

Whitechapel Health Centre

Quality Report

44 Hessel Street
London
E1 2LP

Tel: 020 7702 2036

Website: www.whitechapelhealthcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 19 April 2016

Date of publication: 17/11/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10
Areas for improvement	10
Outstanding practice	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Whitechapel Health Centre	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Whitechapel Health Centre on 19 April 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.
- The practice had a 0% exception reporting rate.
- The practice had an in-house Bengali translator that managed the recall system and translated for the patient participation group.
- 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 in different languages 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.
- To engage hard to reach patients on the topic of mental health, the practice worked with a charity to produce a video to tackle the issues, this video was shared with 50 practices, translated into three different languages and is used as a training tool by seven NHS trusts.

Summary of findings

We saw an area of outstanding practice

- Due to the practice having a low proportion of patients completing bowel screening tests, reception staff were trained to use bowel screening kits and the practice produced a video in Bengali, which was shared with other practices in the borough of Tower Hamlets with a high population of Bengali speaking patients that explained how to use the kits and the reason behind the testing. This video was played in the waiting area and a link to the video was on the

practice website. Reception staff would phone all patients who had not completed the bowel screening and spoke them through the process as well as explaining the importance of the test.

The area the practice should make improvement is:

- Work to improve the GP patient satisfaction scores.

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

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 at or above average compared to the national average.
- The practice produced and shared a video in Bengali on the reasons behind bowel screening and how to use the bowel screening kits.
- The practice employed an interpreter who carried out patient recalls via a telephone call in the language of the patient's choice.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. This included securing an in-house multilingual phlebotomist to make blood tests more convenient for patients who found attending other clinics difficult and whose first language was not English.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand, available in other languages and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.

Good



Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice was a part of the Everyone Counts Scheme, which focuses on patients aged over 75 years old.

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.
- Patients received a telephone reminder of their nurse appointment on the morning of their appointment.
- Recall was carried out by an interpreter to ensure that patients understood the importance of their appointments.
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register with a record of a foot examination and risk classification in the preceding 12 months was 96% compared with a national average of 88%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- 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.
- 83% of women aged 25 to 64 had a record of a cervical screening test documented in their record in the preceding five years compared to 82% nationally.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- The practice offered extended hours four days a week and was open on a Saturday for patients who were unable to attend the practice during normal working hours.

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

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).

- 89% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 84%.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychosis who have a comprehensive agreed care plan documented in the record was 84% compared to a national average of 88%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice told patients experiencing poor mental health how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice worked with a local charity to make a video advising patients of mental health issues, which was translated into other languages and shared with other practices and NHS trusts.
- 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.
- Patients received a telephone reminder of their appointment on the morning that they were due to be seen.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in January 2016. The results showed the practice was generally performing in line with local and national averages. Four hundred and twelve survey forms were distributed and 64 were returned. This represented 0.7% of the practice's patient list.

- 68% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 62% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 73% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 64% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 63 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. There was a recurring theme of professional caring staff.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

The area the practice should make improvement is:

- Work to improve the GP patient satisfaction scores.

Outstanding practice

We saw an area of outstanding practice

- Due to the practice having a low proportion of patients completing bowel screening tests, reception staff were trained to use bowel screening kits and the practice produced a video in Bengali, which was shared with other practices in the borough of Tower Hamlets with a high population of Bengali speaking

patients that explained how to use the kits and the reason behind the testing. This video was played in the waiting area and a link to the video was on the practice website. Reception staff would phone all patients who had not completed the bowel screening and spoke them through the process as well as explaining the importance of the test.

Whitechapel 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 GP specialist adviser, a second CQC inspector and a practice nurse specialist adviser.

Background to Whitechapel Health Centre

Whitechapel Health Centre is located in a building conversion in East London within a residential area. The practice is a part of Tower Hamlets Clinical Commissioning Group and is managed by AT Medics, who took over the management of the practice in September 2014.

There are 8867 patients registered at the practice 85% of which are of Bengali origin.

The practice has one male and one female salaried GPs, three regular locum GPs carrying out 27 sessions per week and a male physicians associate carrying out six sessions per week. There are two female practice nurses carrying out 10 sessions per week, a female nurse practitioner carrying out eight sessions per week and a health care assistant completing eight sessions per week. The practice also has a phlebotomist carrying out five sessions per week. There are two management team members and eight reception/administration staff members.

The practice operates under a Personal Medical Service Contract (PMS) (a locally agreed alternative to the standard GMS contract used when services are agreed locally with a practice which may include additional services beyond the standard contract).

The practice is open Monday to Thursday 8:00am to 8:00pm and Friday 8:00am to 6:30pm, the phone lines are open from 8:00am. Appointment times are as follows:

- Monday 8:30am to 7:30pm
- Tuesday 8:00am to 1:20pm and 2:10pm to 7:30pm
- Wednesday 8:00am to 12:30pm and 1:10pm to 7:30pm
- Thursday 8:15am to 1:20pm and 1:30pm to 7:30pm
- Friday 8:00am to 12:15pm and 1:10pm to 5:30pm
- Saturday 9:00am to 1:00pm

The out of hours provider covers calls made whilst the practice is closed.

