

The Stubbington Medical Practice

Quality Report

Park Lane,
Fareham,
Hampshire
PO14 2JP

Tel: 01329 664231

Website: www.stubbingtonmedical.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 10 May 2016

Date of publication: 03/10/2016

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	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to The Stubbington Medical Practice	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Stubbington Medical Practice on 10 May 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was 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.
- 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.
- Team away days took place regularly and all staff had a forum to raise issues outside of the formal GP clinical meetings.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

Summary of findings

- Review the identification of carers and implement a support mechanism for this patient group.
- Review the practice method of ensuring that people with mental health problems receive the appropriate health checks. Ensure the exception rate in this area of clinical targets accurately reflects care given.
- Review patient survey feedback, with the aim of improving patient awareness and understanding of opening times and access to the service.

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.

Good



- 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; including additional systems for learning such as, case reviews and the practice improvement records.
- 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.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- 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.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.

Summary of findings

- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group 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.
- 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 responded to patient's needs for home visits, before the end of surgery, by starting a home visiting service using trained practice nurses.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

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

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice pro-actively 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 patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- A practice nurse visited one nursing home linked to the practice to educate staff about the use of specific feeding methods and a healthy diet.
- A specialist in elderly medicine visited the practice every two months to support the practice to manage patients who were older and becoming frail.

The practice introduced a visiting service for older people. This consisted of one practice nurse visiting older people who had requested a GP house call on Mondays and Thursdays.

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.
- 78% of patients with diabetes last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5 mmol/l or less (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This was comparable to the Clinical Commissioning Group average of 80% and national average of 81%.
- The practice used specialist equipment to help support patients with long-term conditions. For example, patients with diabetes could upload their blood sugar results to the consultants at the hospital to allow an overview by their diabetes team. This allowed the patients to remain at home and meant the practice could better monitor them.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The percentage of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) was 79%. This was comparable to a Clinical Commissioning Group average of 84% and a 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 and school nurses. The practice met with these professionals on a two monthly basis to ensure the health needs of this group were met. The practice made direct contact with individual school nurses as required.

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.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless patients, 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.

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 living with dementia).

- 88% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months. This was comparable to a Clinical Commissioning Group average of 85% and a national average of 84%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living 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 those living with dementia.
- However, there was an exception rate in this area of clinical targets showing this practice exempted 36 out of 86 patients which was a rate of 42%. This was higher compared to the CCG average of 15% and the national average of 13%. (Information from CQC data pack).

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in January 2016.

The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 238 survey forms were distributed and 137 were returned. This represented about 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 64% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 82% 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%.
- 81% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.
- 77% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

The practice was aware of these findings, which also echoed the views of the patient participation group (PPG) and had recently upgraded the phone system to improve telephone access.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 13 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients' comments were all complimentary using words like friendly, caring, helpful and thorough.

We spoke with 11 patients during the inspection. All 11 patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. Half the patients commented on their wish for a new building but felt this did not compromise the care they received. For example, a wheelchair user explained how narrow doorways and corridors were on the ground floor.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Review the identification of carers and implement a support mechanism for this patient group.
- Review the practice method of ensuring that people with mental health problems receive the appropriate health checks. Ensure the exception rate in this area of clinical targets accurately reflects care given.
- Review patient survey feedback, with the aim of improving patient awareness and understanding of opening times and access.

The Stubbington Medical Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to The Stubbington Medical Practice

The Stubbington Medical Practice, Park Lane, Stubbington, Hampshire is situated in the centre of a large village location close to shops, car park, primary schools and a community centre.

The medical practice is located in a converted house, which has been adjusted several times over the years, with three floors. There is one large reception area on the ground floor with two parking spaces outside for disabled access.

There are four clinical rooms on the ground floor, one of which is wide enough for wheelchair access and allocated for patients with disabilities. GPs move clinical rooms to ensure they can see the patients who cannot manage the stairs. This approach is made clear to new patients and is highlighted on the practice website.

In reception there is an electronic check in system, a "please wait here" privacy sign, which shows patients where to stand to allow for private conversation and a formal queueing system. There is a free water dispenser and magazines.

There is a second waiting room on the first floor and there are seven more clinical rooms off this floor.

The second floor has offices and a conference room for meetings. Breast feeding is promoted by staff who offer women a room if they require privacy.

The practice provides general medical services to 13,273 patients with 38% aged over 59 and 23% aged over 69 years of age. The practice provides the medical care for approximately 200 residents in nursing homes. The practice population has few ethnic minorities and is mostly recognised as White British, in one of the least deprived parts of the country.

There are currently three male and five female GPs, who provide the equivalent of 5.3 whole time equivalent GP partners.

Stubbington Medical Practice is a training practice for doctors who are training to be GPs and at the time of our inspection there were three doctors in these posts. The practice has been successful in finding new GPs for the future and the practice has a low turnover of doctors.

