

Keats Group Practice

Quality Report

1B Downshire Hill
Hampstead
London NW3 1NR
Tel: 0844 477 3102
Website: www.keatsgrouppractice.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 10 May 2016
Date of publication: 06/07/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service		Good	
Are services safe?		Good	
Are services effective?		Good	
Are services caring?		Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?		Good	
Are services well-led?		Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Keats Group Practice	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 on 10 May 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- 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.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were above local and national averages and had improved slightly over the past 12 months.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Summary of findings

- We saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and that they maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- Patients said they generally found it easy to make an appointment, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- Results from the GP patient survey indicated that a lower percentage of patients when compared to local and national averages were happy with the practice opening hours. However, we noted that routine pre-booked appointments were available before 9.00 am and after 6.30 pm, for patients not able to attend during normal working hours.
- Patients told us the practice was accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



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

Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active, although engagement between the group and the practice could be improved.
- There was a 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.

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- GPs made monthly visits to local sheltered accommodation.
- The practice maintained an Avoiding Unplanned Admissions register of 154 patients, all of whom had up-to-date care plans.
- The practice maintained a “Gold Standard” palliative care register of 11 patients.
- The practice had a register of 1026 patients prescribed more than four medicines and records showed that reviews had been carried out in respect of 906 (88%).

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- 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.
- Data showed that the practice was performing above local and national averages in relation to diabetes care. It maintained a register of 233 patients with diabetes and had carried out annual foot checks on 215 (92%) of the patients.
- The practice maintained a register of 89 patients with heart failure, of whom 83 had had an annual medicines review.
- The percentage of patients on the practice’s asthma register, who have had a review in the preceding 12 months was above the local and national average.

Summary of findings

Families, children and young people

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

Good



- There were systems in place to identify 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 and maintained a register of vulnerable children.
- Immunisation rates for all standard childhood immunisations were comparable with the local average.
- 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.
- 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 and health visitors.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

Good



- The 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.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme in 2014/15 was 85%, which was 4% above the national average.
- Data showed that 3706 patients (93% of those eligible) had undergone blood pressure checks.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

Good



- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability. It maintained a register of 13 patients and had carried out annual follow ups and care plan reviews in relation to their care.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- Data showed that 65 patients (being 85% of 77 patients on the dementia register) had had their care reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months, above both local and national averages.
- 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.
- Continuity of care for patients experiencing poor mental health was prioritised.
- Data showed that 88 patients, being 95% of those with severe mental health problems, had an agreed care plan documented in their records.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The latest national GP patient survey results were published in January 2016 and covered the periods January - March 2015 and July - September 2015. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and thirty-three survey forms were distributed and 103 were returned. This represented roughly 1% of the practice's list of approximately 10,800 patients.

- 76% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the local average of 76% and the 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 the local average of 84% and the national average of 85%.
- 75% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the local average of 81% and the national average of 85%).

- 88% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the local average of 77% and the national average of 78%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 39 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received, saying that staff were friendly, supportive and helpful, and that the premises were always clean. They said that GPs and clinical team took time to explain healthcare issues and involved them in decision making.

We spoke with eight patients during the inspection, together with five members of the patient participation group. All the patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

The latest available Friends and Family Test results showed that of 133 patients who had responded, 125 were "extremely likely" to recommend the practice.

Keats Group Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Keats Group Practice

The Keats Group Practice operates from 1B Downshire Hill, Hampstead, London NW3 1NR, premises which the practice leases. It is close to Hampstead underground and Hampstead Heath overground stations with good transport links.

The practice provides NHS services through a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract to approximately 10,800 patients. It is part of the NHS Camden Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) which is made up of 36 general practices. The practice is registered with the CQC to carry out the following regulated activities - diagnostic and screening procedures, treatment of disease, disorder or injury, family planning, maternity and midwifery services and surgical procedures. The patient profile for the practice has a higher than average working age population, and higher than average younger children; the numbers of teenage children, younger adults and older patients are lower than the national average.

