

Dr Johnston & Partners

Quality Report

Ulverston Health Centre,
Stanley Street,
Ulverston,
Cumbria,
LA12 7BT

Tel: 01229 484100

Website: www.drjohnstonandpartners.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 17 March 2017

Date of publication: 11/05/2017

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Dr Johnston & Partners	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Johnston and Partners on 17th March 2017. 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 generally assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

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

There were areas of practice where the provider should make improvements:

- Put a system in place to ensure Patient Group Directions (PGD) are kept up to date.

Summary of findings

- Continue to monitor the new methods put in place for identifying carers, to ensure that these are working and that patients who are carers are being offered appropriate support.
- Ensure staff are clear about what should be reported as a significant event.

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



- 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 generally assessed and well managed. We found that some vaccinations had been administered without a valid Patient Group Direction being in place, however the practice took immediate action to ensure this would not happen again.
- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events. However, some staff were uncertain about what should be reported as a significant event.

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 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, published in July 2016, showed patients rated the practice higher than others for all aspects of care.

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.
- There was a carers' lead who offered support, however at the time of inspection, 22 patients had been identified as carers (0.5% of the practice list). New measures have been put in place to identify carers since the inspection.

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. The practice worked particularly well with the local integrated care community.
- 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 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.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. There was an patient participation group.
- 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 their population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Performance for conditions associated with older patients, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disorder (COPD), was better than the national average. The practice achieved 99% of the total points available for this condition, compared to the national average of 95.9%.

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.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 96% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 89.8%.
- 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.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79%, which was in line with the local and national average of 81%.
- 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 reflected the needs for this age group.

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 who needed them.
- 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.
- There was a carers' lead who offered support, however the practice had identified 22 patients as carers (0.5% of the practice list). New measures have been put in place to identify carers since the inspection.

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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 92.8%.
- 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.
- 89% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face-to-face meeting in the last 12 months. This was better than the national average of 84%.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The National GP Patient Survey results, published in July 2016, showed the practice was performing above local and national averages. 221 survey forms were distributed and 119 were returned. This represented a 54% response rate and approximately 2.8% of the practice's patient list.

- 94% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by telephone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 96% 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 85%.
- 93% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.
- 92% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who had just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received three comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Commonly used words included 'excellent', 'kind', helpful, 'caring' and 'considerate'.

We spoke with four patients during the inspection. All of these patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The practice's "Friends and Family" test showed that between May 2016 and February 2017, 74 out of 78 patients surveyed said they would be likely (11 patients) or extremely likely (63 patients) to recommend the practice.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Put a system in place to ensure Patient Group Directions (PGD) are kept up to date.
- Continue to monitor the new methods put in place for identifying carers, to ensure that these are working and that patients who are carers are being offered appropriate support.
- Ensure staff are clear about what should be reported as a significant event.

Dr Johnston & Partners

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.

Background to Dr Johnston & Partners

Dr Johnston and Partners is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide primary care services.

The practice provides services to approximately 4,300 patients from one location at Ulverston Health Centre, Stanley Street, Ulverston, Cumbria, LA12 7BT. We visited this location on this inspection.

The practice is located in a purpose built health centre. All patient facilities are situated on first floor which is accessible by stairs or a lift. There are disabled toilet facilities, wheelchair and step-free access to all consulting and treatment rooms. There is a car park available adjacent to the health centre.

The practice has 15 members of staff, including three GP partners (two female, one male), three practice nurses (female), a practice manager, an assistant practice manager, and eight reception and administration staff, including a Medicines Manager. The practice had recently recruited a health care assistant, who was due to start their role shortly after the date of inspection.

The practice is part of Cumbria clinical commissioning group (CCG). Information taken from Public Health England placed the area in which the practice was located in the fourth least deprived decile. In general, people living in

more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. The practice population profile broadly reflects the national average, with no one age group particularly over- and under-represented.

The surgery is open from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday, with extended access one evening a week from 6.30pm to 7.30pm on either Monday and/or Tuesday evenings. Telephones at the practice are answered from 8am until 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. Outside of these times a message on the telephone answering system redirects patients to out of hours or emergency services as appropriate. The service for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is provided by the NHS 111 service and Cumbria Health on Call Ltd (CHoC).

The practice provides services to patients of all ages based on a General Medical Services (GMS) contract agreement for general practice.

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.

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 17 March 2017. During our visit we:

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

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

- Is it safe?

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). However, there was some uncertainty among staff about what should be considered a significant event.
- 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, following a significant event, the practice changed the procedure for issuing prescriptions for controlled drugs to ensure they could be tracked more easily and effectively.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.

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

responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child safeguarding level three.

- A notice in the waiting room 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. One of the practice nurses was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were carried and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- 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 DBS checks.
- Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment.) However, we saw that six PGDs were no longer in date, and we were told by staff that at least one of the medications listed on an expired PGD had been administered to patients without any other form of prescription in place. When we raised this with the partners they put measures in place immediately to ensure that up-to-date PGDs were acquired and that a prescription or Patient Specific Direction (PSD) was in place for these medicines in the meantime. (PSDs are written instruction, from a qualified and registered prescriber for a medicine including the dose, route and frequency or appliance to be supplied or administered to a named patient after the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis.)

Are services safe?

