

Ireland Wood Surgery

Quality Report

Iveson Approach
Ireland Wood
Leeds
West Yorkshire
LS16 6FR
Tel: 0113230 3470
Website: www.irelandwoodsurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 20 October 2016
Date of publication: 03/02/2017

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	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Ireland Wood Surgery	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 Ireland Wood Surgery on 20 October 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

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

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.
- The practice had a lead GP for the care homes in the area who worked closely with care home staff and provided regular sessions at each home. The GP was supported by the practice pharmacist.
- The practice offered a dedicated surgery for students in conjunction with the university nurse. This service was offered for one hour on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example; the practice offered an eye clinic for patients registered at the practice. Patients could also be referred into this service by other practices. This provided people with care closer to home in a more convenient setting.
- 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.
- In conjunction with three other GP practices, the practice hosted a hub service from 8am until 4pm on Saturday and Sunday. This service had provided over 3,000 appointments for patients from April to August 2016.
- 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.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- All patients aged 75 years and over had a named GP with health checks available upon request.
- The practice worked with a range of local voluntary services to support the older population.
- The practice employed two care co-ordinators to provide support to patients. This included assessing patients at home and liaising with other services to provide the best support and care.
- The practice had a lead GP for the care homes in the area who worked closely with care home staff and provided regular sessions at each home. The GP was supported by the practice pharmacist.

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.
- The practice ran specialist clinics for asthma, COPD and diabetes.
- The practice had adopted the Year of Care model for management of patients with diabetes. The Year of Care model was aimed at encouraging patients with diabetes to understand their condition and select their own personal health and lifestyle targets.
- The practice had identified patients with multiple co-morbidities using a risk stratification tool. These patients were supported by the clinical care co-ordinators with input from their named GP. This included monthly meetings to review patients and identify any themes in order to better tailor care to suit their individual needs.

Good



Summary of findings

- 92% of patients with diabetes, on the register, had a record of a foot examination and risk classification. This was better than the CCG average of 88% and national average of 89%.
- 98% of patients with diabetes, on the register, had received an influenza immunisation in the preceding eight months.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- The GPs and nursing staff worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 86%, which was better than the CCG average of 79% and national average of 81%.
- The practice provided prenatal advice, antenatal and post-natal care with the support of the community midwives.
- The practice offered family planning services included coils and implants. In addition the practice also offered sexual health screening.
- 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.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care. For example; the practice offered a dedicated surgery for students in conjunction with the university nurse.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group and had worked with the patient participation group to promote this. This has resulted in 20% of the patient list being registered to use online services.
- Patients over the age of 40 were able to access health checks at the practice and the uptake in the previous year was 42%.

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

Good



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).

- Overall performance against the dementia indicators was better than the CCG and national average. However; only 81% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was lower than the CCG average of 87% and national average of 84%.
- 89% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months. This was better than the CCG average of 89% and same as the national average.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- 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.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 7 July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. A total of 222 survey forms were distributed and 114 (51%) were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient population.

- 80% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 77% and national average of 73%.
- 93% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 85%.
- 83% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 76% and national average of 73%.

- 95% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 84% and 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 19 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients used words such as excellent, professional and amazing to describe the service. One comment card also contained less positive comments regarding accessing appointments.

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

Ireland Wood Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Ireland Wood Surgery

Ireland Wood Surgery is located on Iveson Approach, Ireland Wood, Leeds, LS16 6FR. There is also a branch site, The New Croft Surgery which is located on Broadgate Lane, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 4SE. Both sites operate from purpose built buildings and have parking available for staff and patients. We visited both sites as part of our inspection.

The practice is situated within the Leeds West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and provides primary medical services under the terms of a personal medical services (PMS) contract. This is a contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering services to the local community.

The service is provided by twelve GP partners (seven male and five female) and eight salaried GPs (female). The practice also has two advanced nurse practitioners, two senior practice nurses, four practice nurses, a clinical pharmacist, five health care assistants and two clinical care co-ordinators. The clinical staff are supported by a practice manager, an assistant practice manager and an experienced team of administrative and reception staff.

The practice is a training practice for GP Registrars. GP Registrars are fully qualified doctors training to become a GP through a period of working and training at the practice.

The practice serves a population of 24,737 patients who can access a number of clinics for example; an eye clinic, minor surgery and child health and vaccinations.

Both sites are open between 7am and 7pm Monday to Friday with a range of appointments being offered during these hours. In addition the practice also hosts an extended hours hub in conjunction with other local practices. The hub services were open from 8am until 4pm on Saturday and Sunday.

When the practice is closed out-of-hours services are provided by Local Care Direct, which can be accessed via the surgery telephone number or by calling the NHS 111 service.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before 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 20 October 2016. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff including four GPs, the practice manager, the assistant practice manager, the clinical pharmacist, the nurse manager, the HR manager and a member of the administrative team.
- We also spoke with the manager of the locality hub service.
- Received feedback from 18 members of the reception and administrative team and 11 members of the nursing team via questionnaires.
- We spoke with nine patients, three of who were also part of the patient participation group.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.'

