the practice was making a marked and progressive difference to patient care. The practice manager assured us that patient recalls are currently being undertaken in all disease areas on an on-going basis. Furthermore the practice were also undertaking a programme of data cleansing to ensure all patients were re-validated within the system for accuracy and health monitoring purposes.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We spoke with 10 patients during the inspection. All 10 patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. Patients described the service as excellent and very good and said the staff were friendly, caring and listened to them.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Review the systems in place to ensure the confidentiality of patient information in the waiting area.
- Patient suggestions and comments should be monitored on a regular basis.
- Ensure policies are readily available at all times to staff that need them.

City Health Care Partnership CIC - Newington Health Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist advisor, a practice manager specialist advisor and an Expert by Experience.

Background to City Health Care Partnership CIC - Newington Health Centre

Newington Health Centre is situated in the west of Hull City and provides services under an Alternative Provider Medical Services (APMS) contract with NHS England, Hull Area Team to the practice population of 7,939, covering patients of all ages.

The practice has three GP locums, two male and one female. There is one nurse practitioner and one health care assistant. There is a practice manager, a reception manager and a team of secretarial, administration and reception staff.

The practice is open between 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are from 8am to 6.30pm daily. The

practice, along with all other practices in the Hull CCG area have a contractual agreement for NHS 111 service to provide Out of Hours (OOHs) services from 6.30pm. This has been agreed with the NHS England area team.

The proportion of the practice population in the 65 years and over age group is lower than the England average. The practice population in the under 18 age group is higher than the England average. The practice scored one on the deprivation measurement scale, which is the first lowest deprived. People living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. The overall practice deprivation score is higher than the England average, the practice is 55.7 and the England average is 26.6.

The practice has opted out of providing out of hours services (OOHs) for their patients. When the practice is closed patients use the 111 service to contact the OOHs provider. Information for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is available in the waiting area, in the practice information leaflet and on the practice website.

The practice has a branch surgery at Calvert Lane Hull. However, we did not inspect this service as part of our visit.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as

Detailed findings

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 24 November 2015. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including two GPs, one practice nurse and one health care assistant. We also spoke with the practice manager. We also spoke with three receptionists, one administrator, head of services and a clinical director.
- Spoke with 10 patients who used the service and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Observed how staff spoke to, and interacted with patients when they were in the practice and on the telephone.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was 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 also a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, concerns over continuity of care in a patient with long term treatment. The practice implemented updated procedures around appointment templates to ensure sufficient time for patients.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, people received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard adults and children from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies and procedures were not accessible to all staff. However, some policies could not be accessed on the practice electronic system at the time of our inspection. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GP attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and staff and GPs told us they had not received further training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level 3.
- Information telling patients that they could ask for a chaperone was visible in the reception area. Nursing staff acted as chaperones and understood their responsibilities, including where to stand to be able to

observe the examination. Nursing staff had received a disclosure and barring check (DBS). (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 nurse practitioner was the infection prevention and control (IPC) lead who liaised with the local IPC teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received training. Infection control monitoring was undertaken throughout the year and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). 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. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use.
- 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.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patients and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office. The practice had a fire risk assessment and a fire warden in place. Staff we spoke with were able to describe the action they would take in the event of a fire. 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 also had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health, infection control and legionella.

Are services safe?

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty. Staff we spoke with told us they provided cover for sickness and holidays and further locums were engaged when required.

Arrangements to deal with 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 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. There was also a first aid kit and accident book available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.
- The practice had a 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 relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected from the Quality 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). Results from 2014/2015 showed the practice achieved 65.3% of the total number of points available, with 6.9% exception reporting. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 40.7% which was 48.3% below the local CCG average and 48.5% below the national average.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 42.3% which was 49.9% below the CCG average and 50.5% below the national average.
- The percentage of patients with COPD who had had a review, undertaken by a healthcare professional, including an assessment of breathlessness in the preceding 12 months was 54.3%. This was 42.2% below the local CCG average and 41.7% below the national average.
- The percentage of patients with asthma who had had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that included an assessment of asthma control was 53.3%. This was 43.4% below the local CCG average and 44.1% below the national average.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been two clinical audits completed in the last few months and these were completed audits where the improvements were shared with the central governance team and monitored.
- The practice participated in applicable local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result with regard to cervical smears and dementia care.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed members of staff and contracted locums that covered such topics as safeguarding, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme.
- 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 these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for the revalidation of doctors. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when people were referred to other services.

