

Dr Jones & Partners

Quality Report

Mattishall Surgery
15 Dereham Road
Mattishall
East Dereham
Norfolk
NR20 3QA

Tel: 01362 850 227

Website: www.mattishallsurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 9 February 2016

Date of publication: 31/03/2016

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?

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	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Dr Jones & Partners	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14
Action we have told the provider to take	22

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Jones and Partners on 9 February 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.

- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

The areas where the provider must make improvements are:

- Improve the arrangements for the security of blank prescription forms to ensure that they are only accessible to authorised staff.
- Risk assess the systems in place for the ordering and collection of repeat prescriptions.

The area where the provider should make an improvement is:

Summary of findings

- Ensure that dispensing errors are investigated as significant events in order to ensure continuous learning.

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. However, dispensed errors were not handled and discussed by GPs as significant events to ensure they had appropriate oversight of them within the practice.
- When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and a 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 generally assessed and well managed. However, there was scope for the practice to risk assess the systems in place for the ordering and collection of repeat prescriptions.
- The practice did not have robust arrangements in place to ensure the security of medicines and prescription pads stored in the dispensary area.

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 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- Data from the National GP Patient Survey published in January 2016 showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice referred to an Admiral Nurse service to provide individualised support for patients who were carers of people with dementia.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP, and that there was continuity of care with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.

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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents, and shared them with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- 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.

Good



- 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.
- An Age UK representative was available at the practice once a month for older patients to assist them to access help, information and to signpost them to relevant agencies.
- The practice contributed to the development of a local Intergrated Care Organisation, which provided them with direct access to social workers, community matrons, a community geriatrician, a dementia practitioner and an Admiral Nurse service. The practice held monthly multidisciplinary team meetings to discuss the case management of patients.
- The practice referred patients for short term admissions in nursing care settings care when required to avoid their admission to hospital.
- Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients for conditions commonly found in older people, including rheumatoid arthritis and heart failure, were above local and national averages.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management, and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) to monitor outcomes for patients (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). Data from 2014/2015 showed that performance for diabetes related indicators was 99%, which was above the CCG average by 7% and the England average by 10%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.

Summary of findings

- Patients with long-term conditions 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.

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.
- The practice had undertaken an audit of children who did not attend appointments, and had discussed the outcomes in a recent safeguarding meeting. A repeat of this audit was planned for March 2016.
- Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to the CCG and England average.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

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.
- Practice staff carried out NHS health checks for patients between the ages of 40 and 74 years. The practice was able to refer patients to a health trainer to encourage lifestyle changes.

Good



Summary of findings

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

Good



- 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. For example, patients who were carers were proactively identified and signposted to local carers' groups.
- 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.
- The practice worked with two local residential settings for looked after children.

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).

Good



- 84% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to CCG and national averages.
- 91% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive care plan, which was comparable to the CCG average and 2.6% above the England average.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- An Admiral Nurse service was available for patients who were carers of people with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The National GP Patient Survey results were published in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above local and national averages. 236 survey forms were distributed and 138 were returned. This is a 58% response rate.

- 93% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 72% and a national average of 73%.
- 97% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 87%, national average 85%).
- 92% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 84%, national average 85%).

- 93% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 78%, national average 78%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 18 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Clinical and non-clinical members of staff received specific praise for their kindness, efficiency and care. Patients reported that they felt listened to and involved in decisions about their treatment, and were treated with compassion.

We spoke with six patients during the inspection. All six patients said that they were happy with the care they received and thought that staff were approachable, committed and caring. A patient told us that they felt 'empowered' by the practice's focus on patient education and self care.

Dr Jones & Partners

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 a pharmacist inspector.

Background to Dr Jones & Partners

Drs Jones and Partners is situated in Mattishall, South Norfolk. The practice provides services for approximately 8252 patients. It holds a General Medical Services contract with South Norfolk CCG.

According to information taken from Public Health England, the patient population has a higher than average number of patients aged 50 – 85+ years. The practice has a lower than average number of patients aged 0 – 50 years compared to the practice average across England.

The practice team consists of two male GPs and seven female GPs, four members of management staff, four practice nurses and two healthcare assistants. The team also includes secretarial, dispensary and reception staff.

The practice is open from Monday to Friday. It offers GP and nurse appointments between 8:30am and 6pm. It does not offer any extended hours clinics. The practice has a branch surgery in the neighbouring village of Lenwade. It offers appointments between 08.30am and 11.20am on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. It also offers appointments between 2pm and 6pm on Mondays. Lenwade Surgery was not inspected as part of this inspection.

Lenwade Surgery was inspected in February 2014 using previous CQC methodology, and was found to be compliant with the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008. The practice did not receive a rating following this inspection under CQC's previous methodology.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 9 February 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 an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.

