

Moreton Health Clinic - J Wright

Quality Report

Moreton Health Clinic
8/14 Chadwick Street
Moreton
Wirral
CH46 7XA
Tel: 0151 522 0099
Website: www.moretonhealthclinic.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 28 January 2016
Date of publication: 23/03/2016

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	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10
Outstanding practice	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Moreton Health Clinic - J Wright	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection Moreton Health Clinic on 28 January 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.

- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the Duty of Candour (this means providers must be open and transparent with patients' about their care and treatment, including when it goes wrong).

We saw areas of outstanding practice including:

- The practice had undertaken an extensive training programme to become an accredited GP practice for the Gold Standard Framework (GSF is a model that enables good practice to be available to all people nearing the end of their lives, irrespective of diagnosis). This was a significant undertaking and audits demonstrated improvements in the quality of care and treatment offered to patients nearing the end of their lives.

Summary of findings

- The practice with the support of the patient participation group (PPG) had recently set up a carers support group that offered peer support and practical advice about other support networks and services.

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
- The practice used every opportunity to learn from internal and external incidents, to support improvement. Learning was based on a thorough analysis and investigation.
- 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 or comparable to others for almost all aspects of care. For example, 96% of patients had and trust in the last GP they saw or spoke to compared to a CCG average of 96% and a national average of 95%.
- Feedback from patients about their care and treatment was consistently and strongly positive.
- We observed a strong patient-centred culture.

Good



Summary of findings

- Staff were motivated and inspired to offer kind and compassionate care and worked to overcome obstacles to achieving this. For example, the practice had undertaken an extensive training programme to become an accredited GP practice for the Gold Standard Framework (GSF is a model that enables good practice to be available to all people nearing the end of their lives, irrespective of diagnosis).
- We found many positive examples to demonstrate how patient's choices and preferences were valued and acted on.
- Views of external stakeholders were very positive and aligned with our findings.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example the practice provides and minor injury and illness walk in clinic for their patients and the wider community.
- 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 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.
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 81% compared to the national average of 88%.
- 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 provided holistic care and support to patients nearing the end of their lives and provided support to their families and carers.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were effective systems in place to identify, monitor 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 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- The CQC data pack showed that screening rates of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years was 84% compared to the national average of 81%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice operated a minor injuries and illness drop in clinic which was available to their patients and the wider community.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.
- The practice hosted a number of health and social support agencies such as employment support, carers' forum and citizens' advice to offer support and advice to patients.

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.
- The practice operated a minor injuries and illness drop in clinic which was available to their patients and the wider community.
- The practice provided extended opening hours two days a week until 7.30pm.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including 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.

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.

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).

- 92% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2013 to 31/03/2014) compared with the national average of 88%.
- 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 practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they had 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 in January 2016 showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 384 survey forms were distributed and 120 were returned. This was a response rate of 31.3% and representative of 1.9% of the patient population.

- 96% of patients found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 77% and a national average of 73%.
- 90% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 87%, national average 85%).
- 94% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 89%, national average 84%).

- 83% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 83%, national average 77%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 31 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients told us they had confidence in the practice, felt valued and listened to and were able to get an appointment when they needed to.

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

Outstanding practice

We saw areas of outstanding practice including:

- The practice had undertaken an extensive training programme to become an accredited GP practice for the Gold Standard Framework (GSF is a model that enables good practice to be available to all people nearing the end of their lives, irrespective of

diagnosis). This was a significant undertaking and audits demonstrated improvements in the quality of care and treatment offered to patients nearing the end of their lives.

- The practice with the support of the patient participation group (PPG) had recently set up a carers support group that offered peer support and practical advice about other support networks and services.

Moreton Health Clinic - J Wright

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.

Background to Moreton Health Clinic - J Wright

Moreton Health Clinic is registered with CQC to provide primary care services, which include access to GPs, family planning, ante and post-natal care. The practice is based in Moreton, Wirral.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with a registered list size of 6177 patients (at the time of inspection). The practice has one female and two male GP partners, one male and two female salaried GPs, a nurse practitioner, three practice nurses and a healthcare assistant. The practice also has a practice manager and a number of administration and reception staff.

The practice is open between 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday with appointments bookable in a variety of ways. Extended access is available Wednesday and Thursday from 6.30pm to 7.30pm. The practice has a minor injury and illness walk-in clinic which is open Monday to Friday from 10am. Home visits and telephone consultations are available for patients who required them, including housebound patients and older patients. There are also

arrangements to ensure patients received urgent medical assistance when the practice was closed. Out of hours patients are asked to contact the NHS 111 service to obtain healthcare advice or treatment.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 28 January 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

Detailed findings

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, the practice through an investigation and analysis of a significant event identified that there was a need for a protocol to be put in place with regard to two week suspected cancer and minor surgery referrals were closely monitored to ensure appointments were received by patients and lab results were actioned in a timely manner.

