

Parsonage Surgery

Quality Report

Cavell Drive Off Haymeads Lane
Bishops Stortford
Hertfordshire
CM23 5JH
Tel: 01279 827608
Website: parsonagesurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 14 July 2016
Date of publication: 14/10/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Overall summary | 2 |
| The five questions we ask and what we found | 4 |
| The six population groups and what we found | 7 |
| What people who use the service say | 11 |
| Areas for improvement | 11 |

Detailed findings from this inspection

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Our inspection team | 12 |
| Background to Parsonage Surgery | 12 |
| Why we carried out this inspection | 12 |
| How we carried out this inspection | 12 |
| Detailed findings | 14 |

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Parsonage Surgery on 14 July 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. However systems relating recording of monitoring information of historic safety alerts and children not attending hospital appointments (DNA) needed strengthening.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

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

The areas where the provider should:

- Continue to monitor the recently implemented system to monitor historic safety alerts.

Summary of findings

- Continue to monitor the recently implemented protocol to code those children who had failed to attend a hospital appointment (DNA) so they could be easily identified and acted on.
- Ensure modifications to the access doors to the practice are carried through as planned in conjunction with the facilities directorate of Essex Community Hospital so access to patients with limited mobility can be improved.
- Continue to monitor patient survey results and ensure improvement to access to the practice over the phone.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Good



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. However systems relating recording of monitoring information of historic safety alerts and children not attending hospital appointments (DNA) needed strengthening.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, 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.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



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

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



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

Summary of findings

- 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. For example as part of the local federation of five local GP practices the practice was working with the CCG in developing planned and unplanned care pathways, including the development of an urgent care centre.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a 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 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
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

Good



Summary of findings

- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

Good



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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- All patients over 75 had a named accountable GP.
- All these patients were offered an over 75s health check.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice worked closely with Community Nursing Team and the Rapid Response Service (a service provided by the Hertfordshire County Council and East and North Hertfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group incorporating a partnership of health professionals social care workers to help people stay well and independent) and coordinated care at home.
- The practice had identified older patients at high risk of admissions to hospital (patients with multiple complex needs, and involving multiple agencies) and worked community services in planning support.
- The practice provided a vaccination service for the housebound.
- The practice offered spirometry, ECGs, ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ABPM) and phlebotomy services on site for the older patient avoiding the need to travel to a general hospital.
- The practice worked with local pharmacies and arranged the delivery of medicines to the housebound.

People with long term conditions

Good



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

- Nursing staff supported by the GP had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators were better than the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood glucose reading showed good control in the in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015), was 84%, compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 78%.

Summary of findings

- 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. These were arranged through One Stop Clinics which enabled patients to receive appropriate reviews and care in one appointment rather than multiple appointments throughout the year.
- 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.

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.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.
- The practice provided a variety of health promotion information leaflets and resources for this population group.
- The practice offered discreet referrals to the onsite Sexual Health Hertfordshire clinic for family planning and related screening such as chlamydia screening.

Good



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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 late evening appointments on Tuesday 6.30pm till 8pm and on Thursday from 6.30pm till 7.30pm for working patients and those who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- The practice provided telephone triage and ring back service by a duty GP at the patient's request where appropriate.
- The practice offered pre bookable appointments up to six weeks in advance which could be booked in person by telephone or online.
- The practice offered NHS Health checks smoking cessation advice and travel immunisations.
- The practice had enrolled in the Electronic Prescribing Service (EPS). This service enabled GPs to send prescriptions electronically to a pharmacy of the patient's choice.

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 support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice held regular health visitor liaison and multi-disciplinary team meetings to discuss the care needs of specific patients.
- The practice held regular review meetings involving district nurses, GP's and the local palliative care nurses for people that require end of life care and those on the palliative care register.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice identified patients who were also carers and signposted them to appropriate support.

