

Park Lane Surgery

Quality Report

8 Park Lane
Broxbourne
Hertfordshire
EN10 7NQ

Tel: 01992465555

Website: www.parklanesurgerybroxbourne.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 8 September 2016

Date of publication: 01/12/2016

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 Park Lane Surgery	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 Park Lane Surgery on 8 September 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- The practice held regular staff and clinical meetings where learning was shared from significant events and complaints.
- 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.
- 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.

- All patients had a usual GP providing continuity of care. Urgent appointments were available on the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.
- The practice sought the views of their patients through the patient participation group, surveys and the friends and family test.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Implement a system to monitor the use of blank prescription forms and pads in the practice.
- Continue to monitor and ensure improvement to national patient survey results in relation to accessing appointments

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 support, 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.
- Appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment of staff.
- Blank prescriptions were securely stored but there was not a system in place to monitor their use.

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.
- The practice had completed full cycle clinical audits that demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment. Role specific training was evident.
- The practice worked with others within the locality to share and make the best use of allocated funds to provide training.
- 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

- Feedback from patients on the CQC comments cards was very positive about all staffing levels within the practice.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.
- There was a carers lead and a carers noticeboard in the waiting area with information about local support groups. The practice had identified approximately 3% of their patient list as carers.

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.
- All patients had a usual GP to ensure there was continuity of care.
- Urgent same day appointments were available.
- Online appointment booking and repeat prescriptions were available.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.
- The practice had introduced a new telephone system in response to patient feedback and survey results.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to high quality, safe and effective services for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular meetings.

Good



Summary of findings

- There was an overarching governance framework, which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- Care plans were in place and reviewed annually
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Annual health checks were available to patients over the age of 75 years.

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 was similar to the local and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 88% compared to the CCG average of 90% and 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



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.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 82%.
- Opportunistic chlamydia screening was offered to patients aged 15-24 years of age.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.

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.
- There was an automated blood pressure machine in the waiting area for patients to monitor their own blood pressure.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- 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).

- 93% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was better than 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 carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 7 July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. There were 223 survey forms distributed and 106 were returned. This was a response rate of 48% and represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 59% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 63% and the national average of 73%.
- 76% 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 82% and the national average of 85%.
- 89% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 85%.

- 83% 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 74% and the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 20 comment cards, which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were described as helpful, caring and pleasant. Many patients commented that they were treated with dignity and respect.

We spoke with two patients during the inspection. They were both satisfied with the care they received.

Park Lane Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Park Lane Surgery

Park Lane Surgery provides a range of primary medical services to the residents of Broxbourne, Hoddesdon and the surrounding villages. The practice has been at its current location of 8 Park Lane, Broxbourne, Hertfordshire, EN10 7NQ since the 1960s. The building was updated to a purpose built practice in 1996.

The practice population is pre-dominantly white British with a higher than average over 45 year age range and a lower than average 25 to 39 year and under nine year age range. National data indicates the area is one of low deprivation. The practice has approximately 10,700 patients with services provided under a general medical services (GMS) contract, a nationally agreed contract with NHS England and GP Practices.

The practice is led by six GP partners, four male and two female. The nursing team consists of a nurse prescriber, two practice nurses and a health care assistant. There are a number of reception and administrative staff led by a practice manager and a deputy practice manager.

The practice is open from 8am to 1pm and 2pm to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. An emergency telephone number is available from the practice answerphone message between 1pm and 2pm.

When the practice is closed, out of hours services are provided by Herts Urgent Care and can be accessed via the NHS 111 service.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before inspecting, 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 8 September 2016.

During our inspection we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GP, nurses, the practice manager and deputy practice manager, reception and administrative staff. We also spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how staff interacted with patients and their family members.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

Detailed findings

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

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

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

- Older people

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- There was a significant events reporting policy available for all staff to access on the practice computer system.
- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available to complete. 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 support, 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. Significant events were reviewed and discussed at the weekly GP partner meetings.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, MHRA (Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Agency) alerts, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. There was a process in place for the management of alerts. The practice manager disseminated them to the relevant practice staff and kept a record of the actions taken. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, the practice had improved communication links with the local hospital following the death of a patient that had not been identified to them.

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 also a list

of contact details in the reception office for reference. 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 and nursing staff were trained to an appropriate level to manage child safeguarding (level 3).

- A notice in the waiting room and consultation rooms advised patients that chaperones were available if required. The nursing staff and some of the receptionists fulfilled this role. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be visibly clean and tidy. The lead nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. The practice had supplies of personal protective equipment and spillage kits were available for the cleaning of bodily fluids.
- 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 the local East and North Hertfordshire CCG medicines management teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing.
- Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored but there was not a system in place to monitor their use. Two of the nurses had qualified as Independent Prescribers and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. They had regular update training and received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. They also attended quarterly locality prescribing nurse meetings. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to

Are services safe?

allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The health care assistant was trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.

- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. The practice had a recruitment policy in place and utilised the services of an external human resources company for guidance.

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. They had identified fire wardens and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked in June 2016 to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked in April 2016 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 skill 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. Staff informed us they were flexible with their working hours and covered their colleagues' absences if required. There was a buddy system in operation among the GPs to cover each other's workload when on leave.

