

Hanley Primary Care Centre

Quality Report

51 Hanley Road
London
N4 3DU
Tel: 020 3874 5676
Website: www.hanleygp.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 12 July 2017
Date of publication: 14/09/2017

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	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Hanley Primary Care Centre	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Hanley Primary Care Centre on 12 July 2017. The practice had been taken over by AT Medics in August 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 a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- The results of the national GP patient survey showed that patients were satisfied with the practice.
- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.

- Patients we spoke with 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 the requirements of the duty of candour. Examples we reviewed showed the practice complied with these requirements.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Look at ways to improve the scores of the national GP patient survey.
- Continue to work towards achieving the end of year QOF targets.

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.

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed, we found there was an effective system for reporting and recording significant events; lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. When things went wrong patients were informed as soon as practicable, 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 to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff demonstrated that they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- The practice had adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- There was no published performance data to date for the time that AT Medics took over the management of the practice (August 2016), however data provided showed that the practice was on track to meet national performance targets. Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge 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.
- End of life care was coordinated with other services involved.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice comparable to others for several aspects of care.
- Survey information we reviewed showed that patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Good



Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting conditions, including patients with a condition other than cancer and patients living with dementia.
- Patients we spoke with 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 evidence from eight examples reviewed 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 policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- An overarching governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received inductions, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour.
- The practice encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents and sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on. The Patient participation group was active.

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.

- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified at an early stage older patients who may need palliative care as they were approaching the end of life. It involved older patients in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs.
- Where older patients had complex needs, the practice shared summary care records with local care services.
- Older patients were provided with health promotional advice and support to help them to maintain their health and independence for as long as possible.

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 long-term disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The practice was on track to meet its performance targets for long term conditions related QOF indicators.
- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- There were emergency processes for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.
- All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for 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



Summary of findings

- The practice employed a pharmacist to help the doctors with the management of long term conditions and with safe prescribing.

Families, children and young people

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

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found there were systems 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 accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Immunisation rates were on target to meet national standards for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us, on the day of inspection, that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.

Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

- The practice worked with midwives and health visitors to support this population group. For example, in the provision of ante-natal, post-natal and child health surveillance clinics.
- The practice had emergency processes for acutely ill children and young people and for acute pregnancy complications.

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 these populations had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care, for example Saturday appointments.
- 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.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.

Good



Summary of findings

- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- 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 had information available for vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed knew how to recognise signs of abuse in children, young people and adults whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. They were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- 77% (unverified data for 2016-2017) of patients diagnosed with
- The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and dementia.
- The practice had a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving medicines for mental health needs.
- The practice was on track to meet its QOF targets for mental health related indicators.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.
- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed 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 were published in July 2017. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and eighty eight survey forms were distributed and 91 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 81% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 85%.
- 66% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 73%.

- 68% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 77%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 23 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients said that they were provided with a good service, the staff were helpful and the environment was clean.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Look at ways to improve the scores of the national GP patient survey.

- Continue to work towards achieving the end of year QOF targets.

Hanley Primary Care Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser.

Background to Hanley Primary Care Centre

The Hanley Primary Care Centre is a surgery located in the London Borough of Islington. The practice is part of the NHS Islington Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The practice was taken over by AT Medics in August 2016 and it currently holds an APMS contract and provides NHS services to 6200 patients.

The practice serves a diverse population with many patients attending where English is not their first language. Only 4% of the practice population was over the age of 70 and 63% are under the age of 30. The practice had 32% of patients with a long term condition. The practice is situated within a purpose built health centre. Consulting rooms are available on two levels and there is a lift available for those with impaired mobility. There are currently four GPs (two male and two female) offering a total of 28 sessions per week; a pharmacist that works for six sessions per week, two female practice nurses; a healthcare assistant, administrative staff and a practice manager employed in the service.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday, and 8.30am and 12.30pm on Saturday. GP and nurse appointments are from 9am to 1pm every morning and 3pm to 6pm on a week day and 8.30am to 10.30am on a Saturday. Healthcare assistant appointments are from 8.15am to 1pm every morning and 3pm to 6pm. In addition

to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them. The practice did not provide out of hours treatment but referred patients to the local out of hour's provider.

The service is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures, family planning, maternity and midwifery services, surgical procedures and the treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

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 visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations such as NHS England and the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 12 July 2017. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (Clinical director, GPs, Nursing staff, practice management and administration staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.

