

Pond Tail Surgery

Quality Report

Pond Tail Surgery

The Green

Godstone

RH9 8DY

Tel: **01883 742279**

Website: www.pondtailsurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 3 August 2016

Date of publication: 13/10/2016

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

Requires improvement



Are services safe?

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Requires improvement



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	11
Areas for improvement	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Pond Tail Surgery	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14
Action we have told the provider to take	23

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Pond Tail Surgery on 3 August 2016. Overall the practice is rated as requires improvement.

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

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- 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 an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were not always 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.
- 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.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management.
- The practice did not have formal systems to proactively seek feedback from staff and patients and did not have an active patient representative group.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.
- Risks to patients were generally assessed but not always well managed. For example the practice had not responded to the fire risk assessment and a legionella risk assessment had not been undertaken.

Summary of findings

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- The provider must ensure health and safety systems are robust and the fire risk assessment action plan is fully implemented.
- The provider must ensure that a system is put in place to monitor hand written and computer printed prescription pads and forms.
- The provider must ensure they establish systems to obtain the views of patients who use their services and other stakeholders and use this information to develop their services.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- The provider should review their significant event records and complaints to ensure the dissemination of information to all staff is captured.
- The provider should review meeting arrangements to ensure staff have appropriate opportunities to share information and good practice.
- The provider should review the current actions regarding legionella testing to ensure this is supported by a risk assessment.
- The provider should review the Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) exception reporting levels for dementia.
- The provider should review the low QOF outcome result for face to face care plan review meetings for patients with dementia.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

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

Requires improvement



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared with GP colleagues to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. The practice did not demonstrate that this information was shared with the wider team.
- 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 generally assessed but not always well managed. For example the practice had not implemented an action plan to respond fully to the fire risk assessment and a legionella risk assessment had not been undertaken.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



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

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.

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 not always shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as requires improvement 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 a governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. However the arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk were not robust.
- 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.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

- The practice had limited arrangements to obtain feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. A patient reference or participation group was not 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 provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 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.
- The practice had regular meetings with the Proactive care team to help avoid admissions. The practice provided an enhanced service for unplanned admissions – a register of the most vulnerable patients - with care plans and reviews following any unplanned hospital admissions.
- Partners had provided their personal contact details for patients receiving palliative care to ensure they have access to a practice GP at weekends and evenings.

Requires improvement



People with long term conditions

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 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 better than the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 86% compared to the CCG average of 79% and national average of 78%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

- 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.

Families, children and young people

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 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 81%, the national average was 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.

Requires improvement



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 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.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

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

Requires improvement



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 70% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was significantly lower than the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the CCG and national average. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 97% compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 90%.
- 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.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

- 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.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above the local and national averages. 274 survey forms were distributed and 112 were returned. This represented 1.5% of the practice's patient list.

- 77% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 82% 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%.
- 88% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%).

- 89% 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 eight comment cards, all contained positive comments about the standard of care received. Patients commented on a caring, professional and helpful practice team. Patients felt listened to and treated with kindness.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

- The provider must ensure health and safety systems are robust and the fire risk assessment action plan is fully implemented.
- The provider must ensure that a system is put in place to monitor hand written and computer printed prescription pads and forms.
- The provider must ensure they establish systems to obtain the views of patients who use their services and other stakeholders and use this in information to develop their services.

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- The provider should review their significant event records and complaints to ensure the dissemination of information to all staff is captured.

- The provider should review meeting to ensure staff have appropriate opportunities to share information and good practice.
- The provider should review the current actions regarding legionella testing to ensure this is supported by a risk assessment.
- The provider should review the Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) exception reporting levels for dementia.
- The provider should review the low QOF outcome result for face to face care plan review meetings for patients with dementia.

Pond Tail Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Pond Tail Surgery

Pond Tail Surgery is a practice offering general medical services to the population of Godstone and surrounding areas in Surrey. There are approximately 7269 registered patients.

The practice population has a slightly higher number of patients above 40 years of age than the national and local CCG average. The practice population also shows a lower number of patients between the age of 15 and 39 years than the national and local CCG average. There are a higher number of patients with a longstanding health condition than the CCG average however they are in line with the national average of 54%. The percentage of registered patients suffering deprivation (affecting both adults and children) is 16.3% higher than the CCG average of 11.2% but lower than the average for England of 21.8%.

Pond Tail Surgery is run by three partner GPs (One male and two female). The practice is also supported by one male salaried GP; three practice nurses, one healthcare assistant, a team of administrative and reception staff, and a practice manager.

The practice runs a number of services for its patients including asthma clinics, diabetes clinics, coronary heart disease clinics, minor surgery, child immunisation clinics, new patient checks and travel vaccines and advice.

Services are provided from one location:

Pond Tail Surgery

The Green

Godstone

RH9 8DY

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours appointments were offered hours alternate Mondays until 8pm, alternate Saturdays between 9am and 10.30am and from 7.30am Tuesday to Friday.

During the times when the practice is closed arrangements are in place for patients to access care from Care UK which is an Out of Hours provider.

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 3 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nurses, the practice manager and administration staff 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 system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out an analysis of the significant events. Whilst the practice records documented outcomes and actions from incidents and significant events these did not show how information was shared with the practice team.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared at GP meetings but not with the practice team. We saw that action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, following an incident when a child received a vaccine too soon an investigation took place. The patient's family received a full explanation and an apology. Training and support was provided by the practice for the staff involved.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had 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 three. Nurses were trained to level two.

