

St Davids Practice

Quality Report

Feltham Centre for Health
Feltham, Hounslow
TW13 4GU
Tel: 02088937448
Website: www.stdavidspractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 24 October 2016
Date of publication: 30/03/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Requires improvement	
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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to St Davids Practice	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13
Action we have told the provider to take	23

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at St Davids Practice on 24 October 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- The practice had a system in place for reporting and recording safeguarding concerns; however, not all relevant incidents were recorded as safeguarding concerns, and therefore opportunities to learn from these incidents were sometimes missed.
- Risks to patients were mostly assessed and well managed. However, the practice did not have their own defibrillator available or a risk assessment to show that they had considered and mitigated against the risk of not having one.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- 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.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- The provider must review their process for recording and reporting safeguarding concerns to ensure that all staff are aware of the threshold for reporting and recording a safeguarding concern and that lessons learned are appropriately shared and embedded.

- Ensure that the practice has a defibrillator available to respond to medical emergencies or to have completed a risk assessment identifying how they would deal with medical emergencies.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Revise arrangements in place to ensure that patients with caring responsibilities are identified, so their needs are identified and can be met.

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 requires improvement for providing safe services.

- The practice had some systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse. However, they did not always recognise safeguarding concerns, for example, they incorrectly identified and recorded a recent safeguarding concern as a significant incident. All staff had safeguarding training relevant to their role and were aware of their responsibilities in relation to safeguarding.
- Risks to patients were mostly assessed and well managed. However, the practice did not have their own defibrillator available or a risk assessment to show that they had considered and mitigated against the risk of not having one.
- There was a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- When incidents were correctly identified lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



Summary of findings

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

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 (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice provided home visits to monitor the international normalised ratio (INR) for patients with limited mobility.
- 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 it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.

Good



Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- 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.
- These patients had a named GP and were offered an annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



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.
- 74% of patients diagnosed with asthma had an asthma review in the last 12 months; this was comparable to the local average of 76% and national average of 75%.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the local and national average, for instance:
- 69% of patients with diabetes on the register had their blood sugar recorded as well controlled (local average 69%, national average 77%).
- 73% of patients with diabetes on the register had their cholesterol measured as well controlled (local average 74%, national average 81%).
- 92% of patients with diabetes on the register had a recorded foot examination and risk classification (local average 85%, national average 88%).
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and were offered an annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Summary of findings

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.
- 73% of women aged 25-64 had it recorded on their notes that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years; this was comparable to the local average of 77% and national average of 82%.
- 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 and health visitors.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- 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 offered extended opening hours on Tuesday evenings which suited working age people.

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 homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.

Good



Summary of findings

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

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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the local and national average:
 - 92% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had their alcohol consumption recorded in the preceding 12 months (local average 91%, national average 90%).
 - 92% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan recorded in the last 12 months (local average 88%, national average 88%).
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Two hundred and eighty eight survey forms were distributed and 123 were returned. This represented 2% of the practice's patient list.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responded positively to questions relating to appointments and access to nurses and GPs. Some of the results were in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 84% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (local average 72%, national average 73%).

- 71% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried, (local average 71%, national average 76%).
- 78% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good, (local average 81%, national average 85%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 30 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

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

St Davids Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to St Davids Practice

St Davids Practice, provides primary medical services in the London Borough of Ealing to approximately 7400 patients. The practice operates under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract and provides a number of local and national enhanced services (enhanced services require an increased level of service provision above that which is normally required under the core GP contract).

The practice operates from one site. The surgery is a purpose built health centre, which they share with four other practices. The ground floor is occupied by retail shops; the health centre is located on the first floor with lift access. There is ramp access to the waiting area and reception desk. The practice has six consulting rooms..

The practice clinical team is made up of three GP partners (male and female), one practice nurse, two healthcare assistants (HCA), one phlebotomist and non-clinical staff.

The practice offers 26 GP sessions per week.

The practice opens between 8.30am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday.

Appointments are available between 8:30am to 6:30pm.

Extended hours are available from 6:30am to 8:30am on Tuesdays.

When the practice is closed patients can call NHS 111 in an emergency or a local out of hour's service.

The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of; maternity and midwifery service, treatment of disease, disorder or injury, family planning, diagnostic and screening procedures and surgical procedures.

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 24 October 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (two GPs, one practice nurse, two HCA's, one practice manager and other non-clinical staff).
- Spoke with eight patients.
- Spoke with two PPG members.
- 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 30 comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, a patient complained that the reception staff confirmed that they will have the repeat prescription ready to be collected within 24 hours when in fact the GP had requested the patient to be booked in for a review appointment before the prescription was to be issued. The practice apologised to the patient and investigated the matter. The significant event was addressed in line with the practice policy and was discussed at the next team meeting. Training was provided to relevant staff to ensure that they were familiar with the process.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly

outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead 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 on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs, the practice nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3, the HCA was trained to level 2. All non-clinical staff were trained to were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 1. However, they did not always recognise safeguarding concerns; for example, they incorrectly identified and recorded a recent safe guarding concern as a significant incident.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection 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.
- 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 CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGD) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before

Are services safe?

presentation for treatment). The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions (PSD) to enable Health Care Assistants to administer vaccines after specific training when a doctor or nurse were on the premises (PSDs are written instructions from a qualified and registered prescriber for a medicine including the dose, route and frequency or appliance to be supplied or administered to a named patient after the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis).

- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment of permanent, contract and locum staff. For example, proof of 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 a poster in the reception office. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a 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 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 is one of four practices located in a purpose built health centre. The practice has access to two defibrillators, which were shared amongst all four practices. However, on the day of the inspection there was no risk assessment in place to demonstrate that the practice had considered and mitigated against the risk of not having access to their own defibrillator. The practice confirmed that they had verbal arrangements in place to borrow the defibrillator of the practices they shared premises with, however, there was no evidence available to confirm this arrangement. The practice has now reviewed the situation and have implemented an appropriate risk assessment which states that they have formal arrangements in place to access the two defibrillators in a medical emergency, which they can access within two minutes.
- A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.

The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The practice assessed needs and delivered care in line with relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met 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). This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014 - 2015 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the local and national average:
 - 69% of patients with diabetes on the register had their blood sugar recorded as well controlled (local average 69%, national average 77%).
 - 73% of patients with diabetes on the register had their cholesterol measured as well controlled (local average 74%, national average 81%).
 - 92% of patients with diabetes on the register had a recorded foot examination and risk classification (local average 85%, national average 88%).
 - The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was comparable to the local and national average:
 - 79% of patients with hypertension had a blood pressure reading of 150/90mmHg or less (local average 81%, national average 84%).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the local and national average:

- 92% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had their alcohol consumption recorded in the preceding 12 months (local average 91%, national average 90%).
- 92% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan recorded in the last 12 months (local average 88%, national average 88%).

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research. There had been three clinical audits undertaken within the last two years, all of which were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. For example, an audit was looking at the prescribing of Warfarin, a medicine used to reduce the risk of stroke from atrial fibrillation (AF). The practice as part of the audit monitored the international normalised ratio (INR) values for housebound patients. The result of the audit showed that adherence to the audit criteria was low during the first cycle. However, there was notable improvement during the second cycle, after implementation of the practice agreed recommendations. Reoccurring low INR readings significantly increase the risk of stroke, whereas high INR readings increase the risk of haemorrhage. As a result of the re-audit 100% of patients had their INR controlled adequately, compared to 80% at the beginning of the audit.

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 reviewing patients with long-term conditions. Staff administering vaccines and taking

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on alcohol cessation were signposted to the relevant service.
- A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 73%, which was comparable to the local average of 77%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. 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. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. For example:

- 65% of female patients at the practice aged 50-70 had been screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (local average 66% and national average 72%).
- 46% of patients at the practice aged 60-69 had been screened for bowel cancer within the past 30 months (local average 46% and 55% national average).

Are services effective? (for example, treatment is effective)

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were comparable to the local average. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 47% to 86% (local 42% to 88%) and five year olds from 67% to 95% (local 61% to 88%).

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

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

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

- 88% said the GP was good at listening to them (local average 85%, national average 88%).
- 83% said the GP gave them enough time (local average 81%, national average 86%).
- 80% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (local average 84%, national average 91%).

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback from the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views. We also saw that care plans were personalised.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. The practice was comparable to the local and national average, for example:

- 88% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments, (local average 84%, national average 86%).
- 78% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (local average 77%, national average 82%).
- 83% said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments (local average 84%, national average 90%).

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

- 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

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 32 patients as carers (0.5% of the practice list). The practice used their register to improve care for carers, for example carers were

Are services caring?

offered flexible appointment times and the seasonal influenza vaccine. 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

Responding to and meeting people's needs

Practice staff 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 provided home visits to monitor the international normalised ratio (INR) for patients with limited mobility.

- The practice offered extended hours from 6:30pm to 8:30pm every Tuesday.
- The GP's collectively provided 27 clinical sessions a week.
- When the practice is closed patients can call NHS 111 in an emergency or a local out of hour's service.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- The premises were accessible, there was a hearing loop and translation services available.
- Other reasonable adjustments were made and action was taken to remove barriers when patients find it hard to use or access services.

Access to the service

- The practice is open from 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday.
- In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available on the same day 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 the local and national averages.

- 76% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours (local average 78%, national average 78%).
- 84% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (local average 72%, national average 73%).
- 34% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (local average 30%, national average 36%).

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, posters were displayed in the waiting area and leaflets were available for patients at the reception desk.

We looked at four complaints received in the last 12 months and found that lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a patient complained that their psychologist was sharing information about their treatment plan with the GP at the practice. The complaint was dealt with in line with the practice policy; it was investigated, responded to and discussed at the next team meeting. The practice apologised to the patient and explained the reason why the psychologist and the GP practice had to share information.

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
- The practice

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This outlined the structures and procedures in place and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit 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

On the day of inspection the partners told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology.
- The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

There was a clear leadership structure in place and staff felt supported by management.

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the practice changed their contact number from an expensive premium number to a number which is charged at a local rate.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff generally through staff meetings, 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 focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, the practice was part of a pilot scheme providing home visits to monitor the international normalised ratio (INR) for patients with limited mobility.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment</p> <p>How the regulation was not being met:</p> <p>The registered person did not have a clear process in place for analysing significant events, incidents and near misses.</p> <p>The provider did not ensure that there was a defibrillator available at the practice or a risk assessment to indicate the risks of not having one have been assessed.</p> <p>The registered person did not have a defibrillator available at the practice and had not completed a risk assessment to indicate they had assessed the risks this may present to patients.</p>