- Other arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. On the day of inspection, we saw that the vaccine refrigerator was not hardwired, nor was the plug secured or marked in any way to prevent it from being unplugged accidentally. Vaccines stored within refrigerators need to be kept at a temperature between two and eight degrees Celsius, and can be damaged if power to the refrigerator fails. Since the inspection, the practice have taken measures to resolve this.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were generally assessed and well managed, however there were some areas which required improvement.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety, however there had been no recent fire drill performed. Some electrical equipment had been checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use. However, other electrical equipment, which was owned by the practice, had not been checked since June 2015 due to a misunderstanding over who was responsible for arranging these checks. Clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which

identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had an up-to-date fire risk assessment and 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 showed the practice had achieved 98.5% of the total number of points available, compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 97.7%, and the national average of 95.3%. The practice exception reporting rate was slightly higher than the local and national averages at 10.5% (CCG average 10.2%, national average 9.8%). (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 96% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 89.8%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 92.8%.

- Performance for asthma related indicators was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 97.4%.
- Performance for conditions associated with older patients, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disorder (COPD), was better than the national average. The practice achieved 99% of the total points available for this condition, compared to the national average of 95.9%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been 10 clinical audits completed in the last two years, two of which were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, and peer review.

Findings were used by the practice to improve services, such as reducing the need to refer patients with orthopaedic conditions to secondary care.

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 updates 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 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service. The practice had offered End of Life discussions to 76% of patients who had passed away in the preceding 12 months. This was an increase from 6% two years ago.
- Other services, such as physiotherapy, were available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79%, which was in line with the CCG and national averages of 81%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by ensuring a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged their patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. Data from Public Health England from 2014/15 showed that:

- 69% of females, 50-70, were screened for breast cancer in last 36 months, compared to the national average of 72%.
- 60% of people, 60-69, were screened for bowel cancer within six months of invitation, compared to the national average of 58%.

There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were better than national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 93.3% to 100% (national average from 73.3% to 95.1%) and the rate for five year olds was 95% (national average from 81.4% to 95.1%).

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.

We spoke with four patients, including two members of the patient participation group (PPG). They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey, published in July 2016, showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was above average for a number of satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example, of those who responded:

- 94% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and the national average of 89%.
- 89% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 91% 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 average of 97% 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 90% and the national average of 85%.
- 98% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 91%.
- 97% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% 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, of those who responded:

- 91% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 90% 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 86% and the national average of 82%.
- 93% say the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 90%.

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.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. On the day of inspection, the practice had identified 22 patients on their list as carers (0.5% of the practice list). Patients were asked when they joined the practice if they had a carer, but new patients were not asked if they were carers themselves. The practice had a carers' lead who liaised with the local carers organisation.

Are services caring?

Other written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. There was a poster in the waiting area so that patients knew who they could contact for support. Since the inspection, the practice has created posters to display in the waiting area, asking people if they are carers and offering support. The practice leaflet was also updated to add information for

carers, advising them to speak to a member of the reception team should they require support. The new patient questionnaire was also updated to add a question asking if patients are carers.

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. The practice worked particularly closely with the local Integrated Care Community (ICC), of which one of the partners was the clinical lead. Other members of the ICC, such as the care co-ordinator, were based in the practice building, and the practice worked closely with them to offer health promotion activities to the local community.

- The practice offered extended hours one evening a week from 6.30pm to 7.30pm on either Monday and/or Tuesday for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients who needed them, including those 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, and some that were only available privately.
- The practice provided medical care to three care and residential homes in the area.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The surgery offered an International Normalised Ratio (INR) clinic for patients prescribed warfarin. (The INR is a blood test which needs to be performed regularly on patients who are taking warfarin to determine their required dose).
- Patients could order repeat prescriptions and book GP appointments online.
- Other services were based at the practice site to offer services that would benefit their patients. This included physiotherapy and district nursing services.
- The practice offered a minor injuries services to patients, with the aim of reducing the need for patients to travel to accident and emergency (A&E). Of the 107

patients who used the service in 2015/16 only five needed to be followed-up at A&E, thereby reducing the strain on secondary care and making it easier for patients to access care.

Access to the service

The surgery was open from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. Extended access was offered one evening a week from 6.30pm to 7.30pm on either Monday or Tuesday. Telephones at the practice were answered from 8am until 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. Outside of these times a message on the telephone answering system redirected patients to out of hours or emergency services as appropriate. 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, published in July 2016, showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above the local CCG and national averages. Of those who responded:

- 94% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by telephone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 82% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 76%.
- 96% 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 85%.

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Their complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system, such as a summary leaflet.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

We looked at six complaints logged during 2016/17, and found these were dealt with in a timely way, with openness and transparency when dealing with the complaint. Both formal and informal complaints were logged and followed up. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints, and also from analysis of trends, and action

was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. Examples of improvements made as a result of complaints received included rewriting the letter which is sent to patients to remind them to attend for cervical screening. The rewritten version was shared with patients before being put into use to ensure that it was an improvement.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas. This had been developed with staff during a practice away day.
- The practice had a strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and these were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

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

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection, the management 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 and training for all staff on communicating with

patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. They 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. Staff also told us they felt supported in their careers and were able to request training to support their roles.

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

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

- The practice had set up a patient participation group (PPG) to gather feedback from patients. They also carried out surveys and looked for feedback in the compliments and complaints received. The PPG had approximately 12 members who met regularly and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, following feedback from the PPG, the practice updated their practice leaflet to include a "glossary of terms" to help patients better understand the services offered.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

practice was run. For example, one member of staff had suggested carrying out analysis of non-attendance to look for ways to improve. They had then been supported to undertake this work.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and participated in local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example:

- The practice worked closely with the Intergrated Care Community (ICC) to provide health education and promotion to the local community, including the local school.
- The partners and practice management team had implemented a range of improvements since taking over the practice. These included introducing regular team meetings, creating a patient participation group, clarifying staff roles and introducing a staff rota.