

Oak Glen Surgery

Quality Report

Eldwick & Gilstead Health Centre
196 Swan Avenue,
Bingley
BD16 3PA
Tel: 01274 566617
Website: www.oakglensurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: Tuesday 27 October 2015
Date of publication: 17/12/2015

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

Overall summary	Page 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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Oak Glen Surgery	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 at Oak Glen Surgery on 27 October 2015. 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 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 facilities and was 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.

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, people receive reasonable support and actions were instigated to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had embedded systems, processes and procedures in place to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality.
- 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 people's needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data showed that 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.
- Staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and NHS Bradford District Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. Twice a month the practice attended CCG events such as the 'Clinical Commissioning Forum'. Representatives from every practice in the CCG attended. A core group of staff attended this event every month. Discussed topics such as pathways, commissioning intentions, budgets, prescribing and referrals. Data was transparent and open between practices in these meetings. All practices are incentivised to attend these meetings.
- 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.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed that the practice responded to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders e.g. the pharmacy.

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.
- 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:

- 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.
- The practice was managing some of the most common chronic diseases, e.g. diabetes, coronary heart disease and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- 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.
- Cervical screening tests that had been performed (01/04/2013 to 31/03/2014) were comparable to other practices in the area, 85% practice compared to 82% nationally.

Good



Summary of findings

- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw good examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

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

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- 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 people with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- The practice had told 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).

- 95% of people diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months.

Good



Summary of findings

- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, (01/04/2013 to 31/03/2014) was 100% which was better than the national data average of 86%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- It carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- It 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 people with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 8 January 2015 showed the practice was performing above the local and national averages. We noted that 285 survey forms were distributed and 113 were returned, representing a response rate of 40%. On the following patient satisfaction scores the practice fared better than other practices in the CCG or nationally.

- 91% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 62% and a national average of 73%.
- 90% found the receptionists at this surgery helpful (CCG average 83%, national average 87%).
- 67% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 49%, national average 60%).
- 97% said the last appointment they got was convenient (CCG average 91%, national average 92%).
- 86% described their experience of making an appointment as good (CCG average 64%, national average 73%).
- 78% usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen (CCG average 66%, national average 65%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received four comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Comments included the staff were caring and it was easy to get to see a doctor.

We spoke with 12 patients during the inspection. All 12 patients said that they were happy with the care they received and thought that staff were approachable, committed and caring.

Oak Glen 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 advisor, a practice nurse specialist advisor, a practice manager specialist advisor and an Expert by Experience.

Background to Oak Glen Surgery

Oak Glen Surgery is registered with CQC to provide primary care services, which includes access to GPs, family planning, surgical procedures, treatment of disease, disorder or injury and diagnostic and screening procedures. It provides GP services for patients living in the Bingley area of West Yorkshire.

The practice has two GPs (one male and one female), a management team, practice nurses, healthcare assistants and administrative staff.

The practice is open 8am to 6:30pm Tuesday, Thursday and Friday with an early morning start of 7:30am on a Monday and Wednesday and a later closing time of 7pm on Wednesday evening. Patients can book appointments in person, via the phone and online. Appointments can be booked four weeks in advance for both the doctor and nurse clinics. Out of hours services are provided by Local Care Direct. Calls are diverted to this service when the practice is closed.

The practice has a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract. This is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering services to the local community.

The practice is part of NHS Bradford District Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). It is responsible for providing primary care services to 3,300 patients.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

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 that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 27 October 2015.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how people were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed the personal care and treatment records of patients.

Detailed findings

- 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 are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks 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 also 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, an incident where a patient felt faint at reception was discussed. A new plan of action was developed. The new method of working was implemented across the practice.

When there are unintended or unexpected safety incidents, people receive reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and are 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 people 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 member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level three.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that nurses would act as chaperones, if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a disclosure and barring 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. The practice 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 staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice minimised the risks to patients. This included prescribing practices, the storage of drugs and records with respect to the use of 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. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in development to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable Health Care Assistants to administer vaccinations.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found that appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, photo identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

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 information in the reception area. 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

Are services safe?

checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice also 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.

- 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 e.g. the practice manager regularly reviewed workload management plans and amended staff requirements on a weekly basis.

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 rooms.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. There was also a first aid kit and accident book available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. The medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.
- 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 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 checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality 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 that the practice achieved 98% of the total number of points available, with 24% exception reporting. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF or other national clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 100% which was better to the CCG and national average 78%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 100% which was better to the CCG and national average 83 %.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 93% which was better to the CCG and national average 83%.
- The dementia diagnosis rate was 94% which was above the CCG and national average 84%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been nine clinical audits completed in the last two years, all of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.

- The practice participated in applicable local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, introduction of memory clinic on Tuesdays and Fridays.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as; improving Physiotherapist access times.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed non-clinical members of staff that 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 e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme.
- 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 these 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 the revalidation of doctors. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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 people to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they are 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, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits to ensure it met the practices responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Health promotion and prevention

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. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.

The practice had a failsafe system for ensuring results were received for every sample sent as part of the cervical screening programme. The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 80%. 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.

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 89% to 100% and five year olds was 100%. Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 74%, and at risk groups 55%. These were also above CCG and national averages.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We observed that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated people 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 and that 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 four patient CQC comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We also spoke with three members of the patient participation group. They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Discussions with patients 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 doctors and nurses. For example:

- 92% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 88% and national average of 89%.
- 97% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 85%, national average 87%).
- 99% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 95%, national average 95%)
- 95% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 84%, national average 85%).

- 96% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 88%, national average 90%).
- 90% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 83%, national average 87%)

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us that 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 and 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 local and national averages. For example:

- 91% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 86%.
- 93% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 79%, national average 81 %)

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. The practice had identified 15% of the practice list as carers. 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. Last year partners went to a drop in health check at a local community centre to discuss patient issues. This was for all patients in the area not just patients of the practice.

- The practice offered later appointments on a Wednesday evening until 7pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients / patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities and a hearing loop available.
- The practice had a lift to improve access.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 7:30am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 7:30am to 10:30am every morning and 3pm to 5:30pm daily. Extended hours surgeries were offered until 7pm on Wednesday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four 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. People told us on the day that they were able to get appointments when they needed them.

- 83% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 71% and national average of 75%.
- 91% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 62%, national average 73%).
- 86% patients described their experience of making an appointment as good (CCG average 64%, national average 73%).
- 78% patients said they usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time (CCG average 66%, national average 65%).

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.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system e.g. posters displayed and summary leaflet available.

We looked at five complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, all the GPs would now check a child's weight even though the examination and feeding history was reassuring.

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 clear strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This outlined the structures and procedures 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
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which is used to monitor quality and to make improvements
- There were good arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions

Leadership, openness and transparency

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

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 gives affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal or 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 that the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and confident in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- 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

- Gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met on a regular basis, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG developed the patient surveys and produced the practice newsletter.
- Had also gathered feedback from staff. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

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