The practice has a clinical team of five partner GPs (two female and three male) and five salaried GPs (four female and one male). Two of the partner GPs work five clinical sessions per week; two of them work three sessions and the other works two sessions. One of the salaried GPs works five sessions; three others work two sessions and the

remaining salaried GP works one and half sessions per week. There is a nurse practitioner, two practice nurses and a healthcare assistant. The practice also employs a counsellor. It is a training practice, with five registrars (trainee GPs) currently placed there. There is a practice manager and a patient services manager, with six receptionists. The practice team is completed by an administration and research team of four staff.

The practice's opening hours are 8.00 am to 8.00 pm, Monday, Tuesday and Thursday; 8.00 am to 7.30 pm on Wednesday; and 8.00 am to 6.30 pm on Friday. The lunch break is between 1.00 pm and 2.00 pm. Phones are answered between 8.00 am and 7.30 pm on Monday to Thursday and from 8.00 am to 6.30 pm on Friday. After 6.30 pm, the telephone lines are for routine enquiries only; emergency calls are redirected to the out-of-hours service. The practice is closed at weekends. Morning consultation sessions are from 8.00 am to 12 noon on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday; and from 7.00 am to 12 noon on Wednesday. Afternoon / evening sessions are 3.00 pm to 8.00 pm on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday; 3.00 pm to 7.15 on Wednesday; and 3.00 pm to 6.30 pm on Friday. Walk-in and emergency appointments are available in the morning between 9.00 am and 12 noon, and in the afternoon between 3.00 pm and 6.30 pm. Consultation slots between 7.00 am to 9.00 am and 6.30 pm to 8.00 pm are reserved for pre-booked routine appointments.

Routine appointments with GPs and the nurse practitioner can be booked up to two weeks in advance. Booked appointments are 15 minutes long; walk-in and emergency appointments are 10 minutes long. Patients may book double appointments if there are a number of healthcare issues to discuss. The practice nurses provide a number of clinical services, for which a number of appointments can be booked in advance. Appointments with GPs can be booked online by patients who have previously registered to use the system, and there is a 24-hour automated

Detailed findings

telephone booking system. Patients who have provided the practice with their mobile telephone numbers are sent text reminders of their appointments. The GPs conduct telephone consultations with patients and make home visits. Patients can also seek routine advice from GPs by email, which are dealt with by the day's duty GP.

The practice has opted out of providing an out-of-hours service. Patients calling the practice when it is closed are connected with the local out-of-hours service provider. There is information given about the out-of-hours provider and the NHS 111 service on the practice website.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of the practice 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.

The practice had not been inspected previously.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 10 May 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including partner GPs and a salaried GP, the practice nurses, the practice counsellor,

practice manager and members of the administrative team. We also spoke with 13 patients who used the service, including five members of the patient participation group.

- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Two partner GPs shared responsibility for leading on significant events and incidents. 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 had a detailed procedure for recording and investigating significant events, to ensure a thorough analysis of the significant events was carried out. We saw that events were discussed at monthly meetings and all staff were encouraged to contribute to discussions. In addition, significant events were reviewed annually to identify trends and review performance.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw that the clinical team received safety alerts individually and the alerts were collated and filed by the administrative team. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, there had been 15 incidents treated as significant events in the previous 12 months. In January 2016, a mechanical fault with the gas boiler led to the fuses being tripped and cutting the electrical power supply to the premises. There was a delay in reinstating the supply as the staff members present were not aware of the location of all the fuse boards. The practice investigated the incident and revised its Disaster Management Plan to include details of the fuse board locations, so that staff could quickly access them and restore power in similar circumstances in the future.

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. Two of the partner GPs led on adult and child safeguarding respectively and both had named deputies. Safeguarding was a standing item on the monthly full team meeting agenda. The practice ran monthly records searches to monitor cases. There were monthly meetings with health visitors to discuss new and ongoing concerns. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. We saw minutes of two meetings that had been held at the practice relating to a particular case. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role; GPs, the practice nurses and the healthcare assistant were trained to child safeguarding level 3, with the other staff being trained to level 1.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. The practice policy was that members of the clinical team performed chaperoning duties. We saw evidence that they had received formal training and that repeat Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks had been carried out. 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. Three members of the administrative team had also been trained as cover and had DBS checks completed.
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. Cleaning was undertaken by a contractor following agreed written cleaning schedules. Monthly review meetings with the contractor were held and there was a communications book allowing comments and messages to be passed to the cleaners. Clinical waste was collected weekly and disposed of by a licensed contractor. The nurse practitioner was the

Are services safe?

