

Marsh House Medical Centre

Quality Report

Abbey Health Centre
Finchale Avenue
Billingham
TS23 2DG

Tel: 01642561282

Website: www.marshhousemedicalpractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 21/01/2016

Date of publication: 30/03/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Marsh House Medical Centre	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Marsh House Medical Centre on 21 January 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.

- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. This means providers must be open and transparent with service users about their care and treatment, including when it goes wrong.

We saw one area of outstanding practice:

- The GP partners held a personal patient list, which meant the GPs always saw their own patients. The exception would be such things as when a GP was on annual leave. When the GP was not available another GPs provided buddy cover. This meant patients were seen by their named GPs even when requesting an emergency appointment. This enabled good relationships to be built between the patient, and the named GP.

However the area of practice where the provider should make improvement are:

Summary of findings

- Review the process for checking the collection of patient's prescriptions.

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 there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality and comparable 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 multidisciplinary teams 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 better than others.
- 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.

Summary of findings

We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient 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. Examples of these were medicines management, the care of patients in care homes and improving the care of patients with learning disabilities.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular meetings where governance issues were discussed.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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. The named GP monitored their housebound patients.
- The practice identified poorly and vulnerable patients who required open access to the clinician. There was a separate telephone number for high risk patients to access urgent care.
- There were named GPs for individual care homes with regular weekly contact by telephone or visit.
- Every patient over the age of 75 had a named GP.

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.
- The nurses were trained to manage all long term conditions and there were designated GPs who liaised with the nurses to provide patients with timely, appropriate care.
- Nationally reported data for 2014/2015 showed that outcomes for patients with long term conditions were good. For example, the proportion of patients on the diabetes register with a record of foot examinations in the preceding 12 months was 93% which was above the national average of 88%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed. More complex patients were reviewed more frequently.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances.
- Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed 74% of patients diagnosed with asthma, on the register, had had an asthma review in the last 12 months which is just below the national average of 75.
- 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.
- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the proportion of women aged 24 -64 who had had cervical screening performed was 81% which was the same as the national average of 81%.
- 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 reflected the needs for this age group.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.

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).

- 97% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is above the national average.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people 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. The practice worked with the pharmacist to audit mental health prescribing to ensure continued safe practice.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in July 2015 showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. There were 320 survey forms distributed for the practice and 120 were returned. This represented 1.3% of the practice's patient list.

- 84% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 71% and a national average of 73%.
- 84% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 84%, national average 85 %).
- 89% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 85%, national average 85%).

- 76% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 78%, national average 79%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 31 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients told us all the staff were professional, caring and the practice was clean and they always felt listened to by the staff.

We spoke with 10 patients during the inspection. All 10 patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

Marsh House Medical Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Marsh House Medical Centre

Marsh House Medical Centre is near the centre of Billingham. The practice is housed in a purpose built medical centre housing and includes another two practices and a pharmacy. The practice staff were involved in the design of the building which is Eco friendly using solar energy and recycling rain water. There is a drive in pharmacy which means people do not leave their cars when handing in or collecting their prescriptions. There are 8500 patients on the practice list. The proportion of the practice population in the 45 to 65 years age group is slightly above the England average.

There are five GP partners, three female, and three practice nurses and one health care assistant. There is a practice manager who is supported by reception, medicines management, secretarial and other administration staff. The practice is an established training and teaching practice (teaching practices take medical students and training practices have GP trainees and F2 doctors. Foundation doctors are undergoing a two-year planned programme of training where doctors learn about working in the teams that deliver care in the NHS as well as the clinical aspects of caring for sick patients. It is a transition period of practice between being a student and undertaking more specialised training for a future career in

a specialist branch of medicine such as general practice or hospital medicine.) The practice also offers a placement for pharmacy students. There were two GP registrars in the practice on the day of inspection.

The practice is open from 8am to 6pm, Monday to Friday. Appointments are available during these times. Each of the GP partners have their own lists and appointment times are different for each time. The practice provides extended hours on a Monday and Tuesday evening until 19.30. We saw that appointments can be booked by walking into the practice, online and by the telephone. The practice did not use a telephone triage system. However telephone slots where patients requested a call back from the GP or nurse were booked at the end of each surgery. Patients requiring a GP outside of normal working hours are advised to contact the GP out of hour's service provided by Northern Doctors Urgent Care via the NHS 111 service. The practice has a General Medical Service (GMS) contract. The practice is close to the town centre and there is parking available at the practice and nearby. There are good links to public transport.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as 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 the 21 January 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nurses 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 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 practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example following an incident when there had been some delay in a receiving laboratory results the process was changed to ensure that all results telephoned to the practice were given immediately to the named GP. If the named GP was not available the results were passed to the duty GP.