Detailed findings

- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

We also looked at how well services 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

The practice had 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 also a recording form available on the practice's computer system. 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.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, national patient safety alerts and minutes of clinical meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, following the identification of a drug error, extra training was put in place to ensure that staff were confident and competent in administering contraceptive injections.

Overview of safety systems and processes

Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. The policies were available to all staff, and clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if they had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding Level 3 for children.

A notice in the waiting room advised patients that nurses would act as chaperones if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a disclosure and barring check (DBS check). DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they might 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. There were two designated leads for infection control 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. We saw evidence that infection control audits were undertaken and actions had been taken to address any shortfalls identified as a result. There was a log of daily infection control activity undertaken in the treatment room. The practice had a contract with a local cleaning agency who were involved in the audit process and presented their findings on the day of inspection.

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

There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Medicines Management

The practice was signed up to the Dispensing Services Quality Scheme (DSQS) to help ensure dispensing processes were suitable and the quality of the service was maintained. The dispensary operated alongside a Pharmacy which was registered and regulated by the General Pharmaceutical Council. Dispensary staffing levels were in line with DSQS guidance. Dispensing staff were appropriately qualified, were provided on-going training opportunities and had their competency annually reviewed. The practice had conducted some auditing of the quality of its dispensing service which showed high patient satisfaction.

The practice had written procedures in place for the production of prescriptions and dispensing of medicines that were regularly reviewed and reflected current practice. There were a variety of ways available to patients to order their repeat prescriptions. One of the options included the practice accepting direct telephone instructions by patients but the practice had not considered the risks relating to this. There were arrangements in place to provide medicines in compliance aids and a twice weekly delivery service for patients. There was a prescription collection

Are services safe?

point established at a nearby village shop, however, the practice had also not considered the risks relating to this. Prescriptions were reviewed and signed by GPs before they were given to the patient to ensure safety.

The practice had recently put in place means by which blank prescription forms were recorded and tracked through the practice, however, more robust record-keeping was needed to ensure blank prescriptions could be accounted for. We noted that the practice should make more robust arrangements for the security of medicines and prescription pads stored in the dispensary areas ensuring they are only accessible to authorised staff. Records showed medicine refrigerator temperature checks were carried out which ensured medicines requiring refrigeration were stored at appropriate temperatures. Staff told us that processes were in place to regularly check medicines stored within the dispensary areas were within their expiry date and suitable for use.

We saw a positive culture in the practice for reporting and learning from medicine incidents and errors. Both dispensed errors and near-miss dispensing errors were logged and then reviewed within the dispensary to monitor trends and ensure appropriate actions were taken to minimise the chance of similar errors occurring again. However, dispensed errors were not handled and discussed by GPs as significant events to ensure they had appropriate oversight of them within the practice.

Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Furthermore, the practice had a system for the production of Patient Specific Directions to enable health care assistants to administer vaccinations after specific training and when a doctor or nurse were on the premises.

Monitoring risks to patients

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 safety of the premises, such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency. Staff were also aware of panic alarm buttons. All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room. The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises, along with oxygen with adult and children's masks.

There was a first aid kit and accident book available. Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use. We found out of date needles and syringes in the emergency bag, however this was dealt with immediately and the practice provided us with evidence of a new emergency equipment checking policy and protocol.

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. This was held online and off site.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The practice assessed patients' 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 people's needs. The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

We saw that staff were open about asking for and providing colleagues with advice and support. GPs told us that they supported all staff to continually review and discuss new best practice guidelines. This also took place during clinical meetings and the minutes we reviewed confirmed this. We saw that where a clinician had concerns they would telephone or message another clinician to confirm their diagnosis, treatment plan or get a second opinion.

We found from our discussions with the GPs and nurses they completed thorough assessments of patients' needs in line with NICE guidelines. These were reviewed when appropriate.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice. The most recent published results were 99% of the total number of points available, with 7% exception reporting (exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/2015 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the CCG and national average. The practice achieved 98.8% of the total number of points available, which was 7% above the CCG average and 9.6% above the England average.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was better than the CCG and national average. The practice achieved 93% of the total number of points available, which was 6.8% above the CCG average and 9.4% above the England average.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the CCG and national average. The practice achieved 96.2% of the total number of points available, which was 1.6% above the CCG average and 3.4% above the England average.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement. There had been six clinical audits completed in the last year, one of these was a completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. The practice participated in applicable local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research. Findings were used by the practice to improve services.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment. The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed non-clinical members of staff that covered topics including safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.

The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme.

The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for the revalidation of doctors and nurses. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Staff received training that included safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to, and made use of, e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

The information needed to plan and deliver care and treatment was available to relevant staff in a timely and accessible way through the practice's patient record system and their intranet system. This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available. The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring people to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that the multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that patients' care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice had previously used a patient consent form for minor surgical procedures undertaken on site, however there was no evidence of this on the day of inspection. When we discussed this with staff, a new protocol was quickly implemented and copies of the consent forms were printed off for each consultation room.