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 carried out, together with weekly monitoring and spot checks and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. Equipment we inspected was in date and fit for use. Curtains in the treatment and consultation rooms had a note affixed of when they were put up and were changed at least every six months. The practice had spillage kits and a sufficient supply of personal protective equipment, such as surgical gloves, aprons and masks. All medical instruments were single-use. Notices advising on procedures relating to sharps injuries were posted in the treatment and consultation rooms. Staff we spoke with were aware of the appropriate procedures to follow.

- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal. Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow the nurse to administer medicines in line with legislation. We noted that several PGDs were out of date and discussed them with staff; they were reviewed and updated straight away. The health care assistant was trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber. The practice appropriately monitored and recorded stocks of medicines and vaccines. We saw that the vaccines fridge temperature was also monitored and recorded. All the medicines and vaccines we saw were within date and fit for use.
- We reviewed five 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 Criminal Records Bureau or 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 reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. Firefighting equipment, the fire alarm and emergency lighting had been checked and serviced in June 2015 and a fire risk assessment had been carried out. Staff had undertaken annual fire awareness e-learning. The annual testing of electrical equipment had been carried out in June 2015. The annual inspection and calibration of medical equipment had commenced in February 2016 and been completed in April 2016. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health, infection control and legionella, a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings. This included monthly sampling for analysis and temperature monitoring. The practice sent us evidence confirming that a comprehensive clinical risk safety assessment was booked for June 2016. A record was maintained of staff members' immunisation status.

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, which was checked on a regular basis. We saw that the pads were in date and the battery was charged ready for use. There was also a supply of emergency oxygen with adult's and children's masks. There was a first aid kit and accident recording book was used.

Are services safe?

- 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 disaster management in place, which had been reviewed and updated recently following a power failure. It included arrangements for the service to be provided from alternative nearby premises. The plan contained 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. One of the partner GPs co-ordinated the process for dealing with NICE guidelines received. Guidelines and alerts were collated in an alerts folder and passed on to clinicians by email. They were also discussed at practice meetings.
- 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 recently published results related to 2014/15 and were 98.9% of the total number of points available being 5.7% above the CCG average and 4.2% above the national average. The practice's clinical exception rate was 5.9%, which was 1.7% below the CCG average and 3.3% below the national average. Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects.

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 99.6%, being 10.3% above the CCG average and 10.4% above the national average.
- Performance for hypertension related indicators was 100%, being 2.5% above the CCG average and 2.2% above the national average.

- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100%, being 10.1% above CCG Average, and 7.2% above the national average.

The practice provided us with data for 2015/16 which showed that similar figures were attained for the year and the overall score had improved to 99.7%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit. There had been 14 clinical audits carried out in the last two years. Of these, five were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. An example was an audit of patients prescribed oral nutritional supplements. Results showed an improvement in how their care was provided – prescribing was reduced by nearly a third between the audit cycles; the recording of patients' Body Mass Index increased from 58% to 90% to 100% over the course of the three cycles; and the recording of ACBS indications (the underlying diagnosis which led to the supplements being prescribed) had increased from 88% to 95% to 100%. The audit record included a summary of the key points, matters for reflection and an action plan for future monitoring.

The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research. The practice was one of four local practices that made up a research group, for which one of the partner GPs was the lead. We saw an example research paper they had written relating to "Improving management of schizophrenia and severe mental illnesses in general practice".