There is a nursing team led by a nurse manager who is a nurse prescriber, with three practice nursing triage sisters, four practice nurses and two health care assistants.

The practice is supported by an administration team of a practice manager, who started in April 2016, an assistant practice manager and 24 receptionists/clerks.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday.

Detailed findings

Extended hours appointments are offered on alternate Monday evenings until 8.00pm with an early opening on Friday at 7.40am and additional clinics the second Saturday of each month, 8.30am until 12pm.

Patients are directed to use the NHS 111 system when the practice is closed.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 10 May 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff, for example, three GPs, three nurses, six reception and administration staff and spoke with patients who used the service.

- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- 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 living with dementia).

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, 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.
- The practice received feedback on themes and trends from reported significant events via the Clinical Commissioning Group quarterly surveillance report called Quasar. This was in the form of a quarterly newsletter which was then discussed within the practice meetings.

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 August 2015 the practice discussed a significant event following a patient who had fallen at home. The patient required additional social support but the GP was unclear how to set this up whilst in the patient's home. This led to a short delay in finding help. The practice subsequently ensured all GPs carried emergency contact details for social services in each doctor's bag to reduce any delay in the future.

There was a system for clinical case review within the practice, which all staff were encouraged to complete and complex patients or unusual diagnoses were discussed at the clinical bi-monthly meeting.

The practice had another system for whole practice learning called improvement reports. These included any

near misses or events that required analysis. These were used by all staff for reviewing lower level incidents that had affected the practice, the team or staff. For example, one patient was sent to a minor injuries appointment following GP triage but they were then sent on to a hospital accident department. The patient did not come to harm. Using feedback from the hospital, the practice team discussed decision making and options, recording the learning from this on 18 December 2015. The impact on patients was that awareness was raised amongst staff and they were able to discuss clinical advice given to patients to ensure they suggest the correct care pathway.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three. Nurses were all trained to child safeguarding level two. Health care assistants were trained to level one.
- A notice in the two waiting 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. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and

Are services safe?

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 such as the specimen handling process. There was an infection control update on 3 July 2015 and we saw evidence that a further update was planned with the use of a quiz to test staff knowledge.

- 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 CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. They received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient group directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, evidence of satisfactory conduct in previous employment in the form of references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety

representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills, most recently on 6 May 2016. There was one fire marshal for each floor of the building with a nominated deputy in case of annual leave. 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 were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 96% of the total number of points available. This compared to a Clinical Commissioning Group average of 97% and a national average of 95%.

The Health and Social Care Information Centre (HSCIC) data showed the overall clinical exception rate for 2014 to 2015 was 11% compared to the CCG average of 11% and the national average of 9%.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014 to 2015 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators were similar to national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last average blood sugar test was acceptable, was 80% which is similar to the national average of 78%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators were similar to national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption had been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 98%, which is similar to the national average of 90%. However, there was an exception rate in

this area of clinical targets showing this practice exempted 36 out of 86 patients which was a rate of 42%. This compared to the CCG average of 15% and the national average of 13%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been 15 clinical audits undertaken in the last two years, six of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. Others were reviews following national MHRA (Medicine Healthcare Regulatory Agency) alerts and to check compliance with national guidelines.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation and peer review.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included.
- The practice conducted an audit of prescribing gluten free foods in 2013, which was re-audited in November 2015 and April 2016. The aim of this was to ensure staff were prescribing against the Coeliac UK guidelines and promoting healthy eating for patients requiring a gluten free diet. Following the first review by a community pharmacist, 17 out of 38 patients were found to be over ordering products and had been given education regarding alternative foods. By April 2016, this had reduced to seven out of 38 patients who continued to order prescriptions outside of the guidelines.
- Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements. For example, there was a nurse led audit of treatment for patients with chronic obstructive airways disease (COPD) which found that 10% of patients with this condition were not on the most effective treatment. The audit also showed that the template used by the practice did not include a prompt for the clinician to consider treatment options and choice for patients. The template was changed and this had enabled GPs and nurses to offer treatment in line with national guidelines. (Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (**COPD**) is the name for a collection of lung diseases including chronic bronchitis, emphysema and chronic obstructive airways disease).

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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, prescription security, information governance, significant event reporting and introductions to all clinical staff and their roles.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, staff reviewing patients with long-term conditions were able to attend link meetings for the speciality such as through the diabetes nurse network.
- 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 access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. We saw records that showed all staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, and basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.
- This practice took part in TARGET training sessions which were supported by the local Clinical Commissioning group. The practice closed for half a day, once per quarter which was defined as 'Protected Learning Time' in Hampshire. TARGET provided: Time for Audit, Research, Governance, Education and Training. During this time, patients were directed to the NHS 111 service. Practice closures were advertised to patients well in advance.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation and those with diabetes or those who had mental health concerns were referred to counselling. Patients were signposted to the relevant service, such as youth counselling for teenagers.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- A dietician was available on referral and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79% which was comparable to the CCG average of 84% 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 information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

For example, information from the CQC data pack showed 76% of females were screened for breast cancer in the last three years, compared to a CCG average of 72% and national average of 72 %.

