

Dr Mokashi

Inspection report

Clayton Health Centre 89 North Road, Clayton Manchester **Greater Manchester** M11 4EJ Tel: 0161 223 8388 www.drshanifandbannuru.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 18 September 2018 Date of publication: 17/10/2018

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 location	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Overall summary

This practice is rated as Good overall. (Previous rating October 2016 – Good)

The key questions at this inspection are rated as:

Are services safe? - Good

Are services effective? - Good

Are services caring? - Good

Are services responsive? - Good

Are services well-led? - Good

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Mokashi.

At this inspection we found:

- The practice had clear systems to manage risk so that safety incidents were less likely to happen. When incidents did happen, the practice learned from them and improved their processes.
- The practice had systems in place to review and assess significant events and complaints, with annual reviews taking place.
- Patient Group Directions (PGDs), which allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation, had not been updated to reflect changes in staff. However, this was resolved on the day of the inspection.
- The practice routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care it provided. It ensured that care and treatment was delivered according to evidence- based guidelines.

- Clinical audits were effective and maintained by clinicians to drive patient education and to follow national guidance.
- Staff involved and treated patients with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.
- Patients found the appointment system easy to use and reported that they were able to access care when they needed it.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels of the organisation.
- The practice had an established and well attended Patient Participation Group (PPG).
- Patients found the appointment system easy to use and most reported that they were able to access care when they needed it.

The areas where the provider **should** make improvements are:

- Improve the electronic audit trail for responding to missed appointments of vulnerable children and adults.
- Develop an uncollected repeat prescription process.
- Formalise training requirements for GPs in immunisations and vaccinations.

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

Please refer to the detailed report and the evidence tables for further information.

Population group ratings

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

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by a Care Quality Commission (CQC) lead inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser, a GP specialist adviser who was shadowing the inspection process and a practice manager adviser.

Background to Dr Mokashi

Dr Mokashi is the registered provider and provides primary care services to its registered list of 6,500 patients. The surgery is located on the ground floor of Clayton Health Centre which is managed by NHS Properties Ltd and also hosts two other GP practices.

The practice is situated in an area at number one on the deprivation scale (the scale categorises between one and ten, lower the number, the higher the deprivation), which supports a high turnaround of patients who are seeking asylum. The practice sees higher than average health problems in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD- name for a collection of lung diseases), drug and alcohol addiction and a range of mental health issues.

The General Medical Services (GMS) contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities.

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

Regulated activities are delivered to the patient population from the following address:

Clayton Health Centre

89 North Road

Clayton

Manchester

M11 4EJ

www.drshanifandbannuru.co.uk



Are services safe?

We rated the practice as good for providing safe services.

Safety systems and processes

The practice had clear systems to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.

- The practice had appropriate systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. All staff received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns. Learning from safeguarding incidents were available to staff. For example, we were presented with several scenarios where suspected safeguarding issues had been identified by staff and reported, followed up and referred when necessary to the appropriate authorities.
- We identified that some of the children at risk individual records did not have a pop up alert flag in their clinical records. We received confirmation the day after the inspection, all patients with no pop up alert in place had been identified and actioned.
- The safeguarding lead was aware of all children in need and who had DNA (did not attend) a hospital appointment and these were followed up. However, there was no electronic audit trail.
- Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for their role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable.)
- Staff took steps, including working with other agencies, to protect patients from abuse, neglect, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The practice carried out appropriate staff checks at the time of recruitment and on an ongoing basis.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control.
- The practice had arrangements to ensure that facilities and equipment were safe and in good working order.
- Arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.

Risks to patients

There were adequate systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs, including planning for holidays, sickness, busy periods and epidemics.
- There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.
- The practice was equipped to deal with medical emergencies and staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies on the premises and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention. Clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections including sepsis.
- When there were changes to services or staff the practice assessed and monitored the impact on safety.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

- Patient Group Directions (PGD which allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation) had not been signed to reflect the new nurse. This was actioned immediately by the practice during the inspection. The inspection team were shown evidence the PGDs were signed by all clinicians before the inspection had finished.
- The care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to staff
- The practice had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- Clinicians made timely referrals in line with protocols.

