

# Shoreditch Park Surgery

## Quality Report

10 Rushton Street  
Hackney  
London  
N1 5DR

Tel: 020 7739 8525

Website: [www.shoreditchparksurgery.com](http://www.shoreditchparksurgery.com)

Date of inspection visit: 19 September 2016

Date of publication: 06/02/2017

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   |
| Areas for improvement                       | 10   |
| Outstanding practice                        | 10   |

### Detailed findings from this inspection

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Our inspection team                   | 11 |
| Background to Shoreditch Park Surgery | 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 Shoreditch Park Surgery on 19 September 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 been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was 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.

### We saw one area of outstanding practice:

# Summary of findings

- The practice has developed a vulnerable patients list where high risk patients would have up to four home visits per year and had a vulnerable patient coordinator (VPC) who would coordinate the visits and medicine reviews.
- Review how patients with caring responsibilities are identified and recorded on the clinical system to ensure information, advice and support is available to them.

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

**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 ensure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- The practice GPs held daily peer supervision sessions to discuss their day's patients, share good practice and any safeguarding concerns.

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

Good



### Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Good



# Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.
- The practice had identified less than 1% of its patients as being a carer.

## Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice had developed a vulnerable patient list which had been adopted by the City and Hackney Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).
- 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 it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.

Good



# Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, and the patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

# Summary of findings

## The six population groups and what we found

We always inspect the quality of care for these six population groups.

### Older people

The practice is rated as good for the care of older people.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice had monthly Mutli Disciplinary meetings (MDTs) to discuss elderly and vulnerable patients.
- The practice participated in the Coordinate My Care (CMC) initiative which shares personalised care plans between healthcare providers.
- The practice has developed a vulnerable patients list where high risk patients would have up to four home visits per year .

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 percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months is 150/90mmHg or less was 85% compared to the national average of 84%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



### Families, children and young people

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

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.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The percentage of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years was 82% which was the same as the national average.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

## **Working age people (including those recently retired and students)**

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- Online appointment booking and prescription requests were available.
- Telephone consultations with clinicians were available to meet the needs of this population group. Patients aged 40–74 had access to appropriate health assessments and checks that were followed up where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.
- The practice did not offer extended hours but the practice was a part of the local HUB which provided appointments on weekday evenings and weekends.

Good



## **People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable**

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.

Good





# Summary of findings

- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice has a dedicated administrator who ensured that every patient on the vulnerable patient list had visits by their named GP appropriate to their needs.
- The practice had a large Turkish patient group and held clinics twice a week with a Turkish speaking advocate.

## 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 percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 84% which is comparable to the national average of 90%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



# Summary of findings

## What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and fifty nine survey forms were distributed and 119 were returned. This represented 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 95% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 84% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 91% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 91% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 54 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients commented on the kind and caring nature of all the staff and said they were treated with dignity and respect, two of the cards mentioned long waiting times for appointments.

The friends and family test results showed that 95% (73% nationally) of patients find it easy to get through on the phone and 91% (78% nationally) said would recommend the surgery to someone new to the area.

## Areas for improvement

### Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Review how patients with caring responsibilities are identified and recorded on the clinical system to ensure information, advice and support is available to them.

## Outstanding practice

- The practice has developed a vulnerable patients list where high risk patients would have up to four home visits per year and had a vulnerable patient coordinator (VPC) who would coordinate the visits and medicine reviews.

# Shoreditch Park Surgery

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### Our inspection team was led by:

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

## Background to Shoreditch Park Surgery

The practice is located opposite Shoreditch Park in London N1 5DR, it's situated in a purpose built two storey building. The building is owned by City and Hackney CCG and maintained by NHS Property Services. They provide NHS primary medical services to approximately 8000 patients through a General Medical Services contract (a General Medical Services (GMS) contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities).

The premises have step free access with an accessible toilet and has parking spaces for disabled patients. It's located just off the busy New North road and is well served by local bus routes.

The practice staff includes three GP partners (two male, one female) working five and half sessions each, two salaried GPs, one working six sessions (male) and the other working three sessions (female). There is a nurse practitioner working 30 hours per week, a practice nurse working full time and a health care assistant working 28 hours (all female). The practice manager and reception manager both work 36 hours and there is a variety of reception, secretarial and IT staff.

The practice has been a teaching practice since 2009 and had two registrars at the time of our inspection.

The practice is open from;

- Monday: 8:30am – 6:00pm
- Tuesday: 8:30am – 6:00pm
- Wednesday: 8:30am – 6:00pm
- Thursday: 8:15am – 6:00pm
- Friday: 8:30am – 6:00pm

The practice also provides telephone consultations and home visits, the home visits are carried out between morning and evening surgery. The practice does not offer extended hours, however out of hour's services and weekends are covered by the locally agreed out of hours provider who provide telephone consultations, home visits or patients can be seen at the local Homerton University hospital.

The practice serves a diverse population and for many patients English is not their first language. The main local community language is Turkish. The practice does not have a large older population (7%), the largest group (29%) are aged between 25 to 34. The practice population is 46% non-white minority ethnic groups. Information published by Public Health England rates the level of deprivation within the practice population group as three on a scale of one to ten. Level one represents the highest levels of deprivation and level ten the lowest.

## Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal

# Detailed findings

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.

The provider had not been inspected previously.

## 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 19 September 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, practice manager, administration staff, nurse) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

We also looked at how well services were provided for specific groups of people and what good care looked like for them. The population groups are:

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

Please note that when referring to information throughout this report, for example any reference to the Quality and Outcomes Framework data, this relates to the most recent information available to the CQC at that time.

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

### Safe track record and learning

There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action had been taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, following a prescribing error the patient was informed the same day, apologised to and the appropriate prescription given. This was discussed at the daily supervision session and at the weekly clinical meeting.

### 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 to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. One of the GPs was the lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their

responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and the nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three, HCA to level two and non-clinical staff were trained to level one.

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

# Are services safe?

## Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and Legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. The practice did not have a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups but the staff covered each other if there was a shortfall.

## Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

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

The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

# Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

## Our findings

### Effective needs assessment

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

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

### Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 98% of the total number of points available. The practice exception reporting rate was 9% which was comparable the CCG average of 8% and the same as the national average of 9%. (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).

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 similar to national averages. For example, the percentage of patients on the diabetes register with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 92% compared with the national average of 88%. Over all exception reporting for diabetes indicators was 8% compared 9% within the CCG and 11% nationally.

- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 85%, which is similar to national average of 84%. Overall exception reporting for hypertension was 7% (compared to 4% both within the CCG and nationally).
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. For example, the percentage of patients diagnosed with a mental health condition who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record in the preceding 12 months was 91% compared with a national average of 88%. Exception reporting for dementia was 8% (compared to 4% within the CCG and 8% nationally), and exception reporting for depression was 25% (compared to 29% within the CCG and 25% nationally).

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been 11 clinical audits undertaken 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, in order to help patients manage their diabetes better the practice completed an audit on the use of third generation anti-diabetic agents (Anti-diabetic agents are medicines developed to stabilise and control blood glucose levels amongst people with diabetes). The first audit identified 15 patients on such agents and the practice wanted to ascertain whether continuing with these drugs would help to improve diabetic control. After the second audit cycle, six patients diabetic control had improved, nine patients control had still not improved. Of the six whose control had improved there were two in whom blood sugars were too low. The Practice then focussed on the group with poor control to try to improve their test results, and reduced the dose of medicines in those with low blood sugars.

### Effective staffing

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

# Are services effective?

## (for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions. One of the nurses had recently had Cervical smear training and was planning to have further training in COPD and asthma.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs, the practice also had a system of daily peer supervision after each session where each appointment and diagnosis were reviewed. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

### Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

### Consent to care and treatment

Staff 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.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored and consent forms added to patient records.

### Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation and patients were signposted to the relevant service. The practice ran dedicated asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and diabetes clinics in conjunction with specialist outreach services such as dieticians.
- Healthy living advice for adults and children was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and same as the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice



## Are services effective? (for example, treatment is effective)

demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example,

childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 80% to 94%( 73% to 95% nationally) and five year olds from 90% to 100%( 81% to 95% nationally).

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

# Are services caring?

## Our findings

### Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 54 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

Two members of the patient participation group (PPG) 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 comparable to local practices for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 83% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 81% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
- 93% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.

- 83% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 85% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 96% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

### Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 84% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 86%.
- 76% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 78% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

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

## Are services caring?

- The practice has a large Turkish patient group and held surgeries twice a week with a Turkish advocate. Turkish speaking patients were identified at registration and could book appointments on these days if an interpreter was required.

### **Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment**

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 44 patients as carers (less than 1% of the practice list). The practice carried out regular reviews of these patients. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

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

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

## Our findings

### Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice developed a vulnerable patient list when one of their elderly patients who had been a regular visitor to the practice stopped coming and stopped requesting their medicines. The practice visited the patient and found their condition had deteriorated, they reviewed their processes and designated a member of staff as a Vulnerable Patient coordinator (VPC) who kept a regularly updated list of housebound / vulnerable patients. GPs would inform the VPC of any patient who should be added to the Vulnerable Patient list. These patients generally had four visits per year. The practice had run this system for a number of years and it had recently been adopted by City and Hackney CCG called Vulnerable Patient Local Enhanced Service (VPLES). The City and Hackney GPs were joined in this by the Frail Elders Group (a multidisciplinary committee including geriatricians, service managers and therapists).

- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require a same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS and were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available. The Practice ran an advisory clinic on a Wednesday and Friday morning for its patients who spoke Turkish as a first language and a translator was in attendance. Following a death there was a practice protocol to inform relevant parties, including hospitals and district nurses, so appointments were cancelled. This was designed to reduce distress for relatives at the time of a bereavement.

### Access to the service

The practice was open between;

- Monday: 8:30am – 6:00pm
- Tuesday: 8:30am – 6:00pm
- Wednesday: 8:30am – 6:00pm
- Thursday: 8:15am – 6:00pm
- Friday: 8:30am – 6:00pm

Extended hours appointments were not offered at the practice as they felt that their patient surveys had not identified a demand and their patients were satisfied with their opening hours. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent same day appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 76% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 95% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone which is higher than the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

For home visits patients had to call in the morning before 10:00am and the GPs triaged the calls to make an informed decision on prioritisation according to clinical need.

In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

### Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.

# Are services responsive to people's needs? (for example, to feedback?)

- The practice manager handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system the practice had a "How to complain" leaflet with space to write comments.

We looked at four complaints out of 17 received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, with openness and transparency.

Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, we viewed a complaint from a patient regarding a delayed referral which led to a delayed diagnosis. We saw the practice apologised to the patient and gave an explanation as well as discussing it at a practice meeting and carrying out a full investigation which led to the practice reviewing and strengthening their communication with secondary care.

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

## Our findings

### Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had an effective 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 effective arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

### Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so. We noted team away days were held every 12 months.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff away days, through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. 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.

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

## Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. The practice

developed a vulnerable patient list and had a designated member of staff as the Vulnerable Patient coordinator who ensured that these patients had regular home visits and medicines reviews. This has been adopted by City and Hackney CCG.