Staff worked together, and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

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, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent had not been monitored through records audits to ensure it met the practices responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition, those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol and substance misuse cessation and those with mental health problems. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- A dietician was available by appointment and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice had a comprehensive screening programme. QOF data from 2014/2015 showed the practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 95%, which was 3.6% below the local CCG average and 2.6% below the national average. There was also a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Data from 2014/2015 showed childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were relatively high and were comparable to the CCG and national averages for children aged 12 months, two and five years.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. QOF data from 2014/2015 showed the percentage of patients aged 45 or over who had a record of blood pressure testing in the preceding five years was 100%. This was above the local CCG and the national average. Appropriate follow-ups on 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 throughout the inspection that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and they were treated 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 and that 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.

We spoke with 10 patients and they told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. However, we saw that a computer screen was placed in such a position that information could potentially be at risk of being observed by other patients. We discussed this with the practice manager and they assured us that they would rectify this risk. Staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required. Patients also said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

Results from the practice survey showed patients were satisfied with how they were treated and that this was with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was below the CCG and national average for consultations with health professionals. For example:

- 68% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 91%.
- 69% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 82% and national average of 85%.
- 60% said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 86%.

Although the results of the survey showed significant lower results to local and national data, the practice demonstrated progress in increasing their performance data. Patients we spoke to told us that the practice was making a marked and progressive difference to patient care. The practice manager assured us that patient recalls are currently being undertaken in all disease areas on an on-going basis. Furthermore the practice were also undertaking a programme of data cleansing to ensure all patients were re-validated within the system for accuracy and health monitoring purposes.

Further questions from the practice survey showed the key question 'How good was the health professional that you saw at each of the following'. Results were as follows;

- 77% said the practice was good at ensuring conversation were kept private.
- 73% said the practice was good at respecting their needs.
- 72% said the practice was good at taking patient problems seriously.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients we spoke with told us that health issues were discussed with them and 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 on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

Results from the practice survey we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. The results were below local CCG and national averages, for example:

- 65% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 82% and national average of 86%.
- 61% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 79% and national average of 81%.

Are services caring?

Further questions from the practice survey showed the key question 'How good was the health professional that you saw at each of the following' resulted in:

- 72% said the practice was good at taking problems seriously.
- 73% said the practice was good at asking about symptoms.
- 64% said the practice was good at taking personal circumstances into consideration.

Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language and internet translation services was available on the practice website. There was no notice in the reception area informing patients the translation service was available.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

There was information available in the waiting room for patients about how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice had a carer's register in place. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

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

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 CCG to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice worked with the CCG and community professionals to identify their patients who were at high risk of attending accident and emergency or having an unplanned admission to hospital.

Services were planned and delivered to take into account the needs of different patient groups and to help provide flexibility, choice and continuity of care. For example;

- The practice offered specific alcohol and smoking cessation counselling for patients.
- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- Appointments could be made on line, via the telephone and in person.
- Telephone consultations were available for working patients who could not attend during surgery hours or for those whose problem could be dealt with on the phone.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Urgent access appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8am to 6.30pm daily. The practice, along with all other practices in the Hull CCG area have a contractual agreement for NHS 111 service to provide OOHs services from 6.30pm. This has been agreed with the NHS England area team.

Questions from the practice survey showed the performance of key questions; for example:

- 94% said the practice was good at finding the relevant practice information.
- 83% said the practice was good at giving patients the appointment time they wanted.
- 85% said the practice had not changed a patient's appointment time or cancelled in the last 12 months.
- 44% said they were seen within 15 minutes of their appointment time.
- 82% said they were satisfied that they were seen as soon as necessary.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system in place for handling complaints, concerns, comments and compliments.

- 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.
- Information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. Information was on the practice website, in the patient information and complaints leaflets.

The practice had received three formal complaints and nine concerns in the last 12 months and these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, concerns were recorded about patients unhappy about the difficulty getting through to the practice by telephone and staffing to call handling was increased.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a 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. Although, some policies could not be accessed on the practice electronic system at the time of our inspection.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which was used to monitor quality and to make improvements
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice did not have an established system in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents:

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

There was a 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 in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- 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.

- It had gathered feedback from patients through surveys and patient feedback forms received. There was a newly formed PPG which had recently being re-introduced form six participating patient members and four virtual members. A new meeting was planned for January 2016 to discuss the terms and reference of the group and appoint a chair for the group.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and general discussions. Staff

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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.

There was a strong 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.

Continuous improvement