

Dr RW Lawrence and Dr NJ Chawda

Quality Report

Whitwick Road Surgery
Whitwick Road
Coalville
Leicestershire
LE67 3FA
Tel: 01530 836507
Website: www.whitwickroadsurgery

Date of inspection visit: 11 November 2015
Date of publication: 08/07/2016

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	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Dr RW Lawrence and Dr NJ Chawda	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 Dr RW Lawrence and Dr NJ Chawda on 11 November 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- Information about safety was recorded, monitored, reviewed and any issues were addressed in a timely way. There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events and complaints.
- 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 kindness, 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 as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Urgent appointments were available on 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 practice should ensure it documents any learning, actions or changes to processes as a result of significant events analysis.

In addition the provider should:

- Implement a process to ensure lessons learnt are considered, document and shared for incidents and complaints.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

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

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were average for the locality and compared to national averages.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had been trained to have the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence that the practice had a systematic approach to staff development and training with regular meetings and appraisal to identify training and development needs for all staff.
- Staff worked with other healthcare professionals to understand the range and complexity of patients' needs and help meet them.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2015 showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with kindness, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Good



Summary of findings

- We saw staff treated patients with care and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- 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. For example, the practice was involved with the local federation with a view to working with a number of other practices to improve weekend access to GP services.
- 59% of patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP which was similar to local and national averages. (59% and 60%)
- 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.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to provide the best possible health care and advice to 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 was working to develop these to meet the current and future needs of the practice. There were regular governance meetings.
- There was a 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 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, reflective practice and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

- There was a high level of constructive engagement with staff both formally and informally, with low staff turnover and a high level of staff satisfaction
- 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 to monitor any notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.

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.

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of older people in its population.
- The practice had identified patients most at risk of hospital admission. Each patient had a personalised care plan and an alert was put on the patient record. Any admissions were reviewed to identify avoidable factors.
- The practice also referred frail, elderly patients to a regional older persons unit staffed by a geriatrician and multi-disciplinary team where they were usually seen with 48 hours for a review of medication and for other health and social needs to be addressed.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those who needed them.
- The practice provided care for approximately 30 patients living in a local care home with a weekly visit to review patients' needs and home visits when needed.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and worked closely with visiting specialist nurses.
- The practice's performance for diabetes management was similar to the national average, for example, 87% of diabetic patients had had a recent foot examination compared to the national average of 88%.
- Patients were referred to local services for lifestyle advice related to their conditions.
- Patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority and had a personalised care plan. An alert on their record ensured that receptionists were aware that these patients should be offered same-day contact preferably with their usual doctor.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- Where patients had a number of long-term conditions the practice took a holistic approach and offered them an appointments so that, where possible all their conditions could be reviewed during one visit to the surgery.
- Home visits were available when needed.

Families, children and young people

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

Good



- There were systems in place to identify 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 similar to the locality rates for all standard childhood immunisations (95-97%).
- The practice offered a wide range of contraceptive services.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals. Chlamydia screening packs were available in different areas of the practice.
- Data showed 81% of eligible women had received a cervical screening test. (National average 82%).
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. The practice offered 24 hour and six week baby checks.
- Staff told us they had good working relationships with midwives and health visitors.

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).

Good



- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice offered services that were accessible, flexible and, where possible, offered continuity of care.
- Pre-bookable appointments were available from 8.10am to 5.05pm Monday to Friday although the majority were available on the day.
- Pre-bookable telephone consultations were also available.
- Urgent same-day appointments and telephone consultations were available.
- Nursing staff offered a travel vaccination service.

Summary of findings

- The practice offered a range of online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflected the needs for this age group.
- There was on-line access to book or cancel appointments and for repeat prescriptions.

