

Carisbrooke Health Centre

Quality Report

22 Carisbrooke High Street
Newport
Isle of Wight
PO30 1NR

Tel: 01983522150

Website: www.carisbrookehealthcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 28 October 2015

Date of publication: 10/12/2015

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	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Carisbrooke Health Centre	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Carisbrooke Health Centre on 28 October 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- 90.2% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 88.6% and national average of 86%.
- 94.7% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 88.6%, national average 86.6%).
- 98.7% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96.4%, national average 95.2%).
- 93.4% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 89.2% national average 85.1%).
- 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 identified that the podiatry appointments were not enough for the population. A health care assistant had received training to do lower limb assessment to make up for that reduction in the community service.
- Ensure that health and safety risk assessments are regularly reviewed.

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

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When there are unintended or unexpected safety incidents, people receive reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and are 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 people safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.

Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data showed that 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.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.

We also saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- It 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. An example being, Diabetic reviews – the practice identified that the podiatry appointments were not enough for the population. A health care assistant had training to do lower limb assessment to make up for that reduction in the community service.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed that the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- It had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular 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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.

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 practice was comparable to other practices with regards to diabetes indicators.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.
- The practice started patients on insulin, when their dietary efforts & oral medication diabetes tablets were insufficient to control their diabetes and was undertaken by the diabetes nurse and a GP, often requiring the review of at least twice daily blood sugar readings by phoning the patient and giving insulin dosage advice. The benefits to the patient were that they did not have to attend the local hospital and had close consistent contact with the same nurse and GP.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

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

Good



Summary of findings

- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80.33%, which was lower than the CCG average of 81.88%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw good 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.

Extended hours surgeries were offered on four days of the week from 07.30am.

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.
- It offered longer appointments for people with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- It had told vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



Summary of findings

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).

- 76.2% of people diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the preceding 12 months.
- 91.4% of people with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- It 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.
- It 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 people with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 2 July 2015 showed the practice was generally performing in line with local and national averages, although in one area, waiting at their appointment times, they were performing lower than local and national averages. There were 121 responses which represents 1.12% of the practice population.

- 87.1% find it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared with a CCG average of 87.6% and a national average of 73.3%.
- 94.7% find the receptionists at this surgery helpful compared with a CCG average of 92% and a national average of 86.8%.
- 56.9% patients with a preferred GP usually get to see or speak to that GP compared with a CCG average of 66.6% and a national average of 60%.
- 94% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried, compared with a CCG average of 91.4% and a national average of 85.2%.
- 91.6% say the last appointment they got was convenient, compared with a CCG average of 95.8% and a national average of 91.8%.

- 80.8% describe their experience of making an appointment as good, compared with a CCG average of 84.2% and a national average of 73.3%.
- 43.8% usually wait 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen, compared with a CCG average of 64.5% and a national average of 64.8%.
- 43.3% feel they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with a CCG average of 62.2% and a national average of 57.7%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received eight comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Comments made were that the medical practice was superb, always good, staff always helpful, very pleased with the up keep of the waiting room.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure that health and safety risk assessments are regularly reviewed.

Carisbrooke Health Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Carisbrooke Health Centre

The Carisbrooke Health Centre is located at 22 Carisbrooke High Street, Newport, Isle of Wight, PO30 1NR.

The practice has an NHS General Medical Services contract to provide health services to approximately 10500 patients. The practice has a large catchment area covering the centre of the Isle of Wight. The practice has patients in four residential homes and one nursing home. The practice supports patients in one home for people with learning disabilities and one home with supported living for people with mental health issues. The practice has six schools nearby.

Carisbrooke health Centre has been a training practice for 15 years with three registered trainers and they currently have two ST3 GP trainees. They are part of a pilot project which started in August 2015 for FY1 trainees in General Practice.

The practice is open between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are available from 08.30am to 6.00pm. Extended hours surgeries were offered at the following times on four days of the week from 07.30am and if required after 6.00pm. Urgent appointments were also

available for people who needed them. Routine appointments could be made well in advance usually up to a maximum of two months. Appointments could be made by phone, on line or by visiting the practice.

The practice told us that based on data for the last eight weeks they offered 193 clinical appointments per 1,000 population per week. 107 are with GPs and 86 with nurses.

The practice offers online booking of appointments and requesting prescriptions.

The practice has opted out of providing out-of-hours services to their own patients and refers them to the Isle of Wight Out of Hours service via the NHS 111 service.

The practice has six GP partners, four female and two male, and a male salaried GP. The practice has six practice nurses and two health care assistants. The GPs and the nursing staff are supported by a practice manager, an assistant practice manager and a team of 15 administration staff who carry out administration, reception, scanning documents and secretarial duties.

The practice was last inspected by the Care Quality Commission under our previous inspection procedures in March 2014. This was a follow up inspection and the practice was found to be compliant with the Health and Social Care regulations.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

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

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.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 28 October 2015. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how people were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed 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 are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks 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 also a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, a patient was given a white top pot for a urine sample. The practice realised that red top pots are required for mid-stream urine samples so patients are now given red and white top pots and the patient was given information of which pot to use.

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

Overview of safety systems and processes.

