

The Neaman Practice

Quality Report

15 Half Moon Court
London
EC1A 7HF
Tel: 02076009740
Website: www.theneamanpractice.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 3 October 2016
Date of publication: 23/01/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	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
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to The Neaman 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 Neaman Practice on 3 October 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

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

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- 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 should make improvements are:

- Advertise the provision of the interpreting service to inform patients this service is available to them.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (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.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- In response to feedback from patients, the practice employed a psychotherapist. This enhanced access to psychotherapy has meant practice patients can often see a psychotherapist within days or weeks, rather than waiting for months due to NHS waiting lists. Weekly meetings were held with the psychotherapist to ensure patients were offered the most appropriate therapy for their needs and as a result of the psychotherapy service being in-house; clinicians were more aware of psychological issues and strived to offer more holistic consultations to all patients.
- The practice had developed a proactive 'Frail Home Visiting' service to ensure housebound and vulnerable patients who may not otherwise attend the practice were provided with additional support and care.
- In response to a high demand from patients at the practice and high secondary care waiting times; one of the GPs had undertaken training to become a 'GP with Special Interest' (GPwsi) in dermatology.
- The practice worked closely with the hearing aid service and had arranged to hold a stock of hearing aid batteries to enable patients to change their batteries at the practice rather than travel to the service. Double appointments were also offered for patients with hearing loss to allow them more time to address their needs.
- 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.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- 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 and actively reviewed complaints. Learning and improvements made as a result was shared with staff at quarterly meetings.

Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision to provide a high quality healthcare service which is patient centred. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

We always inspect the quality of care for these six population groups.

Older people

The practice is rated as good for the care of older people.

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice had developed a proactive 'Frail Home Visiting' service to ensure housebound and vulnerable patients who may not otherwise attend the practice were provided with additional support and care.
- The practice provided a replacement hearing aid service for patients to enable patients to change their hearing aid batteries at the practice rather than travel to the service. Double appointments were also offered for patients with hearing loss.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators were above the national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol was 5 mmol/l or less, was 88% which was above the national average of 81%; and the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who received a foot examination, was 93% which was above the national average of 88%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Summary of findings

Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 77%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors, family support workers and child psychologists as part of the 'Children and Families' multidisciplinary team meetings.

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.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability and homeless patients were able to register at the practice.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

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

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- Performance for some mental health related indicators were above the national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan was 96% and the national average is 88%.
- The practice employed an in-house psychotherapist to increase access for patients to psychotherapy services.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia and changes had been implemented to the practice to make the premises 'dementia friendly.'

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line or above local and national averages. Three-hundred and nine survey forms were distributed and 101 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 81% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 75% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 88% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 94% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to 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 28 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

We spoke with four patients during the inspection. All four patients said they were satisfied with the care they received. Results from the 'Friends and Family Test' found 90% of patients surveyed would recommend the practice to their friends and family.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Advertise the provision of the interpreting service to inform patients this service is available to them.

The Neaman 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.

Background to The Neaman Practice

Neaman Practice provides GP primary medical services to approximately 9057 patients living in the City of London. The practice serves a relatively affluent population with pockets of socio-economic deprivation. The majority of patients are from White British or White European backgrounds. The practice serves a predominantly older population and there are small numbers of patients between the ages of five and eighteen years of age.

The practice team is made up of three GP partners, four salaried GPs and one registrar GP (providing 24 sessions per week), two nurses, one trainee nurse, five receptionists, one secretary and two practice managers.

The practice is open between 8am-8pm on Mondays; 8am-6:30pm Tuesday to Friday. Appointments are from 9am-12:50pm daily; 4pm-8pm on Mondays and 4pm-6pm Tuesday to Friday. Home visits are provided for patients who are housebound or too ill to visit the practice.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract (GMS is one of the three contracting routes that have been available to enable the commissioning of primary medical services). The practice refers patients to the NHS '111' service and CHUHSE (City and Hackney Urgent Healthcare Social Enterprise) for healthcare advice during out of hours.

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

The practice provides a range of services including maternity care, childhood immunisations, chronic disease management and travel immunisations.

