

Wessex Road Surgery

Quality Report

Wessex Road,
Poole,
BH14 8BQ
Tel: 01202 734924
Website: www.wessexroadsurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 17 February 2016
Date of publication: 20/04/2016

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	6
What people who use the service say	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Wessex Road Surgery	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Wessex Road Surgery on 17 February 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 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 provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

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 2014/15 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 July 2015 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Feedback from the friends and family survey which asked patients how likely they were to recommend the service to friends and family was consistently positive. In January 2016 100% of respondents said they were extremely likely to recommend the service

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, a nurse was employed to give care and support to the over 75 years at home.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to 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

Good



Summary of findings

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.
- 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 patients.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice offered over 75's health checks to all those patients who were not on a chronic disease register.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice employed a nurse to specifically look after the over 75's were they had been discharged from hospital, attended the local accident and emergency department or had frequent contact with the practice. This was to facilitate any changes with their medication, address their concerns and/or improve their situation to avoid further crises.

Good



People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for the care of patients 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 percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who have had influenza
- Immunisation in the preceding 1 August to 31 March 2015 was 96.12%, which was better than the national average of 94.45%.
- 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.
 - The practice had regular liaison with specialist nurses to support patients with a diagnosis of diabetes, Parkinson's disease, patients that had, had a stroke, and patients with a diagnosis of epilepsy.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

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 patients who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- 86.08% of patients diagnosed with asthma, on the register, had received an asthma review in the last 12 months compared to the national average of 75.53%
- Patients told us that children and young patients 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 had been performed in the preceding 5 years was 83.71%, which was better than 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)

The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age patients (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 patients whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including 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 patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- Information was available for patients who had experienced/ experiencing domestic violence. Clinical staff had recently completed Domestic Violence awareness training.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- 80.88% of patients diagnosed with dementia had, had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 84.01%.
- 100% of patients diagnosed with mental health issues had received a face to face review within the last 12 months. This was better than the national average of 84%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- 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.
- The practice had a carers lead within the practice in order to improve the service and the support provided to carers.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 2 July 2015. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 255 survey forms were distributed and 127 were returned. This represented 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 97.8% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to a Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 85.3% and a national average of 73.3%.
- 85.7% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 89.7% and national average 85.2%).
- 80.7% of patients described the overall experience of their GP practice as fairly good or very good (CCG average 82.3% and national average 73.3%).
- 86.9% of patients said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 84% and national average 77.5%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for Care Quality Commission comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 44 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients had written comments which included praise for staff professionalism, kind and caring behaviour and the delivery of a high standard service.

We spoke with four patients during the inspection. All four patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. Feedback from friends and family survey which asked patients how likely they were to recommend the service to friends and family was consistently positive. In January 2016 100% of respondents said they were extremely likely to recommend the service.

Wessex Road Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a Care Quality Commission Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Wessex Road Surgery

The Wessex Road Surgery was inspected on 17 February 2016. This was a comprehensive inspection.

The practice is situated in Parkstone near to the town centre of Poole. The practice provides a general medical service to 6,160 patients of a diverse age group.

There is a team of four GPs partners, two male and two female. Who worked part and full time. Partners hold managerial and financial responsibility for running the business. The team is supported by a practice manager, three practice nurses, a specialist nurse for the over 75 years, a phlebotomist (a person trained to take blood) and additional administration staff.

Patients using the practice also had access to health visitors who are based at the practice. Other health care professionals visit the practice on a regular basis.

The practice is open between 8am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are available from 8:30am every morning to 5:30pm daily. Extended hours appointments are offered three mornings a week for pre bookable appointments between 7am and 8am. The practice offered a range of appointment types including book on the day, telephone consultations and advance appointments.

Outside of these times patients are directed through their website to contact the out of hour's service by using the NHS 111 number.

The practice had has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with NHS England.

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 we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 17 February 2016 During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nurses, reception and administrative staff. We also spoke to a representative of the patient participation group (PPG) and spoke with two patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.

Detailed findings

- 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 patient's needs?
- Is it well-led?