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

- Is it safe?

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice 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, an incident had been recorded when a patient had not received an appointment from the hospital following an urgent cancer referral. The practice contacted the hospital and advised this had not been received. As a result of the incident, the practice changed the process when sending urgent referrals and followed up the faxed referral with a telephone call in order for the hospital to confirm receipt.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead GP for safeguarding adults and a lead GP for safeguarding

children. 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 protection or 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. The practice nurse was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local IPC teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol in place 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 kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Two of the nurses had qualified as Independent Prescribers and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. They received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. PGDs are documents permitting the supply of prescription-only medicines to groups of patients, without individual prescriptions.
- Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific

Are services safe?

prescription (PSD) or direction from a prescriber. A PSD is an instruction to administer a medicine to a list of individually named patients where each patient on the list has been individually assessed by a prescriber.

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

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella. Legionella is a 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 96% of the total number of points available (CCG average 96% and national average 95%) with 10% clinical exception reporting (CCG average 9% and national average 10%). 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. These figures are comparable to CCG and national averages.

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 CCG and national average. For example; 92% of patients with diabetes, on the register, had a record of a foot examination and risk classification. This was better than the CCG average of 88% and national average of 87%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators were better than the CCG and national average. For example, 89% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive

care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months, agreed between individuals, their family and/or carers as appropriate. This was the same as the national average and better than the CCG average of 85%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been five clinical audits completed in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, following receipt of NICE guidance, which advised that aspirin was no longer considered appropriate as an anti-coagulant for patients with a diagnosis of atrial fibrillation, the practice carried out an audit to identify this group of patients. The initial audit was carried out in June 2014 and identified 42 patients. As a result of the audit discussions took place with patients and, where appropriate, an alternative anti-coagulant was prescribed. The practice carried out a re-audit in January 2016 and the number of patients had reduced to 22. The audit demonstrated that appropriate discussions had taken place with these patients and informed decisions had been made.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had role specific induction programmes 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. The practice had supported the health care assistant with training such as a phlebotomy, clinical skills and health check courses.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP 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.
- The practice website contained information and tools for patients to access regarding health eating and weight loss.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 86%, which was better than the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 96% to 99% (CCG average 94% and national average 88%) and five year olds from 91% to 98% (CCG average 98% and national average 89%).

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 19 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. However; one comment card also contained less positive comments regarding accessing appointments.

We spoke with three members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 97% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and the national average of 89%.
- 91% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 87%.
- 99% 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 88% and national average of 85%.
- 88% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 91%.
- 91% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 89% 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:

- 88% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments which was the same as the CCG average and better than the national average of 86%.
- 87% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 82%.
- 83% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that a telephone translation service was available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The practice website advised patients how to request accessible information and there was a form which patients or their carers could complete to advise the practice of patient requirements.

Are services caring?

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 290 patients as carers which represented just over 1% of the practice list. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them. 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. For example; the practice offered an eye clinic for patients registered at the practice. Patients could also be referred into this service by other practices. This provided people with care closer to home in a more convenient setting.

- The practice hosted a hub service from 8am until 4pm on Saturday and Sunday. This service had provided over 3,000 appointments for patients from April to August 2016.
- The practice offered extended hours from 7am until 8am and from 6pm until 7pm Monday to Friday.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- 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. These were utilised by patients at the practice, with 20% of patients registered to use online services.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS and were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice employed two care co-ordinators to provide support to patients. This included assessing patients at home and liaising with other services to provide the best support and care.
- The practice had a lead GP for the care homes in the area who worked closely with care home staff and provided regular sessions at each home. The GP was supported by the practice pharmacist.

- The practice offered a dedicated surgery for students in conjunction with the university nurse. This service was offered for one hour on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 7am until 7pm Monday to Friday with a range of appointments available between these hours. The practice also hosted a hub services from 8am until 4pm on Saturday and Sunday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 89% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 83% and national average of 76%.
- 80% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 77% and national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

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

- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. The practice had complaints procedure which was available for patients and a complaints form for patients to complete should they wish to.
- The practice had received a total of 31 complaints in the last 12 months. We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were handled appropriately, dealt with in a timely way showing openness and transparency when dealing with the complaint.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a strategy in place and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.
- The practice had recently completed a refurbishment to the premises to provide a dedicated eye clinic.

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 effective arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners and practice manager 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 GPs and practice manager were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. This included support training for all staff on

communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The lead GP 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. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the group had suggested that the extended hours hub service be more widely advertised. As a result of this the practice had included the information on the practice social media page. The practice had also increased receptionist working hours as a result of feedback regarding queues at the reception desk.
- The practice also had a social media page to provide patients with information. This could also be used for patient feedback.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through discussion, staff meetings and appraisals. Staff told us they

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

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

team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example; the practice were aware of the requirements of patients and at the time of our inspection were looking into providing Skype consultations to improve access for patients.