

Cornishway Group Practice

Quality Report

Forum Health, Manchester M22 5RX
Tel: 01614902293
Website: www.cornishwaygp.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 10 March 2016
Date of publication: 29/04/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Good



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	8
Areas for improvement	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Cornishway Group Practice	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 10 March 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 generally well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had 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.

- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that 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 areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Ensure a health and safety policy is implemented for the practice with appropriate risk assessments for the practice.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and 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 showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality and 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 multidisciplinary teams 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.

Good



- 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.
- People told us they were not always able to get appointments when they needed them and it was easier to present physically rather than telephone in. The practice had determined the causes and as a result had changed the way the telephone calls were routed and had encouraged patients to sign up for online booking for appointments.
- 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.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- 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 this.
- 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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

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.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for all five diabetes related indicators was better than the national average.
- 97.88% of patients with diabetes had received an influenza immunisation compared to the national average of 94.45%.
- A record of foot examination was present for 86.96% compared to the national average of 88.3%.
- Patients with diabetes in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) was 140/80 mmHg or less was 71.33% compared to the national average of 78.03%.
- Patients with diabetes whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5 mmol/l or less was 72.71% compared to the national average of 80.53%.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCC HbA1c is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 68.18% compared to the national average of 77.54%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 percentage of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) was 93.04%, which was above the national average of 81.83%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- 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.

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 regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record in the preceding 12 months was 68.22% compared to the national average of 88.47%.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed face to face in the preceding 12 months was 80% compared to the national average of 84.01%.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on January 2016 showed the practice was performing above the local and national averages (376 survey forms were distributed and 94 (25%) were returned). This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 26% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 67% and a national average of 73%.
- 84% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 82%, national average 85%).
- 83% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 83%, national average 85%).
- 74% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 75%, national average 78%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 15 comment cards of which 12 were positive about the standard of care received. Comments included praise for the understanding of the GPs and Nursing staff as well as good service from the receptionists. The negative comments were around the lack of availability of urgent appointments especially outside of normal working hours.

We spoke with seven patients during the inspection. All the patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The patients confirmed they had issues getting through to the practice by phone but told us the practice had recently increased the number of telephone lines which had improved the access issues.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure a health and safety policy is implemented for the practice with appropriate risk assessments for the practice.

Cornishway Group Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Cornishway Group Practice

Cornishway Group Practice is based in Manchester. It is part of the NHS South Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and has 8925 patients. The practice provides services under a General Medical Services contract, with NHS England.

Information published by Public Health England rates the level of deprivation within the practice population group as level one on a scale of one to 10. Level one represents the highest levels of deprivation and level 10 the lowest. Male and female life expectancy in the practice geographical area is 74 years for males and 79 years for females, both of which are below the England average of 79 years and 83 years respectively. The numbers of patients in the different age groups on the GP practice register were generally similar to the average GP practice in England. There were a higher number of patients aged 25 to 34 years due to the practice being near a university accommodation area.

The practice had a higher percentage (59.2%) of its population with a long-standing health condition than the England average (54%). The practice had a higher percentage (71.2%) of its population with a working status

of being in paid work or in full-time education than the England average (61.5%). The practice had a lower percentage (4.4%) of its population with an unemployed status than the England average (5.4%).

The service is within a purpose built building with plenty of car parking and is easily accessible to pushchairs and wheelchairs. There is toilet with access for wheelchair users, which also has a baby-changing unit. The practice has a number of consulting and treatment rooms used by the GPs and nursing staff as well as visiting professionals such as health visitors. Cornishway is a “training practice” with close links to Wythenshawe Hospital. They teach and train doctors at levels from medical students through to Registrars (GP trainees in their final year before qualifying as GPs).

There are six GP partners, one managing partner who was also the practice manager, one assistant practice manager, a nursing team with one assistant practitioner, two nurses, a practice pharmacist as well as an administration team including a number of reception / administrative staff who also cover other duties such as dealing with samples and drafting prescriptions.

The practice is open between 08:00 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 18:30 Monday's to Friday's. Extended surgery hours are offered on Thursday mornings from 7am to 8am and from 6:30pm to 8:15pm. The GPs offer a telephone triage with the patient and arrange a suitable time on the day if appropriate. Out of hours cover is provided by Go to Doc and patients can access the local walk in centres and the NHS 111 service.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our comprehensive inspection programme.

Detailed findings

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 10 March 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GP partners, the managing partner who was also the practice manager, the nursing team as well as an administration team including a number of reception / administrative staff.
- Observed how patients were being treated by the staff and spoke with patients, carers and 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 practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, a patient had a cardiac arrest in the waiting room and required emergency support. The practice reviewed the case and purchased a privacy screen, a blanket and had reviewed the availability of emergency drugs as a result.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

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 that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and 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 lead for safeguarding adults and children. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role. GPs and nurses were trained to Safeguarding level 3.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. Only clinical staff acted as chaperones and all had received an appropriate Disclosure and Barring Service check (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. A nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and annual infection control audits were undertaken.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). 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.
- Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed five 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.
- Systems were 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.

Monitoring risks to patients

The main building was owned by NHS Manchester and had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out yearly 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 assessments in place for legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings). Risks to patients were assessed and well managed overall; however, there was no individual health and safety policy or risk assessments for the practice itself.

Are services safe?

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 that 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 as well as alarm buttons which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment rooms.
- 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 fit for use.
- The practice had a 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 peoples' 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 (2014/15) were 94.5% of the total number of points available, with 5.9% clinical exception reporting. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

This practice was an outlier for the number of Emergency Admissions for 19 Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions per 1,000 population (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) with 30.44 cases compared to the national rate at 14.6. We discussed this with the GPs who told us the area was known to be very deprived with a high percentage of people with chronic diseases. A plan was in place to reduce this by holding regular reviews, exploring patient health beliefs and also discussing the plan of action with out of hour's service providers to provide a holistic approach.