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

The practice had some reliable systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

 The practice had been previously advised by the Royal Collage of General Practitioners (RCGP) to place all high-risk medicines on the computer system as an acute item not repeat items. Meaning no record was formed within the repeat screen. After the inspection the practice informed us they had identified a way to code in repeat screen the medicine, to create a record and highlighting any safety issues and interactions.



Are services safe?

- We found the process for checking uncollected medicines was taking place every six months with no clear checking process developed.
- The systems for managing and storing medicines, including vaccines, emergency medicines and equipment, minimised risks.
- Staff prescribed and administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with current national guidance. The practice had reviewed its antibiotic prescribing and taken action to support good antimicrobial stewardship in line with local and national guidance.
- Patients' health was monitored in relation to the use of medicines and followed up on appropriately. Patients were involved in regular reviews of their medicines. However, there was no process in place for documenting regular hospital issued only medicines within the system.

Track record on safety

The practice had a good track record on safety.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety, this was provided by NHS Property Service LTD.
- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.
- The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a range of sources.

Lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so. However, the inspection team felt the threshold for reporting significant events could be reduced.
- There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The practice learned and shared lessons, identified themes and took action to improve safety in the practice. The significant event form was not updated following discussion at clinical meetings.
- The practice acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. For example, we reviewed a two-cycle audit on patients receiving a medicine from an alert which required a clinical review and action. The audit showed patients identified, these patients were invited into the practice to discuss the alert and to sign a consent form was added to the patients record. We did note the searches used in these alerts were not being saved.



Are services effective?

We rated the practice and all of the population groups as good for providing effective services overall.

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

The practice had systems to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence-based practice. We saw that clinicians assessed needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance supported by clear clinical pathways and protocols.

- Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Staff advised patients what to do if their condition got worse and where to seek further help and support.

Older people:

- Older patients who are frail or may be vulnerable received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs. The practice used an appropriate tool to identify patients aged 65 and over who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified as being frail had a clinical review including a review of medication.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital. It ensured that their care plans and prescriptions were updated to reflect any extra or changed needs.
- Staff had appropriate knowledge of treating older people including their psychological, mental and communication needs.
- GPs undertook home visits to older people who could not safely or easily attend the practice.

People with long-term conditions:

- Patients with long-term conditions had a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For patients with the most complex needs, the GP worked with other health and care professionals to deliver a coordinated package of
- Staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long term conditions had received specific training.
- GPs followed up patients who had received treatment in hospital or through out of hours services for an acute exacerbation of asthma.

 Adults with newly diagnosed cardiovascular disease were offered statins for secondary prevention. People with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring and patients with atrial fibrillation were assessed for stroke risk and treated as appropriate.

Families, children and young people:

- Childhood immunisation uptake rates were in line with the target percentage of 90% or above.
- The practice had arrangements for following up failed attendance of children's appointments following an appointment in secondary care or for immunisation.
- 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's uptake for cervical screening was in line with the CCG and national average.
- The practices' uptake for breast cancer screening was in line the national average.
- Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks including NHS checks for patients aged 40-74. There was appropriate follow-up on the outcome of health assessments and checks where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way
 which took into account the needs of those whose
 circumstances may make them vulnerable. Patients
 provided the inspection team with examples of how the
 GPs went above and beyond in the care and after
 support to family members.
- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia):

 The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental



Are services effective?

illness, and personality disorder by providing access to health checks, interventions for physical activity, obesity, diabetes, heart disease, cancer and access to 'stop smoking' services.

- When patients were assessed to be at risk of suicide or self-harm the practice had arrangements in place to help them to remain safe.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment to detect possible signs of dementia.
 When dementia was suspected there was an appropriate referral for diagnosis.
- The practice offered annual health checks to patients with a learning disability.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice had a comprehensive programme of quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.

- The unverified QOF data for 2017/18 showed an improvement in all overall scores and the clinical domains. We were told the previous practice nurse had retired and the practice were finding recruiting a full-time nurse difficult. These changes did have a direct impact on the 2016/17 QOF data in some of the clinical domains. However, the unverified data we collected during the inspection submitted for 2017/18, showed an improvement in areas of asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).
- The practice worked within the Greater Manchester Primary Care Standards.
- The practice used information about care and treatment to make improvements.
- The practice was actively involved in quality improvement activity. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.