We also looked at how well services were provided for specific groups of patients 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 Care Quality Commission 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 with a suspected stroke was advised to attend the surgery when the reception staff should have advised the patient to call 999. The patient arrived within ten minutes of the call and an ambulance was called immediately. The staff received further training on the signs and symptoms of a stroke and posters advising patients on what to do if they suspected they were having a stroke were put up in the waiting room.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received support, truthful information, an 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 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 for children.

A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. The nurses who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had

received a 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. 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 vaccines, 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 Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescriptions used within the practice were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. However we found that individual prescription pads issued to GPs for home visits were not stored securely. The practice took action immediately to ensure that these were stored securely. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.

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

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.

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

Are services safe?

reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment undertaken in April 2015 and had carried out regular fire drills, the last being in June 2015. All electrical equipment was checked in October 2015 to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked in January 2016 to ensure it was fit for use. 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 term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure 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 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 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 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 patient's 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 were 99% of the total number of points available. 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 86.34% which was higher than the national average of 78.03%
- The percentage of patients with hypertension, having regular blood pressure tests was 87.97% which was higher than the national average of 83.65%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100% which was higher than the national average of 83.65%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

There had been six clinical audits completed in the last year, 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, the practice had undertaken an audit of all

patient deaths, in a three month period, to determine whether they were on the practice palliative care register. This register was to ensure quality end of life care by encouraging patients to discuss their wishes and choices about what they do and do not want. They found that out of 19 patients only six (31%) were on the register. After analysing the reasons for this they found that discussions had taken place with patients but these had not been coded correctly on the computer system and the list had not included patients suffering from other illnesses other than cancer.

Following training for staff, improving documentation, and including more professionals with care planning the practice repeated the audit four months later, they found that with 16 deaths, eight (50%) were on the palliative care register which demonstrated an improvement in their clinical practice.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those staff reviewing patients with long-term conditions. Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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.

- 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 every six to eight weeks 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 patients, 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.

The practice employed a nurse to visit patients aged over 75 years in their own home. The purpose of these visits were to provide additional support and advice.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 83.71%, which was comparable to 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. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. 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 Clinical Commissioning Group/ national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 94.3% to 100% and five year olds from 92% to 97.7%.

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

We spoke with one member 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. Care Quality Commission comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey (July 2015) showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 92.4% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 91.9% and national average of 88.6%.
- 91.4% of patients said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 89.9%, national average 86.6%).
- 99.1% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96.9%, national average 95.2%)

- 92.5% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 89.2%, national average 85.1%).
- 90.3% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 92.3%, national average 90.4%).
- 87.7% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 89.8%, national average 86.8%)

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 in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 88.1% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 89.1% and national average of 86%.
- 88% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 86.1% and national average 81.4%)
- 89.9% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 87.4% and national average 84.8%)

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.

Are services caring?

The practice had a carer's lead who was in the process of identifying patients that were also 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. A staff member had devised a useful information sheet for relatives of the deceased person that gave a practical guide of who to contact and telephone numbers of local support agencies.

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 employed a nurse to provide support and care for the patients aged over 75 years to avoid hospital admissions.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' two mornings a week for patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had difficulties attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- Flexible appointments were available for carers.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8:30am to 11.10am every morning and 3pm to 5.30pm daily. Extended practice hours were offered between 7am and 8am on Wednesday and Thursday mornings. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 87.8% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 78.8% and national average of 74.9%.
- 97.8% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone (CCG average 85.3% and national average 73.3%).
- 69.5% of patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 70.9% and national average 60%).

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had an effective system in place for handling complaints and concerns. The 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, for examples, posters displayed in the waiting area, together with leaflets. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint.

We looked at five complaints received by the practice within the last 12 months and found that all of these had been satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Written complaints responses showed that openness and transparency had been followed when dealing with the complaint.

Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, following a telephone call received from a patient requesting a new medicine that had been prescribed by the hospital the patient was given the response that the practice were unable to take medicines requests over the telephone. The team discussed how easy it was not to fully understand what patients were trying to convey. The staff were given additional training which highlighted how to pass on and take information from patients.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust 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 was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust 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 prioritise 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 patients 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 there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues to the management team and felt 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. The practice 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 a virtual PPG which carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a strong 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.