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 who were homeless, had alcohol or substance misuse problems, those with a learning disability and those who were living with dementia.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability and staff were aware of individual patient needs such as what time of day a patient might prefer their appointment.
- Patients with learning disabilities were offered annual health checks and followed up to encourage taking up this service. Approximately 50% had attended half way through the year.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people. Some were referred to a community matron to ensure that their health and social care needs were identified.
- 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.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice had identified patients whose primary health concern was dementia and offered regular health checks to them.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of the people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia. Patients were also referred to the local Memory Clinic.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- 96%% of patients with serious mental health problems had a comprehensive agreed care plan on their records which was higher than the national average of 86%.
- The practice had also provided patients experiencing poor mental health with information 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 when they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in July 2015 showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 289 survey forms were distributed and 119 were returned, this represented a response rate of 41.2%.

- 84% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared with a CCG average of 71% and a national average of 73%.
- 94% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 88%, national average 85 %).
- 84% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (local average 85%, national average 85%.
- 80% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (local average 78%, national average 78%

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 20 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Several patients described the surgery as excellent and said it was easy to get an appointment to see or speak with a doctor. Staff were described as caring, polite and supportive and GPs were considered to be very caring and took the time to listen and explain.

All the patients we spoke with on the day told us that reception staff were polite, friendly and helpful to patients when they telephoned or attended the practice. Patients told us that it could be more difficult to see their choice of doctor but sometimes they were able to have a telephone consultation with them. Patients said that that they were treated with dignity and respect and they knew they could request a chaperone to be present during an examination.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Implement a process to ensure lessons learnt are considered, document and shared for incidents and complaints

Dr RW Lawrence and Dr NJ Chawda

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Dr RW Lawrence and Dr NJ Chawda

Dr RW Lawrence and Dr NJ Chawda's practice is located at the Whitwick Road Health Centre in Coalville in North West Leicestershire. The building was purpose built in 1988 and there is an independent pharmacy on-site. There is disabled parking and suitable facilities within the Centre, including a hearing loop. The practice has approximately 5,500 patients living in Coalville and some of the surrounding villages. Coalville is a market town and previously a mining town. It has some pockets of deprivation.

The Practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract.

- The practice has two full-time male GP partners and a female salaried GP. There are two nurse practitioners, a health care assistant and a phlebotomist who are all female. There are also administrative staff including a practice manager and reception team.
- The practice is open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday and closed at lunchtime from 12.45pm until 1.45pm. Appointments are available from 8.10am until 11.20am on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday and from

- 8.10am until 11am on a Tuesday and Thursday. Appointments are also available from 2.45pm until 5.05pm on a Monday, Tuesday and Thursday, and from 2pm until 5.05pm on a Wednesday and Friday (during lunchtime closing an emergency contact number was provided on the voicemail).
- Telephone consultations and on the day appointments are available.
- Out of hours services are provided by CNCS (Central Nottinghamshire Clinical Services). Patients are directed to the correct numbers if they phone the surgery when it is closed.
- The practice has approx. 5,500 patients registered with a slightly higher proportion of patients over 60 years.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a planned 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 was 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 11 November 2015. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff, including GPs, nurses, reception, and administrative staff and we spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients shared their views and experiences of the service.
- Reviewed some aspects of anonymised patient records.

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 that this relates to the most recent information available to the CQC at the 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 received training to help them identify and report any potentially significant event.
- 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. This supported the recording of 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 or treatment patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support and information and an apology. They were also told about any actions to improve processes to help prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out an analysis of significant events and these were discussed at staff meetings. but reviews of actions taken or lessons learnt to prevent such incidents happening again were not always documented.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, and minutes of meetings and saw that significant events were regularly discussed but actions taken to improve safety in the practice were not always documented.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- There were arrangements in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation. Policies and information were accessible to all staff and included who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There were lead members of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings where possible and provided reports for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role.

- Notices in the waiting areas 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 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).
- We observed that the premises were clean and tidy and that appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were maintained. A practice nurse was the infection prevention and control lead for the practice. Other staff were trained and updated on a regular basis. There was an infection control policy which included annual infection control audits. We saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements needed.
- There were arrangements in the practice for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations which kept patients safe. This included obtaining, prescribing, recording, storing, security and disposal. There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions which included reviews of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular audits 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 appropriately trained nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identity, 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.