- Staff had appropriate knowledge for their role, for example, to carry out reviews for people with long term conditions, older people and people requiring contraceptive reviews.
- Staff whose role included immunisation and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had

- received specific training and could demonstrate how they stayed up to date. However, the doctors needed to formalise their training requirements for immunisations and vaccinations, which had been identified within their continuous learning portfolio.
- The practice understood the learning needs of staff and provided protected time and training to meet them. Up to date records of skills, qualifications and training were maintained. Staff were encouraged and given opportunities to develop.
- The practice provided staff with ongoing support. There
 was an induction programme for new staff. This
 included one to one meetings, appraisals, coaching and
 mentoring.
- There was a clear approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.

Coordinating care and treatment

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to deliver effective care and treatment.

- We saw records that showed that all appropriate staff, including those in different teams and organisations, were involved in assessing, planning and delivering care and treatment.
- The practice shared clear and accurate information with relevant professionals when discussing care delivery for people with long term conditions and when coordinating healthcare for care home residents. They shared information with, and liaised, with community services, social services and carers for housebound patients and with health visitors and community services for children who have relocated into the local area.
- Patients received coordinated and person-centred care.
 This included when they moved between services, when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. The practice worked with patients to develop personal care plans that were shared with relevant agencies.
- The practice ensured that end of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of different patients, including those who may be vulnerable because of their circumstances. We were provided with a hand-written letter from patient expressing how the needs of the patient and family were placed at the centre of the care received from the



Are services effective?

clinicians. They expressed how their partners unconventional preferences were listened to, understood and their final wishes were achieved with the help and support of the clinicians.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

Staff were consistent and proactive in helping patients to live healthier lives.

- The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support and directed them to relevant services.
 This included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, patients at risk of developing a long-term condition and carers. For example, People who were caring for a patient at end of life, took time to express their feelings to the inspection team about how the clinicians go above and beyond to support them in this most difficult time.
- Staff encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their own health, for example through social prescribing schemes.

- Staff discussed changes to care or treatment with patients and their carers as necessary.
- The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health, for example, stop smoking campaigns, tackling obesity.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

- Clinicians understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making.
- Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.
- The practice monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.



Are services caring?

We rated the practice as good for caring.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- Feedback from patients was positive about the way staff treat people. Patients took time to write letters and speak directly to the inspection team, they explained how the practice staff especially the GPs went above and beyond in supporting and caring for them.
- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs.
- The practice gave patients timely support and information.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about care and treatment. They were aware of the Accessible Information Standard (a requirement to make sure that patients and their carers can access and understand the information that they are given.)

- Staff communicated with people in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids and easy read materials were available.
- Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services. They helped them ask questions about their care and treatment.
- The practice proactively identified carers and supported them.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected patients' privacy and dignity.

- When patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed reception staff offered them a private room to discuss their needs.
- Staff recognised the importance of people's dignity and respect. They challenged behaviour that fell short of this.



Are services responsive to people's needs?

We rated the practice, and all of the population groups, as good for providing responsive services.

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.

- The practice understood the needs of its population and tailored services in response to those needs.
- The practice was part of the Manchester Integrated Neighbourhood Care Team (MINC) which was about working together to support patients who had health or social care problems/concerns/difficulties and would benefit from a multidisciplinary approach to health and social care delivery.
- Telephone consultations were available which supported patients who were unable to attend the practice during normal working hours.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.
- The practice made reasonable adjustments when patients found it hard to access services.
- The practice provided effective care coordination for patients who are more vulnerable or who have complex needs. They supported them to access services both within and outside the practice.
- Care and treatment for patients with multiple long-term conditions and patients approaching the end of life was coordinated with other services.

Older people:

- All patients had a named GP who supported them in whatever setting they lived, whether it was at home or in a care home or supported living scheme.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs. The GP and practice nurse also accommodated home visits for those who had difficulties getting to the practice due to limited local public transport availability.
- There was a medicines delivery service for housebound patients provided by their local pharmacy.

People with long-term conditions:

- Patients with a long-term condition received an annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being appropriately met. Multiple conditions were reviewed at one appointment, and consultation times were flexible to meet each patient's specific needs.
- The practice held regular meetings with the local district nursing team to discuss and manage the needs of patients with complex medical issues.

