

The Roseberry Practice

Quality Report

Abbey Health Centre,
Finchale Avenue,
Billingham,
TS23 2DG

Tel: 01642 552700

Website: www.theroseberrypractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 23 June 2016

Date of publication: 08/08/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to The Roseberry Practice	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Roseberry Practice on 23 June 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 a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- 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.
- 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 acted upon feedback from staff and patients.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)
Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and an 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.
- The practice used a national reporting system for the notification of significant incidents, where required.

Changes in clinical guidance were conveyed to staff members through daily meetings.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were at or above average 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 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.

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.

Good



Summary of findings

- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.
- We saw evidence of reception staff being extremely patient and understanding towards patients needing extra time to communicate.

We saw evidence that the nursing staff had reflected on the vulnerability of their patients needing home visits and had shared information about them, appropriately.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, it has been involved with a CCG scheme to promote positive links between health and employment since a pilot in 2008.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a GP, initially in the form of a telephone triage. 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.
- Evidence showed the practice responded quickly to complaints and 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 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 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.

Good



- The practice demographic indicated a higher than average percentage of older people within its registered list.
- The practice used its own resources to support patients at home, in the absence of a community matron.
- As part of the unplanned admission scheme the practice offered same day telephone appointments with a GP to patients who were elderly or vulnerable.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average.
- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- Nursing staff dedicated 'home visit days' to review their patients with long term conditions when they were unable, to visit the practice.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

Good



- 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. Uptake rates were high for all standard childhood immunisations.

Summary of findings

- The practice had a system of follow up when it had been informed that a child had not attended an appointment with an external agency or alternative care provider.
- 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.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice had links with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

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

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 had a good indepth knowledge of its vulnerable patients.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

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 similar to the national average.

The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 86% which was similar to the national average of 88%.

- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 76% which was 8% below the national average.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those 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.

Good



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 similar to local and national averages. 285 survey forms were distributed and 110 were returned. This represented 1.3% of the practice's patient list.

- 72% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.
- 85% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 76%.
- 83% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG and national averages of 85%.

- 77% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 29 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. A recurring theme among the comments was that patients felt that they were treated with patience, caring and understanding and they felt listened to by staff.

We spoke with nine patients during the inspection. All nine patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, organised and understanding.

The Roseberry 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 a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to The Roseberry Practice

The Roseberry Practice is located in Billingham, Stockton-on-Tees. It is part of the NHS Hartlepool and North Tees Clinical Commissioning Group. The total practice patient population is 8214. Housed in a purpose built, modern health centre, the practice shares space with allied health professionals and other GP practices.

The proportion of the practice population in the 65 years and over age group is similar to the England average. The practice scored five on the deprivation measurement scale, the deprivation scale goes from one to ten, with one being the most deprived. The overall practice deprivation score is similar to the England average. People living in more deprived areas tend to have a greater need for health services.

The staff team comprises two female GP partners, and a female salaried GP. There are two nurse practitioners, two practice nurses and a healthcare assistant. The practice is managed and supported by a practice manager, administration, secretarial and reception staff. In total there are 19 staff, in addition to the GPs. There are currently GP vacancies within the practice and there has been some difficulty in recruiting GPs to the posts.

The practice reception is open Monday to Friday 8am until 6pm (excluding bank holidays). Appointment times with a GP are available between 8.30am until 11.30am, and 3pm until 6pm. The practice offers pre-bookable appointments where these are booked up to one week in advance. The practice operates a telephone triage system for urgent appointments. Face to face urgent appointments are available daily for patients that need them. The practice telephones switch to the out-of-hours provider at 6pm each evening and at weekends and bank holidays. The practice is a training practice and has qualified doctors who wish to train as GPs.

The practice has a General Medical Services contract with NHS England. They also provide some Directed Enhanced Services, for example they offer minor surgery and the childhood vaccination and immunisation scheme.

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.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before attending the practice, 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 23 June 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke to a range of staff and spoke to patients who used the service, including the patient participation group.
- 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

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The 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, an apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out analyses 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, when two patients with the same surname were mixed up on a list of those requiring blood level results (for a blood thinning medication). This error was picked up before any results were passed to the patients but all staff were reminded to be vigilant about double-checking dates of birth and other unique patient details.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. 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 were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three. We were told that both clinical and non-clinical staff had raised concerns about signs of abuse and these were referred appropriately.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check.
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy.
- The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Infection control audits were undertaken and had action plans.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines in the practice kept patients safe and oxygen cylinders were checked regularly. Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. She received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber. The practice employed a part-time pharmacist in addition to the pharmacy support it received from the CCG.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found that appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment, for example, references, and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Are services safe?

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly.
- 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 had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book was available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All 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. Copies of this were also kept off site.

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 patients' needs.