74% of patients were screened for bowel cancer in the last 3 years, compared to a CCG average of 65% and national average of 58%.

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

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 82% to 99% compared to the CCG range of 82 % to 99% and for five year olds from 93% to 100% compared to the CCG range of 94% to 99%.

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

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

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

- 88% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 89%.
- 84% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 87%.
- 96% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 95%.
- 88% 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%.

- 91% 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%.
- 90% 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:

- 86% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 86%.
- 79% 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%.
- 85% 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%.

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

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

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

Are services caring?

a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website, such as counselling and the macular society group for sight loss.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 109 patients as carers which was less than 1% of the practice list. The 2011 Census form found that up to 10% of people living in this local authority area may identify themselves as a carer. Carers may not have accessed support required to maintain a healthy lifestyle if they were not identified.

Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation and often a home visit at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

- The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on a Wednesday morning at 7.30am and alternate Monday evenings until 8pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours. Additional clinics were offered the second Saturday of each month, 8.30am until 12pm.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately/ were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice ensured that longer appointments were available for those with additional needs. Other reasonable adjustments were made and action was taken to remove barriers when patients find it hard to use or access services. For example, doctors and nurses would move clinic rooms to see patients on the ground floor if the patients were unable to walk upstairs.
- The practice had a diabetes self-service blood sugar monitor that allowed patients to plug in their blood sugar monitor and send diabetes results to the hospital consultant. The practice told us to date there had been a low uptake by patients so far and that an audit was planned to monitor this facilities use. Staff told us those patients who had used it reported they understood their condition better and did not have to travel to an outpatient's appointment to share information with consultants; saving patient's time and freeing up consultant appointments.

Access to the service

- The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8am to 5pm daily. Extended hours appointments were offered on alternate Monday evenings until 8pm and Friday mornings from 7.30am and the second Saturday of each month, 8.30am until 12pm.
- In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was overall slightly lower comparable to local and national averages.
- 66% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 64% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

Patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them. The practice told us they had upgraded the telephone system in January 2016 to improve access. However, it was too early to assess the improvements made and impact on patient feedback.

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.

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 by the practice. 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.

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

- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system within a specific comments and complaints leaflet and details on the practice website.

We looked at 17 complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, openness and transparency with dealing with the complaint. 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, a verbal complaint was recorded on the practice complaints register. There was a discussion with a family member regarding the care and treatment of a patient. This was listened to, discussed by the practice manager. It was then referred to a GP for a further discussion and after an explanation and apology; this did not escalate to a formal complaint. This was discussed by the practice team to show how verbal complaints could be resolved but still recorded and learned from.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a mission statement which was displayed on the practice website and in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored. There was a development plan outlining the practice vision. This included recent challenges, changes and plans for premises and future skill mix opportunities. There was an associated action plan with aims, achievements, dates and approximate budget requirements.
- The practice were proactive at succession planning. The practice's commitment to being a training practice for doctors who were training to be GPs had been successful in finding new GPs and resulted in a low turnover of doctors.

Governance arrangements

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

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

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners 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. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings. Partners and managers met weekly. There were fortnightly meetings with staff and bi-monthly multi-disciplinary clinical discussion 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 team away days were held three times in the last year.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients, the public and staff. It proactively sought patients' feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service. There was a comments and complaints leaflet that encouraged the sharing of views, including how to contact external agencies.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example,

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff away days and generally through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion.
- For example, there were weekly “team talk” meetings that allowed representatives from each department across the practice to raise issues, concerns and changes without GP partners, ensuring open and honest discussions. We saw evidence this was then fed into managers meetings as required.
- Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. For example, staff told us they suggested one person was allocated repeat prescriptions for a whole shift, rather than half a day to ensure continuity. This was successfully implemented by the practice. 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.

Following an audit of home visits over a three month period from November 2014 to January 2015, options were discussed regarding a new way to manage requests for home visits. The results showed that around 50% of calls could have been performed by a registered nurse or paramedic. A home visiting service commenced in September 2015 to meet the needs of patients who could have a visit earlier in the day, rather than wait until surgery finished. It also reduced the demand on GPs for home visits. The home visiting services took place every Monday and Thursday.

The senior nurse triaged home visit requests and allocated the visits to either a nurse or GP. Following each set of visits, the nurse discussed all patients visited with the duty doctor and any changes to medicines or prescriptions were actioned. The service was due to be re-audited to assess whether this could be developed into a daily service.