

Larkshall Medical Centre

Quality Report

1 Larkshall Road

Chingford

E4 7HS

Tel: 020 8524 6355

Website: www.larkshallmedicalcentre.com

Date of inspection visit: 7 December 2016

Date of publication: 06/02/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	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 Larkshall Medical Centre	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 Larkshall Medical Centre on 7 December 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- Risks to patients were assessed and managed. However there was no log of cleaning for hand held clinical equipment such as spirometer, nebuliser and ear irrigator and no expiry dates present on the log of emergency medicines. Following the inspection, the practice provided evidence of an updated log of emergency medicines with expiry dates present.
- The practice had audited the carers list and was working on improving this and the support given to identified carers.
- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- 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.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice 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.

Summary of findings

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure carers are identified and correctly coded on the computer system and that systems are put in place to support them.
- Produce a schedule for the cleaning of hand held clinical equipment such as spirometer, nebuliser and ear irrigator.

- Continue to review the storage of the vaccine fridges.
- Look at ways to improve patient satisfaction scores.

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



- Risks to patients were assessed and managed. However the practice did not have a log of cleaning hand held clinical equipment such as spirometer, nebuliser and ear irrigator.
- The practice had a log of emergency medicines but this did not include expiry dates. An updated log was provided following the inspection.
- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.

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. The practice was aware of the areas where improvement was needed and was addressing this.

Summary of findings

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

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.
- 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 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.

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Health promotion alerts were sent to patients through text messages.
- Housebound patients were routinely visited on an annual basis for flu vaccinations, medication reviews, long term conditions management and health promotion.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes associated indicators was comparable to the local and national average.
- 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.
- The practice logged all cancer referrals and had put a system in place to chase hospital appointments on behalf of patients.

Families, children and young people

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

Good



- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.

Summary of findings

- 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.
- Cervical screening data was comparable to the national average.
- All university and college students were contacted through text message to promote the meningitis vaccine.
- 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 including text message alerts, booking appointments, ordering repeat prescriptions and viewing medical records.
- A full range of health promotion and screening was available that reflected the needs for this age group.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including 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.
- The practice offered a flu vaccination clinic in a local church hall for homeless people.

Good



Summary of findings

- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face to face review was 94%, which was comparable to the CCG and national averages.
- Mental health related performance indicators were comparable to the local and 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 offered walk in appointments for patients who were feeling distressed or presented with signs of acute mental health problems.
- 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 in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and fifteen survey forms were distributed and 106 were returned. This represented 3% of the practice's patient list.

- 68% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 61% and the national average of 73%.
- 73% 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 67% and the national average of 76%.
- 76% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 60% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 33 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients commented that the staff were very helpful and kind, that they felt supported by the doctors and that the environment was clean.

We spoke with six patients during the inspection. All six patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. Fifty seven of the 58 patients that completed the NHS Friends and Family test for November 2016 were either likely or extremely likely to recommend the practice.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure carers are identified and correctly coded on the computer system and that systems are put in place to support them.
- Produce a schedule for the cleaning of hand held clinical equipment such as spirometer, nebuliser and ear irrigator.
- Continue to review the storage of the vaccine fridges.
- Look at ways to improve patient satisfaction scores.

Larkshall Medical Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Larkshall Medical Centre

Larkshall Medical Centre is located in Chingford, North London. It is part of the Waltham Forest Clinical Commissioning Group. The practice has a patient list of approximately 8200. Forty five percent of patients are aged under 18 (compared to the national practice average of 44%) and 21% are 65 or older (compared to the national practice average of 20%). Fifty four percent of patients have a long-standing health condition.

The services provided by the practice include child health care, ante and post-natal care, immunisations, sexual health and contraception advice and management of long term conditions.

The staff team comprises two GP partners (one male and one female, working a total of 16 sessions a week), two male and two female sessional GPs (working a total of 14 sessions a week), two female practice nurses (working a total of four days a week), a full time practice manager secretarial and reception staff. Larkshall Medical Centre holds a Personal Medical Service (PMS) contract with NHS England. The practice is a teaching practice but does not currently have any students.

The practice's opening hours are:

- Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday 8:00am-6:30pm

- Thursday 8:00am to 1pm
- Tuesday 7:00am-8:00am (extended hours)

Appointments are available at the following times:

- Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday 8:30am – 10:30am and 3:30pm – 5:30pm
- Thursday – 8:30am – 10:30am

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments are also available for people that need them. When the practice was closed, patients were directed to the local out of hour's provider. Routine weekend appointments were provided by the local GP hub.

The practice is registered to provide the following regulated activities which we inspected: family planning, maternity and midwifery services, surgical procedures, treatment of disease, disorder or injury and diagnostic and screening procedures.

The practice has not previously been inspected.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before 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 7 December 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, nurses, practice manager and administrative 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 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.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Patient safety alerts are sent to the appropriate staff by the practice manager then placed in a folder for all staff to view with a summary of the alert and appropriate action taken placed at the front. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, an incident occurred when one of the doctors left the surgery in a hurry leaving the front door open when the practice was closed. A patient then entered the building and approached the reception area unexpectedly. The matter was discussed in the practice meeting where the importance of security was reiterated to staff and the policy updated. A notice was placed on the door to ensure that staff closed it correctly and staff were sent on health and safety security training.

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 and nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3. Non-clinical staff were trained to level 1.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (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 had schedules for the cleaning of the premises in place however there were no schedules for the cleaning of hand held clinical equipment such as spirometer, nebuliser and ear irrigator. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken (latest in July 2016) and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result, for example replacing sinks to elbow operated mixer taps and ensuring that items placed on the surface tops within clinical rooms were removed.
- 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). The practice had two medicines fridges; one of the fridges was over stocked on the day of inspection. We saw no damage to the stock. This was pointed out to the practice that transferred some of the medicines to the second fridge before the end of the inspection.

