

The Nightingale Practice

Quality Report

10 Kenninghall Road
Clapton,
London,
E5 8BY

Tel: 020 8985 8388

Website: www.thenightingalepractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 12 July 2016

Date of publication: 23/11/2016

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 | 3 |
| The six population groups and what we found | 6 |
| What people who use the service say | 9 |
| Areas for improvement | 9 |

Detailed findings from this inspection

| | |
|--|----|
| Our inspection team | 10 |
| Background to The Nightingale Practice | 10 |
| Why we carried out this inspection | 10 |
| How we carried out this inspection | 10 |
| Detailed findings | 12 |

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Nightingale Practice on 12 July 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Not all personnel files contained evidence that all staff had undergone all induction training.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- To provide information governance and health and safety training to all staff.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Good



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

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- The practice was not able to show that all new employees had undergone all pre-employment and induction training including: information governance and health and safety training for all staff. Staff we spoke to were able to explain their role and responsibilities in these areas.
- 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 comparable to 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. The practice is a hub for local phlebotomy services.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.
- A Turkish speaking interpreter attends weekly to provide assistance to patients whose first language is Turkish.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.

Good



Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- 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.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Following a bereavement a GP would offer the family an appointment to discuss their loss and to provide them with details of support available for people experiencing bereavements.

Good



People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for the care of people with long-term conditions.

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- 82% of patients with diabetes, on the register, had well-controlled blood sugars compared to a local average of 79% and a national average of 78%.
- 86% of patients with diabetes, on the register, had well controlled blood pressure (CCG 85% National 78%)
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- 80% of women aged 25-64 whose notes record had had a cervical screening test performed in the preceding 5 years (CCG average 81% national average 82%).
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- There were appointments from 7.00am to 8.30am on Monday to Wednesday and Friday, with Saturday morning GP and nurse appointment from 9.30am to 12.30pm on two Saturdays a month for the benefit of patients who could not attend during working hours.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Good



Summary of findings

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

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- 96% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had had their alcohol consumption recorded in the preceding 12 months, compared to a CCG average of 92% and a 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.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in January 2016 showed the practice was performing in line with national averages. Four hundred and fourteen survey forms were distributed and 88 were returned. This represented less than 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 81% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 85% 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%.
- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.
- 90% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 38 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. A number of patients commented that it was a very good service, and that staff were very helpful and supportive.

We spoke with 14 patients during the inspection. All 14 patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The practice participated in the NHS friends and family test (FFT) (FFT is an anonymised method of asking patients if they would recommend the practice to a friend or family member). One hundred percent of patients responding to the FFT said they would recommend the practice.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

The area where the provider should make improvement is:

- To provide information governance and health and safety training to all staff.

The Nightingale Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to The Nightingale Practice

The Nightingale Practice provides primary medical services in the London Borough of Hackney to approximately 10,800 patients and is one of 44 member practices in the NHS City & Hackney Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The practice population is in the second most deprived decile in England. There is with greater than CCG and national average representation of income deprived children (35% of children of the practice were subject to income deprivation, compared to a CCG average of 32% and a national average of 20%) and older people (income deprivation affected 45% of older patients compared to a local average of 41% and a national average of 16%). The practice had surveyed the ethnicity of the practice population and had determined that 37% of patients identified as having white ethnicity, 16% Asian, 20% black and 27% as having mixed or other ethnicity.

The practice operates from a purpose built property with patient facilities on the ground and first floors that are wheelchair accessible. There are offices for administrative and management staff on the ground and first floors. Both floors are accessed via a lift and stairs.

The practice operates under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract (a contract between NHS England and

general practices for delivering personal medical services. This contract allows the flexibility to offer local services within the contract) and provides a number of local and national enhanced services (enhanced services require an increased level of service provision above that which is normally required under the core GP contract). The enhanced services it provides are: childhood vaccination and immunisation scheme; extended hours access; facilitating timely diagnosis and support for people with dementia; influenza and pneumococcal immunisations; learning disabilities; minor surgery; risk profiling and case management; rotavirus and shingles immunisation; and unplanned admissions.

The practice team at the surgery is made up of four part-time female GP partners along with five female and one male salaried GPs. The GPs work between them a whole time equivalent (WTE) of just under ten GPs. The Nightingale Practice is a teaching and training practice, for undergraduate medical students and GP trainees with one part-time female post-graduate doctor working at the practice at the time of our visit.

The nursing team consists of two part-time female practice nurses, one part-time female assistant practitioner and one part-time female health care assistant. Between them the nursing team work a whole time equivalent of 4.

There are eight administrative and reception staff including a full-time practice manager.

The practice is open between 7.00am and 6.30pm Monday, Tuesday and Friday, from 8.00am to 6.30pm on Wednesday and from 7.00am to 7.30pm on Thursdays. It is also open on two Saturday mornings per month from 9.30am, to 12.30pm. GPs carry out phone triage to decide on which patients need appointments from 8.30am, with appointments available from 9.30am to 1.00pm. Afternoon appointments are from 4.00pm to 6.30pm. Extended hours appointments are from 7.00am to 8.30am on Monday to

Detailed findings

Wednesday and Friday, with Saturday morning GP and nurse appointments from 9.30am to 12.30pm on two Saturdays a month. Nurse appointments are from 9.00am to 12.45pm and 2.00pm to 4.30pm four days a week and until 7.30pm on Thursday.

The practice has opted out of providing out of hours (OOH) services and directs patients to the OOH provider for NHS City & Hackney CCG.

The Nightingale Practice is registered as a partnership with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of: diagnostic and screening procedures; surgical procedures; family planning; treatment of disease, disorder or injury; maternity and midwifery services.

The practice was previously inspected by CQC in January 2014, at which time it was found to be compliant with our previous inspection methodology.

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.

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 12 July 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, nurse, practice manager, administration and reception 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 an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, a letter given to a patient contained information about the health of another patient. The practice apologised for the error and invited the patient to discuss what had happened and how the practice would prevent it happening again. The practice discussed the incident in a meeting and agreed that it would review letters before releasing them to ensure that only relevant information was included.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead

member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3, nurses were trained to level 2 and non-clinical staff to level 1.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction (PSDs) from a prescriber. PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before

Are services safe?

presentation for treatment. PSDs are written instructions from a qualified and registered prescriber for a medicine including the dose, route and frequency or appliance to be supplied or administered to a named patient after the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis.

- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

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

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received 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 comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were just under 100% of the total number of points available. The practice had higher than average exception reporting in two clinical domains during the 2014-15 QOF year:

- 30% of patients with atrial fibrillation had been excepted compared to a local average of 20% and a national average of 11%. The practice provided evidence to show that in the previous year (2013-14) they had excepted 17% of patients, and that for 2015-16 their exception reporting was eight percent.
- 40% of patients with osteoporosis had been excepted compared to a local average of 17% and a national average of 13%. The practice had a very small number of patients in this group, excepting two patients had resulted in the high level of exceptions reported.

Data from 2014-15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the local and national averages. For example 86% of patients with diabetes, on the register, had a last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) of 140/80 mmHg or less compared to a local average of 85% and a national average of 78%.

- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. For example 80% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months (CCG average 85%, national average 88%).

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been four clinical audits completed in the last two years, three of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as: the practice audited its prescribing of co-amoxiclav, cephalosporins and quinolones, three broad-spectrum antibiotics (broad-spectrum antibiotics act against a wide range of disease-causing bacteria) to determine whether it was prescribing in line with guidance from Public Health England. Following the first cycle of the audit, the practice found that it was prescribing the three antibiotics in line with guidance 75% of the time. It analysed all instances where prescribing had been outside of guidance, and met to update all clinicians and to discuss the findings and improve performance. The practice re-audited its prescribing three months later. It found that prescribing had improved to 80% compliance with guidelines. It committed to continuing to reinforce the need to prescribe within guidelines and to undertake a further re-audit in 2017.

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, but was unable to provide evidence that all staff had received training in: information governance, manual handling and health and safety. However, staff we spoke to were able to explain their roles and responsibilities in regard to these topics.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions. The practice had a specialist diabetic nurse who met with other clinicians on a monthly basis to discuss patient care and engagement.

- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

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, family planning and asthma. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- Smoking cessation advice was available on the premises and a dietician was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 72%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 74%. 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 failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 93% to 95% (CCG rates ranged between 86% to 91%) and five year olds from 83% to 97% (CCG 81% to 94%).

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 38 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with three members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 85% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 87% and the national average of 89%.
- 89% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 84% 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 94% and the national average of 95%.
- 78% 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%.

- 85% 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 87% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

Results from the national GP patient survey showed how patients responded 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:

- 81% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 83% 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 national average of 82%.
- 75% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 81% and 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.
- The practice had a text reminder system to help patients remember their appointments.

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 241 patients as

carers (over 2% of the practice list). Carers are able to book appointments outside of working hours. 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 letter. This 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 appointments outside of working hours on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday mornings from 7.00am to 8.30am, and on two Saturday mornings per month from 9.30am to 12.00pm for 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.
- The practice was a local hub for phlebotomy services and offered clinics on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday between 9:00am to 12:00pm.
- It ran an extended minor surgery service which included no scalpel vasectomies for its own patients and those of other local practices.
- As the practice had a relatively large Turkish speaking population (five percent of the patient population) a Turkish interpreter attended the practice every Wednesday afternoon to interpret for Turkish speaking patients. This had developed from a straightforward interpreting service to include patient advocacy and providing cultural contacts for a number of Turkish speaking patients within the community.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 7.00am and 6.30pm Monday, Tuesday and Friday, from 8.00am to 6.30pm on Wednesday and from 7.00am to 7.30pm on Thursdays. It also opened on two Saturday mornings per month from

9.30am, to 12.30pm. GPs carried out phone triage to decide which patients needed appointments from 8.30am, with appointments available from 9.30am to 1.00pm. Afternoon appointments were from 4.00pm to 6.30pm. Extended hours appointments were from 7.00am to 8.30am on Monday to Wednesday and Friday, with Saturday morning GP and nurse appointment from 9.30am to 12.30pm on two Saturdays a month. Nurse appointments were from 9.00am to 12.45pm and 2.00pm to 4.30pm four days a week and until 7.30pm on Thursday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 93% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 81% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

The practice phones 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.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- 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 this included a poster in the reception area, a leaflet was available that explained the complaints procedure and there was information about how to complain on the practice website.

We looked at five complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with

in a timely way, with openness and transparency in dealing with the complaint. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a patient was told by reception staff that they would be able to collect their prescription, but on arriving at the practice they were told that the prescription was unavailable. The practice apologised to the patient, it discussed the complaint at a practice meeting and decided that in future patients would be informed if there was any reason why their prescription would not be prepared.

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 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:

- Although not all staff had received training in information governance, they understood and were able to explain their responsibilities in this area.
- 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 robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The practice had gathered feedback from staff generally through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. 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 for example, the scanning clerk suggested that there was not adequate holiday or busy times cover. The practice trained a member of the reception team to provide additional cover.

- Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. The practice provided an extended minor surgery service its own patients and those of other local practices. As part of its surgical procedures the practice offered a no scalpel vasectomy service. It offered this service to patients of all practices within NHS City and Hackney CCG.