Detailed findings

- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed a 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.
- Visited all practice locations
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver care and treatment plans.

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 living 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 a system 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).
- From the sample of nine documented examples we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed. The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events. Analysis was also carried out at the AT Medics regional significant events board which disseminated learning to all the practices in the region.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example delayed action was being taken by a locum GP when processing pathology results. A system was put in place where the practice manager would monitor this on a daily basis to ensure all had been actioned. This was then discussed in a practice meeting to ensure learning for the whole staff team.
- The practice also monitored trends in significant events and evaluated any action taken.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to minimise risks to patient safety.

- Arrangements for safeguarding 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. From the sample of three documented examples we reviewed we found that the GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible or provided reports where necessary for other agencies.

- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three. The practice nurse had received level two child safeguarding training and non-clinical staff had received level one.
- 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)

The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene.

- We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- The practice nurse was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.

The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice minimised risks to patient safety (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal).

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. Repeat prescriptions were signed before being dispensed to patients and there was a reliable process to ensure this occurred. 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

Are services safe?

safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems to monitor their use. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for clinical conditions within their expertise. They received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. (These are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment).

We reviewed three personnel files for employees that had commenced employment since the current provider took over and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, evidence of satisfactory conduct in previous employments in the form of references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the DBS.

Monitoring risks to patients

There were procedures for assessing, monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety.

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.

- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments 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).
- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. The staff were trained to ensure they could cover each other in times of absence. If there was a shortfall, staff could be requested to cover from the partner practice.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had adequate arrangements 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 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

Clinicians were aware of relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- The practice had systems 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). There were currently no published results for a full QOF year in which the current management were in charge. The practice provided unverified figures for the year 2016-2017 in which they were responsible for part of the year and year to date figures as of 12 July 2017 to show that they were on track to meet their end of year targets. These were as yet unpublished results and were unverified. The year to date figures given showed that the practice had achieved 168 of the total number of points available.

Unverified figures (UV) from 2016-2017 and the figures provided from 1 April 2017 to 12 July 2017 showed:

Performance for diabetes related indicators

- The percentage of patients in whom the last blood sugar level was 64 mmol/mol or less was: 79% (UV) and 24% to date.
- The percentage of patients in whom the last blood pressure reading was 140/80 mmHg or less was: 71% (UV) and 22% to date.
- The percentage of patients whose last measured total cholesterol was 5 mmol/l or less was: 78% (UV) and 24% to date.

- The percentage of patients with a record of a foot examination and risk classification was: 89% (UV) and 15% to date.

Performance for mental health indicators

- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented was: 78% (UV) and 6% to date.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face to face review was: 77% (UV) and 9% to date.

Performance of other health related indicators

- The percentage of patients with asthma who had an asthma review that included an assessment of asthma control using the RCP three questions was: 70% (UV) and 19% to date.
- The percentage of patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) who had a review undertaken including an assessment of breathlessness using the Medical Research Council dyspnoea scale was: 90% (UV) and 8% to date.

The practice compared their performance to other practices in the AT Medics organisation to ensure that the performance of the practice is on track. For example, AT Medics set a benchmark figure of 75% of patients over the age of 65 on the practice register to receive a seasonal flu jab. The practice had so far attained 64%; however they were slightly below the benchmark of 50% of pregnant women to receive the flu jab by attaining 46%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- There had been two clinical audits commenced since the provider took over management of the practice, both of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included. An audit was undertaken in August 2016 to ensure that patients diagnosed with hypertension had been correctly coded on the clinical system, lifestyle advice given and medicines being monitored. A total of 77

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

patients were identified and of that 80% were correctly coded, 74% had received lifestyle advice and 61% were having their medicines managed appropriately. The practice put a plan in place to ensure that GPs coded patients correctly and patients in need of lifestyle advice were followed up. A second cycle took place in January 2017 and looked at the same 77 patients. This time the practice found that 100% had been coded correctly, 67% had received lifestyle advice (some patients had refused this) and 87% had their medicines reviewed and monitored. There were improvements found in the management of these patients and the practice continued to call in patients for lifestyle advice and planned to repeat the audit.

Effective staffing

Evidence reviewed showed that staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs and nurses. 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.
- From the sample of five documented examples we reviewed we found that 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. Information was shared between services, with patients' consent, using a shared care record. 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.