- The practice had a range of policies and procedures to ensure it monitored and managed risks to patients and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available on the practice's computer system which was regularly reviewed. Any risks identified had action plans

Are services safe?

with timescales and completion dates. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure it was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly.

- 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. Staff were flexible and helped cover sickness and holiday absences.

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 all the computers in the premises which alerted staff to any emergency.

- All staff had received basic life support training with annual updates.
- The practice had a defibrillator (used in cardiac arrest) and oxygen.
- Emergency medicines were accessible to staff in secure areas of the practice and staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date. There was also a first aid kit and an accident book.
- The practice had a business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff and could be accessed securely outside of the premises.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The practice carried out assessments and treatment in line with current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- There were systems in place to ensure all clinical staff kept up-to-date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and also used local guidelines to develop how care and treatment were delivered to meet patients' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed using audits, discussion and 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 99.5% of the points available. The overall exception reporting rate was 8.6% (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).

Data from 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar or higher than the national average.
- The practice scored 82% for the QOF indicator relating to blood sugar control management for diabetic patients, compared with a national average of 78%.
- The practice scored 75% for the QOF indicator relating to blood pressure management in diabetic patients (national average 78%).
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, who had influenza immunisation from 1 August 2014 to 31 March 2015, was 95% (national average 94%).
- The practice scored 87% for the QOF indicator related to cholesterol management in diabetic patients (national average 82%).

- The percentage of diabetic patients with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 95% (national average 88%).
- Performance for mental health related indicators, for example, relating to agreed care plans documented in the patient record was 96% (national average, 86%) (there was an exception reporting rate of 35.7% which was higher than the England average of 12.6%).

The practice could evidence quality improvement with a number of clinical audits across a range of areas.

- The practice had completed a number of clinical audits and reviews. We looked at two of these which were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- For example, the practice had reviewed patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD) who had been prescribed non-steroid anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) which may have a detrimental effect on the kidney when used long-term. This resulted in a significant reduction of patients using NSAIDs (94%) with only one patient after discussion choosing to continue to use this medicine. An alert was also put on the records of patients with CKD to alert the GP to the issue of prescribing NSAIDs for patients with this condition.
- The practice also participated in local audits, (such as for antibiotic prescribing) national benchmarking, accreditation, and peer review.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had induction procedures for all newly appointed staff which related to their role and involved appropriate mentoring by a more experienced member of staff. Staff were briefed in topics such as health and safety, safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how staff received role specific training and updating. For example, nurses involved in caring for patients with long-term conditions attended regular training such as in anticoagulant management and worked closely with specialist nurses.
- Staff who administered vaccines and took samples for the cervical screening programme had received training

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

which included an assessment of competence. They were able to demonstrate how they kept up to date with any changes, 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, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received appraisals annually.
- There was also ongoing training to ensure staff kept up-to-date. This included safeguarding, fire safety procedures, and basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

The practice's patient record and intranet system ensured information needed to plan and deliver care and treatment was available to all staff.

- 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 were referred to other services or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were regularly reviewed and updated.

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who were potentially 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 such as diabetes, and those requiring advice on their diet, alcohol and smoking cessation. Patients were offered appropriate checks or signposted to relevant services.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81% which was comparable to the national average of 82%. The practice wrote to patients who had not attended for screening and where there was no response an alert was put on the patient record so that the patient could be encouraged to arrange this if they contacted the practice.
- The practice also encouraged patients to attend national screening programs for bowel and breast cancer. There was information in the waiting area to promote these programs.
- Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/ national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 95% to 100% and five year olds from 96% to 99%.
- 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. Where risk factors or abnormalities were identified there was appropriate follow-up.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

During the inspection we observed that members of staff were polite and helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

- There were curtains in treatment and consulting rooms to ensure a patient's privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- When patients wished to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed receptionists could take them to a private area near the reception area to talk privately.

All of the 20 Care Quality Commission patient comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were polite and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with four patients and two 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. The comment cards highlighted that staff responded sympathetically when patients needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey from July 2015 showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice's satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses were similar to national averages. For example:

- 86% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 88% and national average of 87%.
- 85% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 86%, national average 87%).
- 100% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%).
- 83% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (local average, 84%, national average 85%).
- 92 % said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (local average, 89%, national average 90%).

- 86% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 86%, national average 87%)

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

We spoke with patients who told us that health issues were discussed with them and they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback on the comment cards we received was also positive.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in July 2015 showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 83% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 86%.
- 80% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (local average, 80%, national average 81%).
- 84% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (local average, 82%, national average 85%).

Staff told us that interpretation 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

There were posters and leaflets in the waiting area which gave information about support groups and organisations.

Patients who were carers were encouraged, for example, by information in the waiting area to inform the practice of this so that appropriate support could be offered via the local authority. The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified patients had a caring responsibility and offered them annual health checks as well as directing them to local support available to them.

Are services caring?

Staff told us that if families were bereaved, their usual GP telephoned them and offered advice about how to access appropriate support services if needed.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to ensure the needs of its patients were met wherever possible.

- The practice was trying different ways of meeting patient demand and at the time of inspection the majority of appointments could be booked on the same day.
- Telephone consultations were available for patients.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with complex needs, for example, with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for patients whose clinical needs made it difficult to attend the surgery.
- Same day appointments were available for those who needed to see a doctor urgently, especially children.
- There were disabled facilities including a hearing loop and toilets.
- The surgery's treatment rooms were on the same floor and wheelchair accessible.
- Interpretation services were available.

Access to the service

- The practice was open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were available from 8.10am to 11.50am and from 2.00pm to 5.05pm Monday to Friday. Some of these were telephone appointments. (information about opening and appointment times were available on the practice's web-site)
- The practice closed for an hour at lunchtimes but the answerphone message included a telephone number for emergencies.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in July 2015 showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was lower than some local and national averages.

- 80% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the local average of 73% and national average of 75%.
- 84% of patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (local average 71%, national average 73%).
- 59% of patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (local average 59%, national average 60%).

Patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them but sometimes had to wait if they wished to see a particular doctor.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

We looked at a summary of complaints and at two complaints in detail. We found they were handled in accordance with the policy. They were acknowledged and dealt with in a timely way. There was evidence of a full investigation and the patient was given a full explanation and apology. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. However, the practice should ensure that it records any lessons learned in the complaints review as well as in individual complaints file.

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 the highest standards of health care and advice and promote good outcomes for patients. It was committed to a team approach with well-trained staff.

- The practice communicated these aims through its website and patient information leaflet.
- The practice was developing a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the current vision and values.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities
- The practice had its own policies which were implemented and kept up to date. They were available to all staff on the practice intranet and in a folder kept in the reception office.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which was used to monitor quality and to make improvements
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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 were committed to providing the best possible health care for patients that ensured their safety and well-being. Staff told us they 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 the providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care treatment). The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. Complaints and significant events were investigated and explanations and apologies given to patients.

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings and we saw minutes of these meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice. They felt able to raise issues at team meetings or directly with management and felt confident in doing so. They felt their suggestions and input were welcomed.
- 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.

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. There was an active PPG which met regularly, carried out patient surveys and made suggestions for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG had encouraged the practice to ensure that information provided in the waiting area and on notice boards was kept up-to-date and uncluttered.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through team meetings, discussion and appraisals. Staff told us they felt comfortable making suggestions for improvement or change.

Continuous improvement

There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and was involved with locality

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

and Federation meetings with a view to improve outcomes for patients in the area. The practice was involved in a local pilot scheme with other practices to increase access to a GP at weekends.