Data from 2014/15 showed;

- Performance for the five diabetes related indicators was below the national average.
- 97.88% of patients with diabetes had received an influenza immunisation compared to the national average of 94.45%.

- A record of foot examination was present for 86.96% compared to the national average of 88.3%.
- Patients with diabetes in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) was 140/80 mmHg or less was 71.33% compared to the national average of 78.03%.
- Patients with diabetes whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5 mmol/l or less was 72.71% compared to the national average of 80.53%.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCHbA1c is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 68.18% compared to the national average of 77.54%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months was 150/90mmHg or less was 78%, compared to the national average of 83.65%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was below the national averages. For example:
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record in the preceding 12 months was 68.22% compared to the national average of 88.47%.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed face to face in the preceding 12 months was 80% compared to the national average of 84%.

Clinical audits

- There had been a number of clinical audits completed in the last two years. We saw evidence of improvements being 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, an audit on the prescription of Statins (medicines that can help lower the level of cholesterol in the blood) had been undertaken and audit findings were presented at a practice meeting. Staff were made aware of an update in the guidance and risk assessment.

Effective staffing

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. It covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire 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 vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations 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 during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received on-going training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures and basic life support.

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.
- Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- 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 services 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. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

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 records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Other enhanced services included testing for sexually transmitted diseases and health checks.
- Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.

The percentage of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) was 93.04%, which was above the national average of 81.83%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test.

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 78.8% to 97.8% and five year olds from 88.7% to 97.5%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

NHS health checks for people 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 15 patient Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards we received were positive in relation to the care patients experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

We spoke with six members of the patient participation group and a patient in the waiting room. They all told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

Results from the national GP patient survey (January 2016) showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was mostly above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 97% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 89%.
- 90% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 88%, national average 87%).
- 97% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 95%, national average 95%).
- 91% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 85%, national average 85%).

- 91% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 90%, national average 91%).
- 76% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 84%, national average 87%).

The CQC comment cards had positive comments in relation to how patients were treated. Patients felt the doctors listened to them and empowered them to make positive decisions about their healthcare.

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 on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

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 above the local and national averages. For example:

- 87% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 86%.
 - 93% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 84%, national average 82%).
 - 90% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 86%, national average 85%).
- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer so they could direct them towards the various avenues of support available to them.

Are services caring?

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 worked alongside the local hospital to better direct people towards the correct route for treatment to reduce admissions to A&E.

- The practice offered extended surgery hours on Thursday mornings from 7am to 8am and from 6:30pm to 8:15pm. The GPs offered a telephone triage with the patient and arranged a suitable time on the day if appropriate.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- The building was purpose built with ample facilities for patients such automatic doors and a hearing loop. The practice had seven consulting rooms, two nursing rooms and one treatment room, together with a reception area, shared waiting area, and offices.
- All patient services were on the ground floor with no steps required for access to any consulting areas. There were two patient toilets, one with disabled access and baby changing facilities
- Translation services were also available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 08:00 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 18:30 Monday's to Friday's. Extended surgery hours were offered on Thursday mornings from 7am to 8am and from 6:30pm to 8:15pm. The GPs offered a telephone triage with the patient and arranged a suitable time on the day if appropriate. Out of hours cover was provided by Go to Doc and patients could access the local walk in centres and the NHS 111 service.

Results from the national GP patient survey (January 2016) showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was below local and national averages.

- 70% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 71% and national average of 75%.
- 26% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 67%, national average 73%).
- 47% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 56%, national average 59%).

Due to the location of the practice in a non-owned building, there were restrictions on the number of telephone line availability. People told us on the day of the inspection that they were not always able to get appointments when they needed them and it was easier to present physically rather than telephone in. The practice had worked with patients and the patient participation group (PPG) to determine the causes and as a result had changed the way the telephone calls were routed and had encouraged patients to sign up for online booking for appointments. The PPG told us they had been liaising with the chief executive of NHS Manchester to improve the situation.

In addition, the GPs were able to book in patients daily following a telephone triage. Patients were complimentary of this system whereby they would receive a telephone triage and could come in at a suitable time. The practice also embargoed certain slots and opened them at different times of the day for patients to book.

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. There was a lead GP to handle any clinical complaints.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system such as posters and leaflets in the reception area.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

The practice received 11 complaints between July 2015 and February 2016. We looked at three and found they had been dealt with in a timely and open manner. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care.

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 mission statement to “treat patients with courtesy, respect and dignity at all times irrespective of their ethnic origin, religious and cultural beliefs, gender, social class, disability or age”. The staff aimed “to maintain the highest standards of medical practice at all times” and to “strive to provide care and services for the whole of it's practice population”.

The practice ethos was to “involve patients and their carers in every aspect of their treatment offering help and support respecting their dignity and privacy, to ensure patients receive appropriate care for their general health and wellbeing, to care for patients in a safe, clean environment by qualified staff and to offer timely access to services provided by the practice”.

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 which was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology
- They 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 in doing so and felt supported if they did. We noted team building days were held at Easter, Christmas and to coincide with charity events such as bake-off days.
- 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. There was an active PPG which met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG had been active in working to reduce the waiting times for urgent patient calls and had held discussions around different options for patient parking and for the telephone system such as increasing telephone lines into the practice as well as dedicated divert numbers to different teams.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings and clinical sessions. 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.