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 97% of the total number of points available. There was a 6% exception rate to this figure. (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 January 2016 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. . The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood test (IFCC-HbA1c) was 64 mmol or less in the preceding 12 months, was 72% which was 5% below the national average.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was similar to the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) was 140/80 mmHg or less was 76% which was similar to the CCG average of 81% and national average of 78%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average.

The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a

comprehensive care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 86% which was around 6% lower than the CCG average and similar to the national average of 88%.

- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 76% which was 10% below the CCG average and 8% below the national average.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been two clinical audits undertaken in the last two years where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, the practice audited patients who had been diagnosed with gout, to ensure they were all receiving appropriate treatment in line with national guidance. The audit highlighted that many of these patients were not having their uric acid levels recorded during a blood test. In the second cycle of the audit this rate greatly improved by 30%, therefore reducing the risk of further gout attacks among these patients. By identifying and recalling more of this group of patients for blood tests, the practice hoped to further improve the outcomes for patients with gout.
- The practice previously participated in local audits and benchmarking. Links between the practice, the local medical committee and the local federation helped to achieve this. Difficulties in recruiting GPs in recent months had affected the practice's rate of undertaking audits.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence.
- 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.
- There was a stable workforce, with good retention of staff. An informal meeting of all available staff took place on a daily basis.
- The practice had unfilled GP vacancies and was working hard to recruit to these posts.
- There was no male GP at the practice but there was regularly a male locum GP available.

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.

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.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support. An example of this included patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service. The practice hosted a healthy lifestyle drop in clinic which aimed to reduce obesity. It also signposted its vulnerable patients to support groups in the local area.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80%, which was comparable with the CCG average of 83% and national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer three written reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. 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.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to the CCG average. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 92% to 98% (CCG averages range from 95% to 98%) and five year olds from 90% to 100% (CCG averages range from 93% to 97%).

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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.
- We were told about examples where staff had made home visits and offered extra time to patients and carers, because the patient and clinical staff felt this was needed.

All of the 29 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 were unable to speak to members of the patient participation group (PPG) so we invited their views and comments via email. They also 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 did reflect that patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was around, or below average, for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 85% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 89% and the national average of 89%.
- 85% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%.

- 94% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 95%.
- 80% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average and national average of 85%.
- 99% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 84% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 87%.

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 positive and aligned with these views. We 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. Results were average or slightly below local and national averages. For example:

- 87% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 86%.
- 80% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 82%.
- 94% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 85%.

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

Are services caring?

- 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.
- We were told that patients with a hearing loss were offered lots of visual aids to help with their understanding about their care and treatment.

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 89 patients as carers (approximately 1% of the practice list). Carers were offered a flu vaccination in winter time. 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 to offer support.

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.

- 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.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The building was equipped with a lift to improve access.
- Although the practice was without the service of a community matron at the time of inspection, nursing staff allocated 'home visit days' to its patients who needed extra care. They shared this information with the community matron team.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.30am to 6pm daily. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to one week in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 79% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 78%.
- 72% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 73%.

The practice recognised some problems with its telephone system, where patients were kept on hold for long periods. It now intends to change the system, increasing phone line accessibility in the near future.

Although there was no male GP on the staff team, there was a regular male locum GP used by the practice. This was not highlighted as an issue to the inspection team, when we interviewed patients.

People told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them, although our observations during inspection indicated some patients found the system difficult to understand. There were a high number of telephone appointments offered, mixed with face-to-face appointments where needed. Whilst the system suited some patients, others found it less convenient. The practice recognised this and tried to implement a combination of pre-bookable and telephone appointments to address the issue. The patient participation group had been active in helping to bring about changes to improve the waiting times.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a 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 looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were dealt with in an open and transparent way. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also, from analysis of trends, action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, some face-to-face appointments can now be made on the day after a complaint was made by a patient. Another example included a complaint made by a patient that there was only enough consultation time to discuss one presenting problem during an appointment. The practice decided to highlight this protocol to all patients by placing a poster in the waiting room, and encouraged patients to book longer slots where they had multiple presenting problems.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice felt strongly about its core values of team work, patient focus, commitment and dedication.

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 mostly implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements; although due to recruitment difficulties there had not been as much audit activity in the preceding months.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks and issues, however, these could be more robust and there are improvements to be made in the way they are recorded and held centrally.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They 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. Staff met daily for lunch which was an opportunity for clinical and non-clinical staff to share ideas, concerns and liaise with the GPs and practice manager.

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 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 meetings. Not all meetings were minuted but following our inspection, staff agreed this would improve the dissemination of information and learning.
- 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 and had received numerous thank you cards over the preceding months.

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met bi-monthly or quarterly. They shared ideas on suggestions and improvements.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through regular discussions. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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 to improve outcomes for patients in the area. It had a level of recognition about its challenges but was continually striving to improve, in line with its core values.