Good



Summary of findings

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good



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

- 100% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was above the national average.
- The practice offered annual reviews to all patients on the mental health register which included physical checks.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations including the community drugs and alcohol team.
- Patients could self refer to the local Wellbeing Team through the practice reception.
- Patients attending the hospital memory clinic with a diagnosis of dementia and who were stabilised on their medication were managed by the practice avoiding frequent visits to the hospital clinic.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended A&E where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above the local and national averages. There were 289 survey forms distributed and 123 had been returned. This represented 43% return rate (3% of the practice's patient list).

- 57% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 63% and the national average of 73%.
- 84% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 76%.
- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 85%.

- 90% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 76% and 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. All of the six patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients felt the practice offered a helpful discreet service and staff were approachable caring willing to listen and had treated them with dignity and respect. A number of comments noted satisfaction with the reception staff.

We spoke with five patients during the inspection. All 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

- Continue to monitor the recently implemented system to monitor historic safety alerts.
- Continue to monitor the recently implemented protocol to code those children who had failed to attend a hospital appointment (DNA) so they could be easily identified and acted on.
- Ensure modifications to the access doors to the practice are carried through as planned in conjunction with the facilities directorate of Essex Community Hospital so access to patients with limited mobility can be improved.
- Continue to monitor patient survey results and ensure improvement to access to the practice over the phone.

Parsonage Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team also included a GP specialist advisor.

Background to Parsonage Surgery

Parsonage Surgery situated in Bishops Stortford, Hertfordshire is a GP practice which provides primary medical care for approximately 4,900 patients living in Bishops Stortford and surrounding areas.

Parsonage Surgery provides primary care services to local communities under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract, which is a nationally agreed contract between general practices and NHS England. The practice population is predominantly white British along with a small ethnic population of Asian Polish and other Eastern European origin. The practice has a large population of working age patients with young families.

The practice has two GP partners (one male and one female). There are two nurse prescribers supported by a health care assistant. There is a practice manager who is supported by a team of administrative and reception staff. The local NHS trust provides health visiting and community nursing services to patients at this practice.

This practice is located on the grounds of Herts and Essex Community Hospital and benefits from onsite parking which is pay and display. Adequate parking is also available for those patients with mobility issues.

The practice is open Monday to Friday from 8am to 6.30pm except on Tuesday when the practice is open until 8pm and

on Thursday when the practice is open until 7.30pm. The practice offers a variety of access routes including telephone appointments, on the day appointments and advance pre bookable appointments.

When the practice is closed services are provided by Herts Urgent Care via the 111 service.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before inspecting, 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 inspection on 14 July 2016.

During our inspection we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including the GPs, nursing staff, administration and reception staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being assisted.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

Detailed findings

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.

- The staff we spoke with knew the reporting process used at the practice and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. Staff would inform a GP or the practice manager of any incidents. The incident 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 support, 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. There was a consistent approach to investigations.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. For example, the practice had strengthened their procedures for cervical screening recall invitation letters to patients following an investigation of an incident.

The practice had a process in place to act on alerts that may affect patient safety, for example from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). The nurse practitioner we spoke with recalled the safety alert related to managing immunisation against meningococcal B disease for infants aged from two months and discussed actions had been taken as recommended. However the practice process was not explicit in relation to reviewing historic alerts. We spoke with the practice about this during the inspection. Following our inspection the practice confirmed that historic searches have been re-run and automatic searches have been set up for periodic re-runs.

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. A GP was the lead for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and provided reports where necessary for other agencies. There were regular meetings with the Health Visitor to discuss patients who were on the child protection register. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities. All staff had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to the appropriate level to manage child (level 3) and adult safeguarding.
- We reviewed how the practice reviewed those children who had failed to attend a hospital appointment (DNA). We found the practice did not have a protocol to code DNA notifications from the hospital so they could be easily identified and acted on. Following our inspection the practice confirmed that a protocol was now in place for level 3 trained clinician to contact guardians for reason for non-attendance.
- A notice in the waiting and in clinical rooms advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a risk assessment for the need for 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. Hand wash facilities, including soap dispensers were available throughout the practice. There were appropriate processes in place for the management of sharps (needles) and clinical waste. There was an infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention team to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.