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

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and 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 or lead nurse attended safeguarding meetings when possible and provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level 3. There were formal

safeguarding meetings held in the practice to discuss safeguarding concerns. Staff told us that they were able to raise any safeguarding concerns with the practice lead.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones was trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service check (DBS check). (DBS
- 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 update training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result of audit. We saw that not all bins were foot operated and there were two rooms without bins.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. However we saw in the prescription collection box there was a prescription for an older person who had been prescribed medication on the 20/11/2015. that had not been collected. The practice took immediate action and have reviewed the process for checking uncollected prescriptions. We also saw that the practice did not always use the electronic messaging and task system to communicate. Instead the practice often used a paper system that could lead to risks occurring. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable Health Care Assistants to administer vaccinations after specific training when a doctor or nurse were on the premises.
- We reviewed three personnel files and found recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to

Are services safe?

employment for those staff recently employed. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. However we saw that references were not always available in staff files.

- 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 smear results.

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, 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 that enough staff were on duty. The staff confirmed that they were flexible and willing to provide cover for each other during sickness and holidays.

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.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks.
- A first aid kit and accident book was available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.
- The practice had a 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 peoples' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected 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 showed the practice achieved 98.9% of the total number of clinical points available, with 9.1% exception reporting 2.1 percentage points below CCG Average, 0.1 percentage points below England Average. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). Lower exception reporting rates are more positive. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was above the CCG and national average.

The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who have had influenza

immunisation in the preceding 1 August to 31 March (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) was 97% which was above the national average of 94%.

- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 83% which was the same as the national average 83%.

- The dementia diagnosis rate whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months 97% which was above the national average of 84%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been seven clinical audits completed in the last two years, two of these were completed 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, recent action taken as a result included an improvement in the management of sore throats by flagging up the prescribing guidelines, there was an improvement in the correct antibiotic being prescribed at the right dose.

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. It 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. Staff administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations 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. We saw that following a significant event analysis the practice had introduced protected time for nurses during immunisations to reduce the risk of errors.
- 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. The practice closed every Thursday between 12 mid-day and 2pm for staff training and meetings.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, and basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services 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. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a regular basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance. We found that the GPs had knowledge of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. However we saw that not all the nurses had a good knowledge of the Mental Capacity Act.
- 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.

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, life style, smoking and alcohol. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service. The practice provided a smoking cessation clinic which was unfunded.
- Smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which the same as the national average of 81%. 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.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to the local CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 98% to 100% and five year olds from 97% to 99%.

Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 75%, and at risk groups 59%. These were also comparable to local CCG and national averages.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. 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. The practice staff had been employed for some time and knew the patients by name. We saw examples of where staff responded to patient's individual needs such as their ability to communicate.

All of the 31 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 one member of the patient participation group. 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 above the local CCG and national averages for majority of its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 89% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 89%.
- 91% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 87%, national average 87%).
- 94% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%).

- 75% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 85%, national average 85%).
- 87% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 92%, national average 90%).
- 90% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 89%, national average 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 on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responses were above average to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. For example:

- 90% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 86%.
- 80% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 82%, national average 81%).
- 87% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 88%, national average 85%).

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.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them locally.

Are services caring?

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. Examples of these were improving the management of patients with learning disabilities and improving medicines optimisation in the practice.

- The practice offered late evening appointments on Monday and Tuesday between 6pm and 7.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability, older patients or those identified as vulnerable.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions. The reception staff aware of these patients when they requested appointments.
- 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 had recently moved to a purpose designed building which met the needs of their patient group.

Access to the service

The practice was open Monday to Friday. Appointments were from available between 8am to 11.30am and in the afternoon between 14.30pm to 17.30pm. Extended surgery hours were offered on a Monday and Tuesday evening up to 7.30pm. 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. The practice offered a personalised list model which offers a personalised list system with a named GP. This allows a two-way relationship and trust between the patient and the clinician.

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.

- 76% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 76% and national average of 75%.
- 84% of patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 73%, national average 73%). The practice had implemented a new telephone system which patients reported as an improvement.
- 89% of patients said they always or almost always saw or spoke to the GP they preferred (CCG average 60%, national average 59%).

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

We looked at eight complaints received in the last 12 months and found these had been satisfactorily handled. We saw that lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example improving communication between staff and patients.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This outlined the structures and procedures in place and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings. The GPs and trainees met up on a daily basis to discuss any concerns. The nurses were welcome to attend these meetings. However the meetings were held during the nurses lunch break.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners and practice manager 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 or when this was not possible they communicated via email. The PPG carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. Following the patient surveys they produced an action plan to address some of the issues raised by the survey. For example, improving patient education during prescribing and medication reviews. The practice also arranged meetings with local pharmacies to improve the process for repeat prescribing.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through regular meetings, appraisals, staff discussions and their work as part of Investors in People. 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. They explained how they were all involved in improving systems and processes following a significant event analysis investigation into an incident.

There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. The practice took part in a number of local schemes to support their patients. The practice told us they were exploring the opportunity to provide transport for those patients who struggled to attend the practice. They were also active in referring patients to local schemes such as 'Bridging the Gap' to help those socially isolated.

Continuous improvement