Whitechapel Health Centre operates regulated activities from one location and is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide surgical procedures, maternity and midwifery services, treatment of disease, disorder and injury and screening procedures.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive programme. This location had not previously been inspected.

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

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 19 April 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GP's, nurses, managers and administration/reception staff. We also spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, we saw a completed significant event form about the practice phone system not working so patients were unable to contact the practice and the company were contacted to resolve the problem informed the practice they no longer had a contract with them. We viewed minutes of meetings where this was discussed and the agreed outcome was to ensure the business continuity plan was always updated.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements

reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead GP member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and nurses were trained to child safeguarding level 3 and non-clinical staff level 1.

- A notice in the waiting room and consultation rooms advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Regular infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure 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. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. She received mentorship and

Are services safe?

support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.

- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

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

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 97% of the total number of points available, with an exception reporting rate of 0% (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 and had a policy to not exception report patients. Data from QOF showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. For example the percentage of patients on the diabetes register with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 96% compared with the national average of 88%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. For example the percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face to face review in the preceding 12 months was 89% compared with the national average of 84%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been eight clinical audits completed in the last two years, four of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result of a patient safety alert into the safe prescribing of warfarin led to the practice carrying out an audit. On initial audit 92% of patients being prescribed warfarin had an alert on their record, 42% of patients had a record of international normalised ratio (INR) in their notes in the last three months. On re-audit 100% of patients who were being prescribed warfarin had an alert on their record stating it and 100% of patients had an INR recording in the record in the last three months.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as: due to some low QOF scores, the practice began calling patients on the morning of their nurses appointment to reduce the 'did not attend' rate and enabled the interpreters to manage the recall system, this led to an increase in the average blood test result of HbA1c for patients with diabetes from 60.63% to 71.4% over a 12 month period.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.

- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, patients living with cancer, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- Diet and smoking advice was available on the premises.
- We saw an area of outstanding practice, reception staff were trained to use bowel screening kits and the practice produced a video in Bengali, which was shared with other Tower Hamlets practices with a high population of Bengali speaking patients that explained how to use the kits and the reason behind the testing. This video was played in the waiting area and a link to the video was on the practice website. Reception staff would phone all patients who had not completed the bowel screening and spoke them through the process as well as explaining the importance of the test.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 83%, which was above the national average of 74%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients before their appointment and also to 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.

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

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 94% to 95% compared to a CCG average of 92% to 93% and a national average of 73% to 93%. Vaccinations for five year olds from 55% to 92% compared to a CCG average of 21% to 94% and a national average of 81% to 95%.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- 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 63 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with two members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. 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 mostly in line with local and national averages for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 81% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 84% and the national average of 89%.
- 84% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 87%.
- 86% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 95%.

- 80% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 78% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 85% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 87%.

The practice was aware of its low satisfaction score for nurses, it was said to be due to the numerous changes being made to the practice over time, we saw that the practice was working alongside the PPG to improve this, which included increasing the number of nurse appointments and creating a poster that explains what illnesses nurses can treat. The practice expects the improvement to be seen in time for the next survey.

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 slightly below local and national averages. For example:

- 78% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 86%.
- 72% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 74% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

Are services caring?

- 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.
- Health promotion videos were played in the patient waiting area in other languages.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 89 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them and the practice offered carers an annual review to ensure that their personal health needs were being met.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. This included securing an in-house multilingual phlebotomist to make blood tests more convenient for patients who found attending other clinics difficult and whose first language was not English.

- The practice offered extended hours on Monday to Thursday evenings until 7.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice used leaflets with bigger print and braille for patients with a visual impairment.

Access to the service

The practice is open Monday to Thursday 8:00am to 8:00pm and Friday 8:00am to 6:30pm, the phone lines are open from 8:00am. Appointment times are as follows:

- Monday 8:30am to 7:30pm
- Tuesday 8:00am to 1:20pm and 2:10pm to 7:30pm
- Wednesday 8:00am to 12:30pm and 1:10pm to 7:30pm
- Thursday 8:15am to 1:20pm and 1:30pm to 7:30pm
- Friday 8:00am to 12:15pm and 1:10pm to 5:30pm
- Saturday 9:00am to 1:00pm

The out of hours provider covers calls made whilst the practice is closed.

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 84% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 68% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

We looked at eight complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For

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

example, we viewed a complaint from a patient about not receiving all the medication they requested. We saw that

the practice contacted the patient with an apology, carried out an investigation and discussed in a practice meeting, where measures were put into place to ensure that it did not happen again.

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 and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

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

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG), which meets every two months, has approximately 45 patients attend each meeting and uses an interpreter. The practice also gathers feedback through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, as a result of a request from the PPG the practice created a which clinician does what poster to put in the patient waiting area to enable patients to know who best to book an appointment with. The PPG also initiated Zumba classes, which took place in the

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

practice on a weekly basis and with the practices help petitioned the local council to provide a park gym in a park close to the practice to enable patients to be able to exercise for free without gym costs.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through a staff survey, 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 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. For example to engage hard to reach patients on the topic of mental health, the practice worked with a charity to produce a video to tackle the issues, this video was shared with 50 practices, translated into three different languages and is used as a training tool by seven NHS trusts.