The practice ensured that end of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of different patients, including those who may be vulnerable because of their circumstances.

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.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support and signposted them to relevant services. 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.
- Smoking cessation advice was available from the practice nurse and by referral from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 78%, which was comparable with the national average of 81%.

Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds was 78% and five year olds was 79% compared to the national standard of 90% for both age ranges.

There was a policy to offer telephone or written reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems 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. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer.

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

During our inspection we observed that 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.
- Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.
- Patients could be treated by a clinician of the same sex.

All of the 23 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with four patients. They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comments highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 83% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 79% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 86%.
- 91% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.

- 79% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 86%.
- 86% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 91%.
- 91% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 92%.
- 96% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 92%.
- 89% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 90% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 88% 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.

Children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and recognised as individuals.

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:

- 79% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 86%.
- 78% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.

Are services caring?

- 82% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 90%.
- 85% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format and could be printed in large font.
- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital.

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. Support for isolated or house-bound patients included signposting to relevant support and volunteer services.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 105 patients as carers (2% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. Older carers were offered timely and appropriate support.

A member of staff acted as a carers' champion to help ensure that the various services supporting carers were coordinated and effective.

Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, the practice 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 understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population:

- The practice offered a Saturday morning clinic between 8.30am and 12.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice had an in-house pharmacist who worked with the management of long term conditions and ensured safe prescribing.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions. There were early and ongoing conversations with these patients about their end of life care as part of their wider treatment and care planning.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice employed a pharmacist for six sessions a week to assist the GPs with long term conditions management and safe prescribing.
- The practice supported out of area patient registrations allowing patients who worked locally to the practice to use the service.
- The practice sent text message reminders of appointments and test results.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately/ were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were accessible facilities, which included a hearing loop, and interpretation services available.
- The practice had a lift to improve access.
- Other reasonable adjustments were made and action was taken to remove barriers when patients find it hard to use or access services.

- The practice has considered and implemented the NHS England Accessible Information Standard to ensure that disabled patients receive information in formats that they can understand and receive appropriate support to help them to communicate.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday, and 8.30am and 12.30pm on Saturday. GP and nurse appointments were from 9am to 1pm every morning and 3pm to 6pm on a week day and 8.30am to 10.30am on a Saturday. Healthcare assistant appointments were from 8.15am to 1pm every morning and 3pm to 6pm Monday - Friday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients 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.

- 76% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 73% and the national average of 76%.
- 73% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 71%.
- 77% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 84%.
- 73% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 81%.
- 66% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 73%.
- 56% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 58% and the national average of 64%.

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

The practice had a system to assess:

- whether a home visit was clinically necessary; and

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- The urgency of the need for medical attention.

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system for handling complaints and concerns.

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.

- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. A complaints leaflet was available, posters were on display in the practice and information on how to complain was displayed on the practice website.

We looked at eight complaints received since the provider took over the management of the practice and found they were dealt with appropriately and in line with the practice policy. Lessons were learned from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a patient complained that it was difficult to get through to the practice by telephone to request repeat prescriptions. The practice apologised for this and explained the other ways to contact the practice, for example online. The complaint was reviewed at both practice and regional meetings and staff were directed to ensure that patients were made more aware of ways to contact the practice.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a clear strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs and nurses had lead roles in key areas. For example the practice nurse was infection control lead and the pharmacist was jointly responsible for medicines management with the lead GP.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. These were updated and reviewed regularly.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained. Practice meetings were held monthly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.
- We saw evidence from minutes of a meetings structure that allowed for lessons to be learned and shared following significant events and complaints.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners 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 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 provider encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. From the sample of six documented examples we reviewed we found that the practice had systems 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 and staff felt supported by management.

- The practice held and minuted a range of multi-disciplinary meetings including meetings with district nurses and social workers to monitor vulnerable patients. GPs, where required, met with health visitors to monitor vulnerable families and safeguarding concerns.
- 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. Minutes were comprehensive and were available for practice staff to view.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients and staff. It proactively sought feedback from:

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- Patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, changes to the appointment system that freed up more routine appointments for GPs by triaging appointments which could be more appropriately dealt with by the pharmacist.
- The NHS Friends and Family test, complaints and compliments received.
- Staff through annual appraisals, staff meetings and supervision meetings. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and were constantly looking at ways to improve outcomes for patients in the area.