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 had a suitable information pack for use by locum GPs employed from time to time. Staff told us that the few locums used had been trainees at the practice and therefore knew it well.
- 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support the Mental Capacity Act and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of a range of e-learning training modules and in-house training.
- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support and signposted them to the relevant service. 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. The practice had identified 732 patients as smokers and had offered advice to 673 (92%) of them.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme for 2014/15 was 85%, which was 4% above the national average. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to the local averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 85% to 91% and five year olds from 68% to 93%.

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. Data showed that 3,706 patients (being 93% of those eligible for the

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 fortnightly basis, by tele-conferencing, and at monthly face-to-face meetings, 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

tests) had undergone them in the last five years.
Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health
assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities
or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 39 patient comment cards we received and the 13 patients we spoke with 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 and patients we spoke with 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's satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses were generally above local averages. For example -

- 89% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 89%.
- 88% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.
- 84% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern, compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 85%.
- 84% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern, compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 91%.

- 83% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful, compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 89% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 86%.
- 85% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 82%.
- 74% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 85%.

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

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

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.

Are services caring?

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 294 patients as carers, being approximately 2.7% of the practice list. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. The practice had appointed one of the administrative staff as "Carers' Champion". It was their role to be the first point of contact for carers and to help direct them to the services and support available.

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. We saw information about bereavement services was available in the waiting area.

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.

- Routine pre-booked appointments were available before 9.00 am and after 6.30 pm for patients not able to attend during normal working hours.
- Routine appointments could be booked up to two weeks in advance. Follow up appointments, requested by clinicians, could be booked up to four weeks in advance.
- Walk-in and emergency consultations were available for children and those patients with medical problems which required urgent consultation.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- All patients could request a telephone consultation, avoiding the need to attend the practice. They could also access GPs by email for routine issues.
- There were disabled facilities, translation services and a portable hearing loop available.
- Appointments could be booked, and repeat prescription requested, online. There was a 24-hour automated phone booking system.
- Text reminders, regarding appointments and regular routine monitoring, were sent to patients who had provided their mobile phone numbers.

Access to the service

The practice's opening hours were 8.00 am to 8.00 pm, Monday, Tuesday and Thursday; 8.00 am to 7.30 pm on Wednesday; and 8.00 am to 6.30 pm on Friday. The lunch break was between 1.00 pm and 2.00 pm. Phones were answered between 8.00 am and 7.30 pm on Monday to Thursday and from 8.00 am to 6.30 pm on Friday. After 6:30 pm, the telephone lines were for routine enquiries only; emergency calls were redirected to the out-of-hours service. The practice closed at weekends. Morning consultation sessions were from 8.00 am to 12 noon on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday; and from 7.00 am

to 12 noon on Wednesday. Afternoon / evening sessions were 3.00 pm to 8.00 pm on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday; 3.00 pm to 7.15 on Wednesday; and 3.00 pm to 6.30 pm on Friday. Walk-in and emergency appointments were available in the morning between 9.00 am and 12 noon, and in the afternoon between 3.00 pm and 6.30 pm. Consultation slots between 7.00 am to 9.00 am and 6.30 pm to 8.00 pm were reserved for pre-booked routine appointments.

The practice had opted out of providing an out-of-hours service. Patients calling the practice when it is closed were connected with the local out-of-hours service provider. There was information given about the out-of-hours provider and the NHS 111 service on the practice website.

In addition to booking appointments, repeat prescriptions could be requested online and the practice used the Electronic Prescription System to allow patients' prescription to be sent electronically to a pharmacy of their choice. There was also a telephone 24-hour automated appointment booking system.

We saw from the results of the national GP patient survey showed that most patients were happy with their experience of contacting the practice by phone - 76% of patients said they could get through easily compared to the local average of 76% and the national average of 73%. However, 61% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the local average of 71% and the national average of 75%. None of the patients we spoke with, or any of the comments cards we received, referred to opening hours being a problem. Two of the comment cards mentioned difficulties with the automated telephone booking system.

Patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get emergency, same-day appointments when they needed them.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- 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.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. There were notices posted around the premises and a complaints leaflet available both at the practice and on its website.