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs 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 relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level 3 for safeguarding children.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that nurses would act as chaperones, if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a disclosure and barring check (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 drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable Health Care Assistants to administer vaccinations.
- We reviewed three personnel files and found that 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 managed.

- The practice did not regularly review the health and safety risk assessments. We saw that although the practice had a health and safety mission statement and risk assessment. There were procedures in place for monitoring and these were out of date. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the staff rest area.

Are services safe?

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

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. There was also a first aid kit and accident book available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment.

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people.

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 99.3% of the total number of points available, with 14.2% exception reporting. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014-2015 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the clinical commissioning group (CCG) and national average. The practice was 3.3 percentage points above the CCG average and 9.6 percentage points above the England average.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was similar to the CCG and above the England national average by 2.2 percentage points.
- Performance for mental health related indicators better than the CCG by 3.2 percentage points and the England average by 7.2 percentage points.
- The dementia diagnosis rate was better than the CCG and national average.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been six clinical audits completed in the last two years, several of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.

- The practice participated in applicable 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 of an audit of patients on warfarin and aspirin. Several patients had agreed to take a proton pump inhibitor (PPI) to reduce risk of developing dyspepsia (indigestion) and gastrointestinal bleeding.

Effective staffing.

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

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed non-clinical members of staff that 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 e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme.
- 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 these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included on-going support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for the revalidation of doctors. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing.

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring people to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs and to assess and plan on-going care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they are discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a five week rotation basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Consent to care and treatment.

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, 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, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through records to ensure it met the practice's responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Health promotion and prevention.

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

- These included patients in the last months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.

- The practice supported a Public Health Nurse to develop electronic access of lab results and a video of a doctor explaining what the results mean. The first video has been developed with one of the GPs and the next step is to start implementing it. This project had support from the local specialists as well as the National Health Executive.
- Smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice had a system for ensuring results were received for every sample sent as part of the cervical screening programme. The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80.33%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81.88%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 91.4% to 93.8% and five year olds from 86.2% to 96.6%. Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 62.75%, and at risk groups 36.2%. These were below CCG and national averages. The practice told us that this low number was due to not ordering sufficient stocks and a general shortage of supplies across the Isle of Wight in 2014. There had also been a cold chain failure, when a builder accidentally switched off a fridge and the stock had to be disposed of. In 2015 the practice had made sure that sufficient stocks were ordered and there had been process put into place to ensure that the fridges would not be switched off.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy.

We observed that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated people 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 and that conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed and they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

All of the eight patient CQC 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. 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 doctors and nurses. For example:

- 90.8% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91.2% and national average of 88.6%.
- 94.7% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 88.6%, national average 86.6%).
- 98.7% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96.4%, national average 95.2%)
- 93.4% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 89.2% national average 85.1%).
- 87.2% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 93.4, national average 90.4%).

- 94.7% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 92%, national average 86.8%)

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment.

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

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients 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:

- 90.2% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 88.6% and national average of 86%.
- 83.5% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 83.4%, national average 81.4%)

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

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment.

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

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

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them. 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.

- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients / patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities, hearing loop and translation services available.
- There were routine and emergency appointments outside school hours. The practice encourages children and teenagers to come to them for minor injuries. This works well as they have 3 schools located in close vicinity.
- Phlebotomy was offered in the practice and in the last year the practice has implemented extended hours in the mornings, which include extra phlebotomy appointments.
- The practice is a dementia friendly practice. Staff have had training to recognise and bring issues to the clinicians.

Access to the service.

The practice was open between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 08.30am to 6.00pm. Extended hours surgeries were offered at the following times on four days of the week from 07.30am and if required after 6.00pm. Urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them. Routine appointments could be made well in advance usually up to a maximum of two months. Appointments could be made by phone, on line or by visiting the practice.

The practice had appointments available each day of the week with the practice nurse for minor injuries such as cuts and bruises, splinters, bee or wasp stings etc.

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

- 83.3% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 83.5% and national average of 74.9%.
- 87.1% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 87.6%, national average 73.3%).
- 80.8% patients described their experience of making an appointment as good (CCG average 84.2%, national average 73.3%).

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.

We looked at seven complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way and with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a verbal complaint about the attitude of staff was made. This was investigated quickly and an apology made to the patient. Lessons learned about customer service was then updated in the practice protocols. We saw feedback from patients that the staff treated them with respect and dignity and were very caring.

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 which 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
- There was a comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice
- There was a programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which is used to monitor quality and to make improvements
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions

Leadership, openness and transparency.

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

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

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- the practice gives affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology

- They kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

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

- Staff told us that the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings, were confident in doing so and felt supported if they did. We also noted that team away days were held every three months across the whole of the Isle Of Wight practices.
- 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.

- It had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and from complaints received. There was an active PPG which met on a regular basis, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, patients requested that all the toilets were re decorated. This was completed and received good feedback from patients.
- The practice had also gathered feedback from staff through staff away days and generally 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.

Continuous improvement.

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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

the core team being comprised of a GP, a practice nurse, a district nurse, the community matron, the care navigator

and social services. The aim is to facilitate better communication between the community teams to avoid duplication and move care forward in a co-ordinated and integrated way.