Are services safe?

- 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 NHS East and North Hertfordshire (CCG) medicines management team, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. For example the practice had reviewed anti-bacterial drug prescribing for urinary tract infections to ensure such prescriptions were in accordance with CCG guidelines. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- 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. We noted that a recently recruited clinical staff member also worked part time at another GP practice. During the recruitment process the practice had accepted the DBS check undertaken by the other practice as the job role and environment were similar. Following our inspection the practice confirmed that they have applied for a fresh DBS check for this employee.

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. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills some in conjunction with the Herts and Essex Community Hospital with whom the practice shared premises. 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 which was provided through the facilities directorate of the Herts and Essex Community Hospital (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 the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty. Practice staff covered for each other during times of annual leave. The practice employed a locum GP to cover planned absences and leave.

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.
- 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. The practice manager and a GP kept a copy off site for easy access in the event of an emergency.

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 used 'Map of Medicine' which is an electronic system to access clinical guidelines and pathways. New guidance and changes in practice were discussed during clinical meetings.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records. For example the practice had reviewed the use of a predictive electronic tool used to assess the potential risk of cardiovascular disease in patients following an alert from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and acted accordingly with their advice.

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 100% of the total number of points available.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators were above the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood glucose reading showed good control in the in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015), was 84%, compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 78%. Exception reporting for this indicator was 8% compared to a CCG average of 9% and national average of 12%. (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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diagnosed psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) was 100% where the CCG average was 92% and the national average was 88%. Exception reporting for this indicator was 7% compared to a CCG and national average of 13%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been two clinical audits completed in the last two years, both 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, a recent audit of insertion of intrauterine device (IUD or coil) or intrauterine system (hormonal coil) at the practice had confirmed that procedures had been undertaken in accordance with guidelines including those related to consent and post insertion checks.

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 such as diabetes asthma and COPD (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease).
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 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, and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an annual appraisal and staff we spoke with confirmed this was a positive productive experience. The nurse practitioners were appropriately supported by the GPs. We saw evidence of learning outcomes which had been identified and addressed.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. They had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training as well as protected learning afternoons which occurred monthly.

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. The practice used an electronic system communicate with the district nurse and health visitor. The pathology service were able to share patient clinical information and results electronically. There was a system to review patients that had accessed the NHS 111 service overnight and those that had attended the A&E department for emergency care.
- There was an information sharing system to review patients attending Herts Urgent.

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 primary health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs and those that needed end of life care.

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 practice gained written consent for minor surgery which were scanned and maintained in the patient's records.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers and those at risk of developing a long-term condition, those patients with mental health problems and patients with learning difficulties. Patients were offered regular health reviews and signposted to relevant support services.
- We saw a variety of health promotion information leaflets and resources, for example, on smoking cessation sexual health and immunisations.
- The practice provided a variety of health promotion information leaflets and resources for children and young people for example the discreet provision of chlamydia testing.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Results showed:

- 61% of patients attended for bowel screening within six months of invitation compared to national average of 58%.
- 75% attended for breast screening within six months of invitation which was similar to the national average of 73%.

- Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds was 90% to 94% and five year olds from 91% to 97%.

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 six patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients felt the practice offered a helpful discreet service and staff were approachable caring willing to listen and had treated them with dignity and respect. A number of comments noted on how well they were satisfied with the reception staff.

We spoke with a member 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.

For example:

- 97% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 93% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG and the national average of 95%.

- 91% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 85%.
- 85% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 91%.
- 94% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 87%

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 93% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 86%.
- 86% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 78% and national average of 82%.
- 76% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 84% and 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.

Are services caring?