We saw that nine complaints had been made during the last 12 months. The complaints were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, with openness and transparency. They were monitored and discussed at monthly meetings and reviewed on an annual basis. Monitoring information regarding complaints was also shared with the patient

participation group. The complaints were analysed to identify any trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, following a complaint about patients' medication reviews, the practice involved the patient participation group in producing a guidance leaflet explaining the reasons why the reviews are needed, the benefits of having them done, and the required frequency. The leaflet was available in the waiting area and had been uploaded onto the practice website.

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's aims and objectives were set out in its statement of purpose. The aims were -

- "To work in partnership with other agencies to tackle the causes of, as well as provide the treatment for ill health.
- To operate on a financially sound basis.
- To ensure all staff have the competency and motivation to deliver the required standards of care.
- To ensure all patients and their carers have a positive experience.
- To manage patients who are ill or believe themselves to be ill with conditions from which recovery is generally expected.
- To manage patients who are terminally ill.
- To provide a service which includes the management of patients with chronic disease.
- To provide ongoing treatment and care to all registered and temporary patients taking account of their specific needs.
- To provide primary care medical services required in core hours for the immediately necessary treatment of any person within our practice area owing to an accident or emergency.
- To provide any Locally Enhanced Services (LESS), or their equivalent, which may be commissioned from the practice by the CCG, Local Authority or the NHS Commissioning Board for the benefit of our patients when resources allow us to do."

It included the practice's policy statement -

- "The doctors, nurses and administration team seek to provide services that promote health, to detect and prevent ill health and offer treatment and total care for all patients registered at the practice.
- We will provide this care regardless of race, colour, ethnic or national origins, age, gender, sexuality, employment status, mental health status, homelessness, class, HIV status or religion. We welcome diversity and aim to be non-judgemental and open minded about differing philosophies of health care, to deliver safe, high quality services, and to provide excellence at all times."

The practice also had a published charter on display in the waiting area. It had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the aims 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.
- 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 arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

The partner GPs 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 partner GPs were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of the practice team.

The practice 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 partner GPs 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.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings. We saw minutes confirming these took place weekly.
- 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.
- 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 partner GPs 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. We saw that comments and suggestions forms were available in the waiting area and the practice website had facilities for patients to submit them electronically.

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG was first established in 2003 and was re-launched in its current format in 2011. At the time of the inspection, it consisted of eight patients, one of whom was the chair, and an additional 85 members of the "virtual PPG" who were contacted by email and who were able to take part in the work of the PPG. It met regularly and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. We saw the annual PPG for 2014/15, which highlighted three areas – (1) to increase the group's representation in the local CCG; (2) to review complaints and concerns regarding patient access and services, and how they were managed by the practice; and (3) to gain a better understanding of the frontline services and appointment system and to improve communication between the practice, patients and the PPG. As a consequence, one PPG member was accepted onto the board for the North Locality Patient Alliance Group and another was voted to the board of the Camden Public Patient Engagement Group. A PPG member was appointed as contact for complaints review and assessment. All virtual PPG members were personally invited to a meeting; two members of the core group spent some time observing reception staff to gain a better understanding of their work;

a member of the group met with the practice manager to understand more about the appointment system. In addition, email addresses of all virtual group members were passed to the core PPG to improve communications with virtual group. We saw minutes of PPG meetings, which evidenced that complaints and suggestions were reviewed, that practice performance generally was monitored, including a review and comparison of current and past GP Patient Survey results, and that guest speakers attended to address the group on specified topics.

The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals, general discussion and staff surveys. 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 focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. For example, a staff member told us they had requested training in a particular field which would further their career development and this had been readily arranged by the practice.

The practice held daily clinical meetings to pass on and discuss notable aspects of care and there were monthly educational meetings. There were frequent practice development afternoons. In addition to being a training practice for GPs, nursing students often attended to further their education and development.

The practice participated in a research group of four local practices and one of the partner GPs was the lead. We saw that research themes included all six of the patient population groups – 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; and People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia).

Staff told us of the practice's commitment to delivering consistent high quality services, with ongoing improvement; to growing as a learning organisation, working with the local GP federation and to research.