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.

This practice has not been inspected before.

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 3 October 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, Practice Managers, Practice Nurses, receptionists) and spoke with patients who used the service.

Detailed findings

- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, in response to an incident relating to blood results not being checked as a result of a clinician being absent from the practice; arrangements were made to introduce a pathology 'buddy up' failsafe system to ensure all blood results are checked and processed.

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. One of the GP partners was the lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended and hosted safeguarding meetings 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 and nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3 and non-clinical staff were trained to level 1.

To develop child safeguarding procedures the practice had recently volunteered for a Locality Peer Review. The review found the practice safeguarding procedures were sound and further training opportunities were in the process of being arranged for staff relating to Female Genital Mutation (FGM) awareness.

- A notice in the waiting room and in the treatment rooms advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. One of the GP partners was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention leads to keep up to date with best practice. The practice also had a team of people responsible for infection control including the GP, nurses and the cleaners. There was an infection control policy in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). 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 a CCG Pharmacist 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. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer

Are services safe?

medicines in line with legislation. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment).

- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment.

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 one of the waiting areas which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. Staff also undertook regular checks on the electromagnetic doors, fire escapes and the portable fire equipment. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had adequate arrangements in place to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book was also 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. All staff were given a copy of the business continuity plan to be kept at home as part of their induction to the practice.

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.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through clinical meetings, risk assessments and audits.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 99% of the total number of points available.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators were above the national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol was 5 mmol/l or less, was 88% which was above the national average of 81%; and the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who received a foot examination, was 93% which was above the national average of 88%.
- Performance for some mental health related indicators were above the national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan was 96% and the national average is 88%.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face to face review in the preceding 12 months was 87% which was comparable to the national average of 84%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been ten clinical audits completed in the last 12 months, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation and peer review. One of the GP partners was the nominated lead for audits with the practice.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, as a result of an audit relating to broad spectrum antibiotic prescribing and antibiotic resistance, the second cycle of this audit found the practice had achieved an 18% reduction in prescriptions of cephalosporins, coamoxiclav and quinolones antibiotics.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements. For example, one of the GPs had undertaken training to become a GP with special interest in dermatology as a result of high patient demand at the practice and high secondary care waiting times.

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, chaperoning, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality. There was also a comprehensive locum pack for locum GPs working at the practice.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals and meetings. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. A variety of meetings took place with other health care professionals when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs including weekly 'Psychotherapy Referral' meetings; monthly 'Older Persons' and 'Child and Family' meetings; and quarterly 'Dementia' and 'Psychiatric Liaison' meetings.

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 assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking, substance misuse and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- A dietician provided sessions at the practice as required and a substance misuse advisor attended the practice for two sessions each week to provide this service for patients.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 77%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using ensuring a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening and followed up patients who did not attend their appointments with these services.

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 90% to 97% and five year olds from 92% to 95%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.
- Reception staff provided extra support for frail and vulnerable patients. For example staff told us they had walked patients with dementia home from the practice and supported frail patients with organising and getting into taxis after their appointments.
- The practice strived to be respectful of patients' cultural and religious beliefs. Patients were able to book appointments with male and female doctors according to their preference and patients were offered appointments with a same sex doctor, if it is anticipated they may require an intimate examination during a consultation.

All of the 28 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with four 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 was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 93% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 89% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.
- 99% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.
- 82% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 95% 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%.
- 94% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% 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 also positive and aligned with these views. We also saw that care plans were personalised.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 92% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 86%.
- 82% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 90% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

Are services caring?

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

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. However, there were no notices within the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- We observed in the waiting area there were a number of information leaflets available in the Turkish language for patients.

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 92 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). The practice had organised a 'Carer's Table' within the waiting area which provided written information to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them and one of the receptionists had been nominated as the 'Carer's Lead' to further assist patients also identified as carers.