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.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and these were available on the desktops of the practice computers. They used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.
- Locally agreed treatment templates that incorporated NICE guidance were used to manage patients with long term conditions.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results showed the practice achieved 96% 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 was similar to the local and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 88%, with 3% exception reporting, compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 88%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national average. For example, the percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 93%, with 9% exception reporting, compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 84%.

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.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been three clinical audits carried out in the last year, all of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, following an audit of patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) the practice used an independent company to review their prevalence figures to ensure that all patients were appropriately identified. This ensured that those patients with a long term condition were appropriately reviewed and had their care monitored.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements. The practice regularly reviewed their QOF achievement to identify if there were any areas which required additional focus; this included both GPs and the nursing team.

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. As part of the induction process, staff had performance reviews to monitor their progress.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions. The nursing staff had undertaken additional training in a variety of conditions, for example, COPD, diabetes and wound care.
- 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice and nurse meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- The practice worked with others within the locality to share and make the best use of allocated funds to provide training.
- 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 to, or after they were discharged from hospital. The nursing staff discussed patients with complex long-term conditions with local specialist nurses for advice on managing their symptoms.

Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs. The health visitor attended the practice once a month to discuss any concerns with patients.

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. 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 and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to relevant services. For example, patients were referred to slimming groups for weight management advice. The health care assistant was trained to give smoking cessation advice.

Two members of the nursing team were trained to offer contraceptive and family planning advice. Opportunistic chlamydia screening was offered to patients aged 15-24 years of age.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 83% 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. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. For example,

- 77% of females, aged 50-70 years, were screened for breast cancer in last 36 months compared to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 72%.

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

- 65% of patients, aged 60-69 years, were screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months compared to the CCG average of 60% and the national average of 58%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to the CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 96% to 100% and five year olds from 95% to 99%. The CCG averages were from 96% to 98% and 94% to 97% respectively.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

All of the 20 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 described as helpful, caring and pleasant. Many patients commented that they were treated with dignity and respect.

Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately and the GPs always gave enough time to listen to patients 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 average or above 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%.
- 88% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
- 97% 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%.
- 84% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 85%.

- 87% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 91%.
- 83% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt satisfied with 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 comparable with local and national averages. For example:

- 90% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 86%.
- 81% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 82%.
- 76% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.

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.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Are services caring?

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. They had an identified carers lead and the practice had identified 306 patients as carers which equated to approximately 3% of the practice list size. There

was a carers board in the waiting area with written information available to direct carers to the avenues of support available to them. The practice offered flexible appointment booking, annual health checks and flu vaccinations to carers.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them and sent a condolence letter. This was followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs.

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 East and North Hertfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.

- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and those with complex health needs.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- All patients had a usual GP to improve continuity of care.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours for children to attend.
- Online appointment booking and repeat prescriptions were available.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There was an automated blood pressure machine in the waiting area for patients to monitor their own blood pressure.
- There were facilities suitable for people with disabilities and patients with young children that included a ramp at the entrance and wide doors and corridors to manoeuvre wheelchairs and pushchairs. There was an access enabled toilet and baby changing facilities. All of the consultation and treatment rooms were on the ground floor.
- Translation services and a hearing loop were available.
- The practice had patients of no fixed abode and allowed them to use the practice address for NHS and social care purposes.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am to 1pm and 2pm to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. An emergency telephone number was available from the practice answerphone message between 1pm and 2pm. There was a range of

appointments available between these times with all members of the health team. 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 lower than the local and national averages.

- 65% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 78%.
- 55% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 63% and the national average of 73%.

In response to the patient survey results the practice had installed a new telephone package. This allowed callers to know how many others were queuing to have their call answered ahead of them. It also gave options to divert to the relevant staff group rather than all calls going via the reception staff. Patients could use the new system to cancel appointments without speaking to a receptionist. The practice informed us that initial feedback from patients was positive to the changes made.

The practice had a system in place to assess whether a home visit was clinically necessary and the urgency of the need for medical attention. Urgent requests were reviewed and acted on by the duty GP for the day. The practice had access to the local CCG Acute in Hours Visiting Service to refer patients who required an urgent home visit. This service was a team of doctors who worked across east and north Hertfordshire to visit patients at home to provide appropriate treatment and help reduce attendance at hospital. 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.

Are services responsive to people's needs? (for example, to feedback?)

- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system in the waiting area of the practice and on the website.

We looked at two 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 and

also from analysis of trends and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, the practice had introduced a process to register patients as temporary residents if they required medical treatment prior to registering as a permanent patient with the practice.

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, safe and effective services and environment for patients. They aimed to provide monitored, audited and continually improving health care services that was available to the whole population and create a partnership between patients and health care professionals, which ensured mutual respect, continuous learning and training.

The practice's statement of purpose was available to view on the website and documented the practice's aims and objectives.

The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. Reception staff had their duties for the day outlined on their desks.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

The practice was led by the GP partners with the support of the practice manager. 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 and the practice manager 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). 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 they gave affected people reasonable support, an explanation and a verbal and written apology. The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

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

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

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the information on the noticeboards in the patient waiting area had been reduced to make it easier to read. The practice had also introduced a new telephone system to improve the patient experience when contacting the practice.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- They made use of the NHS Friends and Family test, a feedback tool that supports the fundamental principle that people who use NHS services should have the opportunity to provide feedback on their experience. Most recent published results showed 83% would recommend the practice.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

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.

The practice was a member of a local health federation with other practices within the locality. The aim of the federation was to bid for services to keep them local for patients.