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.

When interviewed, staff were able to give examples of how a patient's best interests were taken into account if the patient did not have capacity to make a decision. Clinical staff demonstrated a clear understanding of Gillick competencies (these are used to help assess whether a child has the maturity to make their own decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions).

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who might be in need of extra support. These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers and those at risk of developing a long-term condition. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.

The practice offered a comprehensive screening programme. The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to other practices. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 94% to 98% and five year olds from 93% to 100%.

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 years. Appropriate follow-ups on the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

A GP at the practice had proactively created health education leaflets to be given to patients for specific issues. For example, we saw a leaflet that educated patients on which medications should be temporarily stopped if they were unwell.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed that 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 and that conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard. Patient phone calls were taken in a designated office behind the reception desk, ensuring privacy and confidentiality. The reception desk was placed away from the seats in the waiting area, and we saw a notice informing patients they could request a private room to speak to receptionist.

We spoke with six patients and two members of the Patient Participation Group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in January 2016 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:

- 94% said the GP was good at listening to them, compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 89%.
- 95% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 87%, national average 87%).
- 98% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 95%, national average 95%).
- 94% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 86%, national average 85%).
- 90% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 93%, national average 92%).

- 94% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 88%, national average 87%)

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us that they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in January 2016 showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were above local and national averages. For example:

- 94% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 86%.
- 91% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 82%, national average 81%)

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

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that families who had suffered bereavement were contacted by their usual GP. This was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice referred to an Admiral Nurse service to provide individualised support for patients who were carers of people with dementia.

The practice offered a variety of services to patients in addition to chronic disease management. Examples of these included minor surgery, contraceptive advice and travel clinics. It also offered an influenza vaccination service.

The practice was able to meet the needs of patients with disabilities despite the constraints of the building. For example, there was sufficient space for wheelchairs, disabled toilet facilities and disabled parking.

There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability. Home visits were available for older patients / patients who would benefit from these. The practice offered an emergency clinic for on the day appointments. Patients were able to see both male and female clinical staff.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.30am to 12.20pm every morning and 2pm to 6pm daily. Patients were also able to make appointments at Lenwade Surgery between 8.30am and 11.20am on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. Lenwade Surgery also offered appointments between 2pm and 6pm on Mondays. The practice did not offer extended surgery hours. 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.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in January 2016 showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above local and national averages.

- 78% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours, compared to the CCG average of 70% and national average of 75%.
- 92% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 72%, national average 73%).
- 83% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 58%, national average 55%).

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 on the practice's website and in their information leaflet. Information about how to make a complaint was also displayed on the wall in the waiting area. Reception staff showed a good understanding of the complaints' procedure.

We looked at documentation a number of complaints received in the previous year and found that they had been fully investigated and responded to in a timely and empathetic manner. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

The practice had a 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 were regularly monitored.

There was a proactive approach to succession planning in the practice. The practice had clearly identified potential and actual changes to practice, and made in depth consideration to how they would be managed.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. The practice had a comprehensive list of policies and procedures in place to govern its activity, which were readily available to all members of staff. We looked at a number of policies and procedures and found that they were up to date and had been reviewed regularly.

There was a clear leadership structure with named members of both clinical and administration staff in lead roles. Staff we spoke with were all clear about their own roles and responsibilities. Staff were multi-skilled and were able to cover each other's roles within their teams during leave or sickness.

Communication across the practice was structured around key scheduled meetings. There were weekly practice meetings involving the GPs and the practice manager, regular nurses' meetings and staff meetings involving all administrative staff.

We found that the quality of record keeping within the practice was good, with minutes and records required by regulation for the safety of patients being detailed, maintained, up to date and accurate.

There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

The partners in the practice have 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 that they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

There was a clear leadership structure in place and staff felt supported by management. Staff told us that there was an open, non-hierarchical culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings. We also noted the practice held social events. Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

The practice gathered feedback from patients through surveys and complaints received. A suggestion box in reception area was available for patients to leave comments in, which was checked daily.

The practice had a PPG who were passionate about the practice. There was an active PPG who had regular contact with the practice and were keen to take part in local events, such as a Wellbeing Festival in a local town.

The practice had been actively monitoring comments it had received on the NHS Choices website and where patients had raised concerns, we saw that these had been replied to with patients invited to contact the practice to discuss their concerns.

The practice had also gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals, discussion and away days. Staff

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. For example,

a member of the management team was being supported to undertake a diploma in Practice Management. The practice supported both undergraduate medical students and pharmacy students. The practice team could demonstrate their forward thinking approach, and were involved with local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area.

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
Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment</p> <p>The practice did not have a system in place to ensure that blank prescription forms were only accessible to authorised staff.</p> <p>The practice did not have a risk assessment in place for the ordering and collection of repeat prescriptions.</p> <p>Regulation 12. - (2) (g)</p>