The practice offered 'Time to Talk' extended GP consultations for patients with a diagnosis cancer or multiple chronic conditions. The practice had also employed a psychotherapist who provided an in-house psychotherapy and counselling service for patients.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP telephoned them and this call was either followed by a patient consultation 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 engaged with the local CCG and was part of the South West Hackney Consortium which met on alternate months to discuss clinical topics including reducing inappropriate referrals to secondary care; preventing unnecessary hospital admissions and ensuring cost effective prescribing.

- Patients with no fixed abode were able to register with the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice offered appointments on Monday evening day until 8pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability; a diagnosis of cancer; and those with multiple chronic conditions.
- In response to feedback from patients, the practice employed a psychotherapist. This enhanced access to psychotherapy has meant practice patients can often see a psychotherapist within days or weeks, rather than waiting for months due to NHS waiting lists. Staff told us by discussing cases in a weekly meeting with the psychotherapist, patients are offered the most appropriate therapy for their needs and clinicians are more aware of psychological issues and strive to offer more holistic consultations.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice. The practice had developed a proactive 'Frail Home Visiting' service to ensure housebound and vulnerable patients who may not otherwise attend the practice were provided with additional support and care.

- In response to a high demand from patients at the practice and high secondary care waiting times; one of the GPs had undertaken training to become a 'GP with Special Interest' (GPwsi) in dermatology.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available. The practice had also liaised with the hearing aid service and arranged to hold a stock of hearing aid batteries to enable patients to change their batteries at the practice rather than travel to the service. Double appointments were also offered for patients with hearing loss to allow them more time to address their needs.
- The practice hosted staff from the 'City Advice' service which offers advice to people in the City of London to manage their everyday problems.
- The practice offered patients a comprehensive range of in-house services, facilitating treatment closer to home including physiotherapy, podiatry, social prescribing and anticoagulation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS and were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am-8pm on Mondays; 8am-6:30pm Tuesday to Friday. Appointments were from 9am-12:50pm daily; 4pm-8pm on Mondays and 4pm-6pm Tuesday to Friday. 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 showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above the national averages.

- 83% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 81% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- whether a home visit was clinically necessary; and
- the urgency of the need for medical attention.

The reception team recorded the patient details of those requesting a home visit and these were passed on to the Duty Doctor. The practice operated an on-call Duty Doctor system from 8am-6.30pm daily to deal with urgent appointments, urgent telephone calls from patients and professional colleagues. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

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.

- The practice manager was the designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. The complaints procedure was advertised in the waiting area and also on the practice website.

We looked at 12 complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints. All complaints were discussed at the quarterly practice 'Comments and Feedback' meetings to share learning with staff and identify action to be taken to improve the quality of care. For example, as a result of patient complaints, the practice telephone system had been changed to inform callers their place in the telephone queue as opposed to solely music being played when the phones are engaged.

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 provide a high quality healthcare service which is patient centred.

- The practice had a mission statement which was to continuously strive to improve the quality of care with a commitment to evidence-based medicine, listening to patient views and shared learning.
- The partners and the practice Business Manager met on a monthly basis to discuss strategies and monitor the vision and values. The practice also held external team building days to promote the vision and values with the whole team.

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.
- Each of the GP partners had clearly defined roles within the practice including, safeguarding, infection control, significant events, QOF, audit and nursing.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were effective arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

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.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. One of the GP partners had also been nominated as the practice lead for Duty of Candour. All of the GP 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 weekly team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so. We noted the practice had recently held a team building afternoon during which the priorities of staff and patients were discussed and how the team could support each other to manage these.
- 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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met every quarter and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, improvements were made to the waiting area including newly upholstered chairs and chairs with arm rests to cater for patients who may have difficulties in sitting and standing, such as elderly patients and those with musculoskeletal conditions. Membership to the PPG was advertised on the practice website and within the practice newsletter. The PPG meeting dates were also advertised at reception in advance.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. For example, staff had suggested the use of a handover book for the reception team on duty for each shift to manage the workflow and this had been implemented. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice was an accredited training practice and had hosted undergraduate medical students from Barts & The Royal London medical college since 1991. In 2015 the practice provided 100 sessions of teaching. The practice was also currently hosting a Nurse and a GP Registrar in training.