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 for safeguarding who was supported by a lead administrator. 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 3. The practice had an effective system to monitor and review vulnerable children's

attendance at A&E departments, walk in health services and GP out of hours services and none attendance at secondary care appointments and ensured information was appropriately coded to support clinicians to effectively safeguard vulnerable children.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check.
- 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. We discussed with the practice the need to carry out risk assessment where a possible risk of cross infection was identified such as fabric covered chairs. Since the inspection the practice has provided a completed risk assessment and information that showed the chairs were professionally cleaned at regular intervals.
- 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. The practice worked proactively with the local pharmacy and patients to maximise the benefit of the medicines prescribed and to reduce the stock piling of medication. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found for clinical staff all 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 DBS. We discussed with the practice the need to ensure references were sought

Are services safe?

for administration and reception staff, the practice manager confirmed references would be sought prior to employment. The practice had a system in place to monitor the professional registration of their clinicians.

- There were appropriate 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 reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor the safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health, 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 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 defibrillators available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book was available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All 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. We discussed with the practice the need to include up to date emergency numbers for staff to refer to. Following the inspection, the practice confirmed they had updated the business continuity plan.

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 showed the practice had attained 96% of the total number of points available, with 9% 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). Data from 2014/15 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the national average. For example: The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who had had influenza immunisation in the preceding 12 months was 98% which was better than the national average of 94%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months is 150/90mmHg or less was 84% which was comparable to the national average of 83%.
- The percentage of female patients aged 50-70 years screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage) was 71% which was comparable to the CCG and national average of 72%.

- The percentage of patients with asthma, on the register, who have had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that includes an assessment of asthma control using the 3 RCP questions was 74% was comparable to the national average of 75%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been five clinical audits completed in the last two years, three audits 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, a review of patients with type 2 diabetes had resulted in information about outcomes for patients being used to make improvements such as a review of the recall system used to for those patients with long term conditions. This had resulted in a more individualised system for patients that met their needs.

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. It covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff for example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, staff administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme. Staff had received specific training which had included an assessment of their 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 on-going support

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 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 on-going 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. We saw evidence that clinicians were aware of their role and responsibility with regard to their involvement in making best interest decisions for vulnerable patients.

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 and 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 and those patients with addiction issues. The practice referred patients to the CCG led 'live well' programme and also sign posted to other services for further support.

The percentage of patients with COPD who had a review undertaken including an assessment of breathlessness using the Medical Research Council dyspnoea scale in the preceding 12 months was 94% which was higher than the national average of 89%

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/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 for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

The practice referred patients to the CCG led 'live well' for further support.

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 31 Care Quality Commission patient 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 six members of the Patient Participation Group (PPG). They also told us they were very satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when patients needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 93% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 91% and national average of 88%.
- 97% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 89%, national average 86%).
- 98% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%)
- 91% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 89%, national average 85%).

- 96% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 92%, national average 90%).
- 96% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 90%, national average 86%)

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.

Staff were motivated and inspired to offer kind and compassionate care and worked to overcome obstacles to achieving this. For example, the practice had undertaken an extensive training programme to become an accredited GP practice for the Gold Standard Framework (GSF is a model that enables good practice to be available to all people nearing the end of their lives, irrespective of diagnosis). The practice worked hard and engaged with other services to support patients nearing the end of their lives to live their lives how they wished to.

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:

- 91% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 86%.
- 88% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 86%, national average 81%).
- 94% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 87%, national average 84%).

Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as their first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.

Are services caring?

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 with the support of the patient participation group (PPG) had recently set up a carers

support group that offered peer support and practical advice about other support networks and services. 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 or sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

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 had worked with the CCG to set up a minor injury and illness walk in centre to support patients and the wider community access healthcare support and treatment.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on a Wednesday and Evening Wednesday evening until 7.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- The minor injury and illness drop in clinic operated from 10am Monday to Friday and provided extended hours four days per week. This service was available to patients from the practice and the wider community.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately/were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended surgery hours were offered at the following times on 6.30pm to 7.30pm Wednesday and Thursday. The minor injury and illness walk in centre was available from 10am Monday to Friday. This service was a nurse practitioner led service that offered patients and the wider community. The service offered the community a viable alternative to attending the local A&E department. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

The practice had an automated appointment line that allowed patients to book, cancel, check or change appointments. This service operated seven days a week.

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.

- 86% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 81% and national average of 74%.
- 96% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 77%, national average 73%).
- 62% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 63%, national average 60%).

People 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.

- 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 such as posters displayed in the waiting area.

The practice had received fourteen complaints in the last twelve months and we looked at three. We found they 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, a complaint about how information was shared with patients with regard to the issuing of repeat prescriptions resulted in discussions with staff to ensure the practice protocol was followed.

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 robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and these 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 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 took the time to listen to all members of staff. Staff also told us the practice supported training and invested in their career development.

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.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the practice management team. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged 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 the NHS 'Friends and Family Test' and complaints received. There was an active PPG that met regularly and was enthusiastic about working in partnership with the practice to support improvement. The practice carried out regular surveys to ensure the services provided met the needs and expectations of the patient population. The practice had developed action plans and was working to address issues identified.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and informal team discussions. 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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

The practice had undertaken an extensive training programme to become an accredited GP practice for the Gold Standard Framework (GSF is a model that enables good practice to be available to all people nearing the end

of their lives, irrespective of diagnosis). This was a significant undertaking and audits demonstrated improvements in the quality of care and treatment offered to patients nearing the end of their lives.