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 151 patients as carers (3% of the practice list). The practice had identified a

carer's champion who provided information as well as to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. This included referral to Carers in Hertfordshire which supported people in their caring role.

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 NHS East and North Hertfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example as part of the local federation of five local GP practices the practice was working with the CCG in developing planned and unplanned care pathways, including the development of an urgent care centre.

- The practice offered late evening appointments on Tuesday 6.30pm till 8pm and on Thursday from 6.30pm till 7.30pm for working patients and those who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- The practice provided telephone triage and ring back service by a duty GP at the patient's request where appropriate.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and others with complex needs.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Patients over 75 had a named accountable GP and were offered the over 75 health check.
- The practice offered spirometry, ECGs, ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ABPM) and phlebotomy services on site for the older patient avoiding the need to travel to a general hospital.
- The practice worked closely with Community Nursing Team and the Rapid Response Service (a service provided by the Hertfordshire County Council and East and North Hertfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group incorporating a partnership of health professionals social care workers to help people stay well and independent) and coordinated care at home.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice offered discreet referrals to the onsite Sexual Health Hertfordshire clinic for family planning and related screening such as chlamydia screening.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS.
- There were disabled facilities and translation services available. There was a hearing loop available.
- We noted that access to the practice was through the Herts and Essex Community Hospital and involved three sets of double fire doors potentially affecting access for patients with limited mobility. The practice had risk assessments in place to temporarily assist such patients and had worked with the facilities directorate of Essex Community Hospital to permanently modify access arrangements. We were shown confirmed plans for this work to be completed shortly.
- There was a phlebotomy service available on site provided by Herts and Essex Community Hospital.
- Online services were available for booking appointments and request repeat prescriptions.
- The practice worked with local pharmacies and arranged the delivery of medicines to the housebound.
- Through the Electronic Prescribing System (EPS) patients could order repeat medications online and collect the medicines from a pharmacy near their workplace.

Access to the service

The practice was open Monday to Friday from 8am to 6.30pm except on Tuesday when the practice was open until 8pm and on Thursday when the practice was open until 7.30pm. 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.

- 71% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 78%.
- 57% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 63% and 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:

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

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

The reception staff were all aware of how to deal with requests for home visits and if they were in any doubt would speak to a GP. Home visit requests were assessed and managed by a GP.

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 responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw there was a poster in the waiting area that informed patients of the complaints procedure. There was also information on the practice website.

We looked at 13 complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these had been satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, raising awareness for clinical staff of the need to check availability of vaccines before sending invitations for vaccinations so patients were not disappointed when they present for vaccination.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was to provide modern family medicine in partnership with their patients and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a documented statement of purpose which included their aims and objectives and reflected their mission statement.
- The practice had supporting plans which reflected the aims and objectives and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

Being a small team the overarching governance framework was overseen by a GP and supported the delivery of 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 electronically on their desktops.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained through active staff participation and regular review at meetings.
- 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 practice prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the GPs and practice manager 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 practice 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 support, information and a verbal and written apology
- The practice kept written records of correspondence.

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular meetings we saw minutes of these to confirm this. Staff also told us the practice manager kept them informed of practice matters at all times formal and daily informal discussions or by email.
- An open team culture was evident on account of the small team and staff told us they had the opportunity to raise any issues directly to a GP or the practice manager at any time and during staff meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the GPs and the practice manager. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and were encouraged to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.
- There were named members of staff in lead roles. For example there was a nominated GP lead for safeguarding asthma and COPD.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. We spoke with the chair of the PPG who told us that they had worked with the practice on several initiatives. For example as the practice shared the premises with Herts and Essex Community Hospital they had worked with the practice to improve internal signage so patients were signposted appropriately.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. They told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

team was forward thinking and was part of local federation of five local GP practices who aimed to improve services for the patients living in Stort Valley. There were several initiatives for example work in relation developing planned and unplanned care pathways, including the development of an urgent care centre.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice