

Regent Street Surgery

Quality Report

73 Regent Street
Stonehouse
Gloucester
Gloucestershire
GL10 2AA
Tel: 01453 825690
Website: www.regentstreetpractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 16 June 2016
Date of publication: 18/07/2016

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	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	11
Areas for improvement	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Regent Street Surgery	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Regent Street Surgery on 16 June 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. However, on the day of our inspection we found that an out of date controlled medicine from 2014 had not been disposed of.
- 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.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure there is a robust and consistent system in place for disposing of out of date controlled medicines.

Summary of findings

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Good



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. However, on the day of our inspection we found that an out of date controlled medicine from 2014 had not been disposed of.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were above average compared to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice 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.

Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible. Comprehensive advice and signposting to a number of organisations that provide patient support was displayed in the waiting room alongside a patient information screen which provided health promotion advice.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality. The practice had placed a white noise machine in the seating area outside a treatment room and played a radio in the main waiting room to maintain patient confidentiality.
- Patients with a hearing loss or vision problems were flagged on the practice's computer system and all patients were collected from the waiting room by the GPs and nurses.

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. For example, the practice participated in a "Village Agent" scheme run by the local County Council to facilitate access to benefits and services to patients over the age of 55.
- 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.
- The practice was informed by a patient that a local health centre no longer issued hearing aid batteries and the nearest place to acquire them was in Stroud. The practice contacted the audiology department at Gloucester Royal Hospital and now receives regular batteries for issuing to patients and local people who are not registered at the practice.
- Information about how to complain was available on the practice website and from reception. This was easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders such as midwives, community nurses and mental health workers, through relevant meetings.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 recently recruited an assistant manager to support the practice manager in driving the practice forward. 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
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

Good



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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population and had a range of enhanced services, for example in dispensing, dementia, influenza and pneumococcal immunisations.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Patients who were discharged from hospital were flagged by the administration team to prompt a GP review of the patient and their care plans.
- The practice participated in a “Village Agent” scheme run by the local County Council to facilitate access to benefits and services to patients over the age of 55.

People with long term conditions

Good



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

- The practice had specialist nurses for diabetes and respiratory disease who provided both chronic and acute management of these patients within their area of expertise. Support from a GP was available if needed, and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for overall diabetes related indicators in 2014/15 was 100% which was above both the clinical commissioning group average of 95% and the national average of 89%.
- 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.

Summary of findings

Families, children and young people

Good



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

- 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 patients 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 patients were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years in 2014/15 was 88% which was above both the clinical commissioning group average of 84% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses through minutes of monthly multidisciplinary meetings.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age patients (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. A 24 hour automated appointment booking system was also available.
- The practice had a virtual patient reference group in addition to the patient participation group to enable working age patients to contribute.

Summary of findings

- Clinics available included in house phlebotomy (blood testing), acute aortic screening, minor surgery, joint injections, spirometry (lung function testing), 24 hour electrocardiogram (ECG) monitoring, international normalised ratio (INR) monitoring and NHS health checks.
- Extended hours surgery were offered Monday to Thursday evenings for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours. Bookable telephone appointments were also available.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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

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

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good



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

Summary of findings

- 90% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months (04/2014 to 03/2015), which is above both the clinical commissioning group average (CCG) of 86% and the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100% which was above both the CCG average of 97% and national average of 82%.
- 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.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Two hundred and thirty four survey forms were distributed and 110 were returned, a completion rate of 47% (which represents 2.6% of the patient population).

- 98% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to a clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 83% and a national average of 73%.
- 90% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to a CCG average of 89% and a national average of 85%.
- 89% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to a CCG average of 89% and a national average of 85%.
- 87% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to a CCG average of 83% and a 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 25 comment cards of which 24 were positive about the standard of care received. The one negative comment related to waiting over 30 minutes for an appointment however, this was in contrast to the other comment cards, patient survey data and comments from patients we spoke with. Patients told us that the service was excellent and staff were caring, respectful and treated them as individuals always listening to their concerns.

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

We looked at the NHS Friends and Family Test from 1 April 2016 to 30 April 2016, where patients are asked if they would recommend the practice. The results submitted showed 100% of respondents would recommend the practice to their family and friends.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure there is a robust and consistent system in place for disposing of out of date controlled medicines.

Regent Street 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, an assistant CQC inspector, and a pharmacist specialist adviser.

Background to Regent Street Surgery

Regent Street Surgery is a long established family orientated GP practice located in Stonehouse, Gloucestershire. The practice is situated in a single storey, purpose built health centre building and is wheelchair accessible with automatic doors to the practice.

The practice provides general medical services to approximately 4,165 patients. Services to patients are provided under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with NHS England. (A GMS contract is a contract between NHS England and general practices for delivering general medical services and is the commonest form of GP contract).

The Practice has two GP partners and two salaried GPs (three female and one male) which is equivalent to two and a quarter whole time equivalent GPs. The clinical team includes two practice nurses and one healthcare assistant (all female). The practice manager is supported by an assistant practice manager and a team of five receptionists.

Regent Street Surgery is a dispensing practice with four of the reception team being qualified to work in the dispensary on a rotational basis. The practice dispenses to approximately 33% of the registered patient base.

The practice population has a higher proportion of patients aged between 15 and 19 compared to local and national averages. For example, 11.5% of practice patients are aged between 15 and 19 compared to the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) and national averages of 6%. This is due in part to the practice supporting a local university and college.

The practice is located in an area with low social deprivation and is placed in the second least deprived decile by public health England. The prevalence of patients with a long standing health condition is 49% compared to the local CCG average of 55% and the national average of 54%. People living in more deprived areas and with long-standing health conditions tend to have greater need for health services.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm on Monday to Friday. Appointments are available between 8.15am and 1pm every morning and 2.15pm to 5.30pm every afternoon. Extended surgery hours are also offered Monday to Thursday evenings between 6.30pm and 7.30pm.

Out of hours cover is provided by South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust and can be accessed via NHS 111.

The practice provided its services from the following address:

Regent Street Surgery

73 Regent Street

Stonehouse

Gloucestershire

GL10 2AA

This was the first inspection of Regent Street Surgery.

Detailed findings

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 16 June 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including four GPs, the practice manager, the assistant practice manager, two nurses, one dispenser and two members of the administration team. In addition to this we spoke five patients and one patient participation group member 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 25 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 was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, laboratory results were placed in an administrator's box rather than the clinician's box resulting in a delay in advising patients of their results. Staff had been retrained and also advised that they must check the administrators box daily to ensure that this does not reoccur.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

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

provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three and nurses to level two.

- Notices in the waiting room, consultation rooms and treatment rooms 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. For example an audit showed that a damaged pedal bin was identified and replaced.
- 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 clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGD) 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. Health care assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction (PSD) from a prescriber.

Are services safe?

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

- There was a named GP responsible for the dispensary and all members of staff involved in dispensing medicines had received appropriate training and had opportunities for continuing learning and development. Any medicines incidents or 'near misses' were recorded for learning and the practice had a system in place to monitor the quality of the dispensing process. Dispensary staff showed us standard procedures which covered all aspects of the dispensing process (these are written instructions about how to safely dispense medicines).
- The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse) and had procedures in place to manage them safely. There were also arrangements in place for the destruction of controlled drugs, however on the day of our inspection we found that an out of date controlled medicine from 2014 had not been disposed of. We were advised that the locality pharmacist had been contacted prior to our inspection to visit and destroy the out date medicine and that this now been destroyed following inspection.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the kitchen which identified local health and safety

representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received 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 from 2014/15 were 100% of the total number of points available Exception reporting for the practice was 10% which was comparable to both the local average of 10% and 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 100% which was above the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 95% and national average of 89%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 90% which was above both the CCG average of 85% and national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100% which was above the CCG average of 97% and national average of 93%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been ten clinical audits completed in the last two years, six of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included an audit of patients who had been prescribed hypnotic medicines. The CCG had reviewed guidance in relation to hypnotic prescribing and appropriate reduction in 2014 and the practice performed an internal audit in line with the new guidance. A draft letter was implemented and sent to relevant patients inviting them to discuss reducing medicine doses. The practice have re-audited this three times since the initial audit and found that the results highlight a gradual decrease in prescribing of hypnotics each time.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as: when a patient with epilepsy presented, a poor record of attendance for annual epilepsy checks, was noted. The practice implemented a new procedure to ensure that regular electronic searches on patients with a diagnosis of epilepsy were conducted to ensure the annual review and medicine review was up to date. Patients were then invited for review as appropriate.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. 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. Four reception staff had received National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) level two training in dispensary which ensured that there was sufficiently trained staff available in the practice at all times.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months, with the exception of the two nurses who sat just outside of 12 months. We were advised that these had been postponed due to a change in GP partners over the past year. We saw evidence that both appraisals had been planned within the following month.
- 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 patients, 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 through patient records audits.

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. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- Smoking cessation advice was available with the practice nurses.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 88%, which was above both the CCG average of 84% and 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 demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by ensuring a female sample taker was available. 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.

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. The practice's uptake for females aged between 50-70 years, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months was 86%, which was above the CCG average of 77% and above the national average of 72%. The practices

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

uptake for patients aged between 60-69 years, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months was 61% which was comparable to both the CCG average of 63% and the national average of 58%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were above both the CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to

under two year olds ranged from 87% to 100% compared to CCG averages of 72% to 96%. Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to five year olds ranged from 94% to 97% compared to CCG averages of 90% to 95%.

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. The practice had placed a white noise machine in the seating area outside a treatment room and played a radio in the main waiting room to maintain patient confidentiality.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs and had developed a confidentiality slip for patients to use.
- Patients with hearing or vision impairments were flagged on the practice's computer system and all patients were collected from the waiting room by the GPs and nurses.

All of the 25 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced, with the exception of one which commented on a long wait for an appointment. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with one member of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were pleased with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected and that as patients they were always listened to. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 94% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and national average of 89%.
- 92% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 87%.
- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 97% and national average of 95%.
- 90% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 88% and national average of 85%.
- 92% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 90%.
- 93% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% and 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 or above local and national averages. For example:

- 92% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 86%.
- 84% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 82%.
- 91% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 85%.

Are services caring?

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

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

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 60 patients as carers (1.5% of the practice list). The practice had updated their new patient registration forms to ask whether patients were carers and whether they would like to be added to the carers register. The practice had a carers lead, a dedicated carers board in the waiting room and carers packs available at reception. Carers were offered annual health checks and longer appointments and could be referred to social prescribing. Young carers were signposted to local support groups for additional support. 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. For example, the practice participated in a "Village Agent" system which was run by the local County Council to facilitate access to benefits and services to patients over the age of 55.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' Monday to Thursday evenings until 7.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours. Bookable telephone appointments were also available.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability. The practice had 43 patients on the learning disability register and 30 had received an annual health check.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- Weekly meetings took place that included discussions of hospital admissions, hospital discharges and palliative care patients.
- Patients who had been discharged from hospital were flagged by the administration team to prompt a GP review of the patient and their care plans.
- The practice was informed by a patient that a local health centre no longer issued hearing aid batteries and the nearest place to acquire them was in Stroud. The practice contacted the audiology department at Gloucester Royal Hospital and now receives regular batteries for issuing to patients and local people who are not registered at the practice.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.15am to 1pm every

morning and 2.15pm to 5.30pm daily. Extended hours appointments were offered between 6.30pm and 7.30pm Monday to Thursdays. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 88% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and national average of 78%.
- 98% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 73%.

Patients 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.

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.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system there was a poster displayed in the waiting room, detailed leaflet available and details on the practice website.

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found that all complaints were dealt with in a timely manner, with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and

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

also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a complaint was received from a patient concerned that any discussions held between reception staff may be overheard in the waiting room. This led to a full investigation and various improvements being implemented including developing a 'confidentiality slip' for patients to hand to

receptionists if they wished to speak in a private room, radio music being played into the waiting room and notices being placed at reception and dispensary requesting patients keep their distance from those patients at the desk. The practice had also purchased a white noise box and placed this in the seating area outside the treatment room.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

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

Leadership and culture

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 at least once a year.
- 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), the patient reference group (PRG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG had recently formed and had met as a group twice, the PRG was established several years ago and continued to support the practice in addition to the PPG. Between the PPG and PRG they had carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, a water cooler and chairs with arms were purchased as a result of patient feedback in addition to redecorating the waiting room. The practice was very receptive to patient feedback and

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

published their annual patient reference group reports on their website which detailed all of the many improvements made as a direct result of patient feedback at the practice.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff 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 for example, a reception team member identified that a referral had not been processed, this was raised to the practice manager and the referral was immediately submitted. The patient was contacted and informed of the delay and an apology was given. The

practice manager investigated the incident, retrained the relevant staff member and discussed the incident at the next practice meeting. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. Four of the reception team members had received training to work in the dispensary which gave the practice additional staff trained to provide cover as necessary. The practice had employed an apprentice receptionist whom they supported and developed into a receptionist role and were looking to develop further by funding dispensary training.