Families, children and young people:

- Baby clinics were GP led and included an eight week check-up for the baby and an immunisation clinic at the surgery.
- We found there were systems to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency (A&E) attendances. Records we looked at confirmed this.
- All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child under the age of 16 were offered a same day appointment when necessary.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students):

- All immunisations were offered at the practice and inhouse phlebotomy (blood taking service) was offered for patient convenience.
- The practice referred patients to the local community health promotion services, patients could access services such as health trainers and exercise groups.
- The needs of this population group had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- There was additional out of working hour's access to meet the needs of working age patients with extended opening hours every Tuesday and Friday open from 7am.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

Patients received coordinated and person-centred care.
 This included when they moved between services, when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. The practice worked with patients to develop personal care plans that were shared with relevant agencies.



Are services responsive to people's needs?

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- People in vulnerable circumstances were easily able to register with the practice, including those with no fixed abode.
- Patients who wanted to be seen by a GP at the practice at a quiet time of the day were accommodated to do so and they were given longer a longer appointment.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia):

- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and those patients living with dementia.
- The practice held GP led dedicated monthly mental health and dementia clinics. Patients who failed to attend were proactively followed up by a phone call from a GP.
- Staff had access to refer patients to self-help services and community alcohol services.

Timely access to care and treatment

Patients were able to access care and treatment from the practice within an acceptable timescale for their needs.

• Patients had timely access to initial assessment, test results, diagnosis and treatment.

- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- Patients reported that the appointment system was easy to use.
- The practices GP patient survey results were above local and national averages for questions relating to access to care and treatment.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice took complaints and concerns seriously and responded/did not respond to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

- Information about how to make a complaint or raise concerns was available. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.
- The complaint policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance. The practice learned lessons from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care.



Are services well-led?

We rated the practice as good for providing a well-led service.

Leadership capacity and capability

Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.

- Leaders were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.
- The practice had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the practice.

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision and credible strategy to deliver high quality, sustainable care.

- There was a clear vision and set of values. The practice had a realistic strategy and supporting business plans to achieve priorities.
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.
- The strategy was in line with health and social care priorities across the region. The practice planned its services to meet the needs of the practice population.
- The practice monitored progress against delivery of the strategy.

Culture

The practice had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.

- Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work in the practice.
- The practice focused on the needs of patients.
- Leaders and managers acted on behaviour and performance inconsistent with the vision and values.
- Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.
- Staff we spoke with told us they were able to raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.

- There were processes for providing all staff with the development they need. This included appraisal and career development conversations. All staff received regular annual appraisals in the last year. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary.
- There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of all staff.
- The practice actively promoted equality and diversity. Staff had received equality and diversity training. Staff felt they were treated equally.
- There were positive relationships between staff and teams.

Governance arrangements

There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

- Structures, processes and systems to support good governance and management were clearly set out, understood and effective. The governance and management of partnerships, joint working arrangements and shared services promoted co-ordinated person-centred care.
- Staff were clear on their roles and accountabilities including in respect of safeguarding and infection prevention and control
- Practice leaders had established policies, procedures and activities to ensure safety and assured themselves that they were operating as intended.

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

- There was an effective, process to identify, understand, monitor and address current and future risks including risks to patient safety.
- The practice had processes to manage current and future performance. Practice leaders had oversight of safety alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was clear evidence of action to change practice to improve quality.
- The practice had plans in place and had trained staff for major incidents.
- The practice considered and understood the impact on the quality of care of service changes or developments.



Are services well-led?

Appropriate and accurate information

The practice acted on appropriate and accurate information.

- Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.
- Quality and sustainability were discussed in relevant meetings where all staff had sufficient access to information.
- The practice used performance information which was reported and monitored and management and staff were held to account.
- The information used to monitor performance and the delivery of quality care was accurate and useful. There were plans to address any identified weaknesses.
- The practice used information technology systems to monitor and improve the quality of care.
- The practice submitted data or notifications to external organisations as required.
- There were robust arrangements in line with data security standards for the availability, integrity and confidentiality of patient identifiable data, records and data management systems.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The practice involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

- A full and diverse range of patients', staff and external partners' views and concerns were encouraged, heard and acted on to shape services and culture. There was an active patient participation group.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement.
- Staff knew about improvement methods and had the skills to use them.
- The practice made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints. Learning was shared and used to make improvements.
- Leaders and managers encouraged staff to take time out to review individual and team objectives, processes and performance.