- Notices advised patients that chaperones were available if required. We found that staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and they 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. Quarterly infection control audits were undertaken. The latest infection control audit took place on 20 April 2016. We spoke with the infection control lead who demonstrated a clear understanding of this role.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal) did not always keep patients safe. Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions however this did not include 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 however there were no systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.

Are services safe?

- The practice did not hold stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse).
- We reviewed six personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment including satisfactory evidence of conduct in previous employment. For example, proof of identification, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service were in place.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed but not always well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patients and staff safety. However the responses to audits and risk assessments were inconsistent. For example the practice had an up to date fire risk assessment carried out in September 2015, the report had 47 recommendations and actions. No information was available to demonstrate that this had been discussed and responded to. The practice management were not able to tell us what action had been taken as the person who dealt with this was unavailable at the time of the inspection. All electrical equipment was last checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use in 2013. The practice had not carried out any checks or a visual inspection of equipment since. Following the inspection the practice provided a copy of their response to some of the action points. 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. The practice had not undertaken a legionella risk assessment. (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings). However they had evidence of legionella testing undertaken by an external contractor in 2015.

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage on the day of inspection.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 98.6% of the total number of points available.

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

Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) was 140/80 mmHg or less was 86% compared to the CCG average of 79% and national average of 78%.

Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the CCG and better than the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective

disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 90% compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 88%.

We found that a number of QOF outcomes had expected or lower levels of exception reporting (The QOF includes the concept of 'exception reporting' to ensure that practices are not penalised where, for example, patients do not

attend for review, or where a medication cannot be prescribed due to a contraindication or side-effect.). However some exception levels were higher than expected and the practice was unable to explain the reasons for these high exception rates in diabetes and dementia outcomes. The practice sent further information following the inspection that explained the high level of exception reporting for diabetes. However no data was provided for the patients excepted from the dementia outcomes.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been three clinical audits completed in the last two years, these were audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, the practice had undertaken an audit of patients prescribed high doses of corticosteroid inhalers for the treatment of asthma and this resulted in an action plan to invite all patients not seen in the last 12 months for a review and all patients to have a management plan put in place.

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. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions. We spoke with a member of staff who had been supported to attend an extended training course to enhance wound management skills.
- 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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 did not always seek patients' consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

- We saw that patients' verbal consent was recorded in their care records. Consent for minor surgery was not routinely documented. The practice had a pro-forma for consent however the staff told us that this was not used. The practice could not demonstrate that the risks of undertaking procedures were discussed with the patient.

- 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 not monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81%, the national average was 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. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 83% to 90% compared to the national averages of 71% to 79% and five year olds from 75% to 88% compared to the national averages of 69% to 88%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 eight patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received contained 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. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

We spoke with four patients during our inspection. They told us that they were treated with respect, supported to make decisions themselves and the service they received was very good. Patients told us staff were polite and kind and compassionate.

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

- 83% 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 88% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% 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%.
- 84% 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%.

- 94% 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%.
- 88% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 83% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 86%.
- 78% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 82%.
- 84% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 85%.

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

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

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 192 patients as carers (3% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support

available to them. The practice meets with a carer support officer from the local authority on a regular basis to ensure their information is up to date. The practice has a care coordinator who monitors and updates carer information.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.

- The practice offered extended hours alternate Mondays until 8pm, and alternate Saturdays between 9am and 10.30am and from 7.30am Tuesday to Friday for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours appointments were offered hours alternate Mondays until 8pm, and alternate Saturdays between 9am and 10.30am and from 7.30am Tuesday to Friday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 82% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 78%.

- 77% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, openness and transparency with dealing with the complaint. We noted that actions were taken by the practice following the outcome of complaints investigations. For example when a patient complained regarding appointments access and reception staff being rude the practice investigated, reviewed their approach and provided support to staff to reduce the risk of a reoccurrence. The actions to ensure all staff learnt from complaints was difficult to access as the dissemination of information was not always documented apart from the discussion at the GP partners meeting.

Are services well-led?

Requires improvement 

(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 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 a 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 and to make improvements.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. However there were areas identified at this inspection that required improving. For example, security and monitoring of prescription pads and health and safety systems.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with

patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment::

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

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

- Staff told us the practice did not hold regular team meetings. We noted that the nurse team did not have a formal minuted meeting structure to support their practice.
- 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

- We were told that the practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients, the public and staff. The practice did not have any formal systems to obtain patients' feedback and had not engaged patients in the delivery of the service.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions at staff meetings. 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

The practice considered 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.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

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

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment</p> <p>The provider had not ensured health and safety risk assessments had been responded to and an action plan had been implemented.</p> <p>The provider had not ensured hand written prescription pads and computer generated prescription forms were monitored.</p> <p>This was in breach of regulation 12 (1) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014</p>
Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 17 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Good governance</p> <p>The provider had not ensured that systems were in place to monitor the quality of services provided. This included formal systems to obtain feedback from patients who use the service and other stakeholders.</p> <p>This was in breach of regulation 17 (1) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014</p>