Are services safe?

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. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment.

- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, 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. 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. All non-clinical staff were multi trained so that they are able to provide cover in the event of a colleague being absent.

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. Emergency medicines were logged but there were no expiry dates on the log so the only way of identifying expiration was to look at each box individually. Following the inspection, the practice provided evidence of an updated log with expiry dates present.
- 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.

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 that the practice achieved 97% of the total number of points available. The practice had a total exception rate of 16% compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 10% and the national average of 9% (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). The practice explained they had a high exception reporting figure because they routinely audit their lists and ensure the correct coding is applied on the clinical system.

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

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the CCG and to the national average. For example:
 - 88% of patients' last blood sugar reading was within the target range compared to the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 78%.
 - 92% of patients' last blood pressure reading was within the required range compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 78%.

- The percentage of patients whose last measured total cholesterol was 5 mmol/l or less was 85%, compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 81%.
- The percentage of patients with a record of a foot examination and risk classification was 97%, compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 88%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the CCG and to the national average. For example:
 - The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented was 99%, compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 88%.
 - The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face to face review was 94%, compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 84%.
- Performance for other health related indicators were comparable to the CCG and the national average. For example:
 - The percentage of patients with atrial fibrillation with CHADS2 score of 1 who were currently treated with anticoagulation drug therapy or an antiplatelet therapy was 100%, compared to the CCG average of 99% and the national average of 98%.
 - The percentage of patients with asthma who had had an asthma review in the last 12 months was 84%, compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 75%.
 - The percentage of patients with lung disease who had had a review undertaken in the last 12 months was 90%, compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 90%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.
- We were provided with evidence of two clinical audits completed in the last two years; both of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking and peer review.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, an audit was undertaken in November 2015 to identify the number of carers in an attempt to offer the seasonal flu vaccination and routine health checks. The audit identified nine patients who were offered the service. Following discussion of the audit in the practice meeting it was agreed to add a question regarding carers to the practice registration form. Staff dealing with avoiding unplanned admissions and clinical staff, through consultations were to identify carers and ensure they were correctly coded on the computer system. The audit was repeated in November 2016 and 49 carers were identified. The practice acknowledged that the figure was still low and continued to work to identify carers. They planned to repeat the audit.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions
- 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. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months. Non-clinical staff were given the opportunity to

undertake training to further their job role. For example one of the receptionists had qualified in phlebotomy and another was currently training to become a healthcare assistant.

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. 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.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80%, which was comparable to the CCG and national average of 81%. 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. There were failsafe systems in

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

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 87% to 97% (CCG average range of 83% to 90%) and five year olds from 70% to 90% (CCG average range of 81% to 95%).

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 33 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 comparable to the local average for most of its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. However they were slightly below the national average. For example:

- 83% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 82% and the national average of 89%.
- 81% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 87%.
- 91% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 95%.

- 80% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the 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 national average of 91%.
- 85% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 83% 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:

- 78% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 86%.
- 78% 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%. The practice was aware of this low result and explained that the survey was undertaken within a time of change at the practice where a locum was being used.
- 81% 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.

Are services caring?

- 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 a number of support groups and organisations.

Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 49 patients as

carers (less than 1% of the practice list). The practice provided seasonal flu vaccinations and general health checks for carers. 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 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 Tuesday morning between 7am and 8am for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- 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.
- The practice sent health promotion information to mobile phones for patients signed up to the service.
- Housebound patients were visited annually for flu vaccinations, medication reviews, long term conditions management and health promotion.
- The practice logged all cancer referrals and had put a system in place to chase up all hospital appointments on behalf of the patient.
- The practice worked with the local mental health wellness service in the treatment of patients with mental health concerns.
- Walk-in appointments were available for any patient feeling distressed or presenting with acute mental health problems. The practice provided a flu vaccination clinic in a local church hall for homeless people.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice's opening hours were:

- Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday 8:00am-6:30pm
- Thursday 8:00am to 1pm
- Tuesday 7:00am-8:00am (extended hours)

Appointments were available at the following times:

- Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday 8:30am – 10:30am and 3:30pm – 5:30pm
- Thursday – 8:30am – 10:30am

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that need them. When the practice was closed, patients were directed to the local out of hour's provider. Routine weekend appointments were provided by the local GP hub. Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was comparable to local and national averages.

- 71% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 78%.
- 68% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 61% and the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

- 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. 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.
- 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 including information in the waiting area, complaints leaflet and information on the practice website.

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

We looked at five complaints received in the last 12 months and found that they were handled appropriately and in line with the practice policy. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a complaint was received following a patient booking two appointments with

different health professionals following each other. The practice reviewed this and sent an apology to the patient and ensured that the patient re-booked the second appointment. The policy was changed to ensure that there was an appropriate gap between patient's appointments to ensure that they did not miss the second appointment in future.

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 in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a 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.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- Internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were 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 people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology
- The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular 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, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice 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, providing health information through text messaging. The PPG carried out a patient survey in June 2016 which focussed on the general service provided by the practice, including waiting times for appointments and whether patients the usefulness of receiving a text message appointment reminder. Results were favourable towards the practice.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through practice meetings and annual appraisals. Staff told us

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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. Staff were given the opportunity to improve through training to carry out extended duties such as an administrator training in phlebotomy and a receptionist training to be a healthcare assistant.