

# Dr Kalwant Singh Koonar

## Quality Report

Healing Health Centre  
Wisteria Drive  
Healing  
Grimsby  
DN41 7JB

Tel: 01472 280221

Website: [www.healinghealthcentre.nhs.uk](http://www.healinghealthcentre.nhs.uk)

Date of inspection visit: 24 November 2015

Date of publication: 03/03/2016

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

## Ratings

### Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Good



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



# Summary of findings

## Contents

### Summary of this inspection

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Overall summary                             | 2    |
| The five questions we ask and what we found | 3    |
| The six population groups and what we found | 5    |
| What people who use the service say         | 8    |

### Detailed findings from this inspection

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Our inspection team                   | 9  |
| Background to Dr Kalwant Singh Koonar | 9  |
| Why we carried out this inspection    | 9  |
| How we carried out this inspection    | 9  |
| Detailed findings                     | 11 |

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Kalwant Singh Koonar on 24 November 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Staff had 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.

- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment. There were 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 provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour (i.e. any patient harmed by the provision of a healthcare service is informed of the fact and an appropriate remedy offered, regardless of whether a complaint has been made or a question asked about it).
- The practice had proactively sought feedback from patients and had an active patient participation group.
- Patients' confidentiality was respected. Whilst conversations at the reception desk could be overheard, there was a private room if required.

**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.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- There are robust recruitment and selection processes for all staff which follow best practice.

### Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data showed patient outcomes were similar to the locality.
- Audits had been carried out and we saw evidence that audits were driving improvement in performance to improve patient outcomes.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs.

### Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data showed that 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.
- We saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect. Whilst conversations at the reception desk could be overheard, there was a private room if required.

# Summary of findings

## Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- 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 that the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment. There were urgent appointments available the same day.
- People could access appointments and services in a way and at a time that suited them. Repeat prescriptions could be ordered and appointments booked online.
- Telephone appointments were available and there was extended opening hours on Tuesday.
- 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.

## Are services well-led?

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

Good



- It 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 this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity.
- The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- The practice implemented suggestions for improvements and made changes to the way it delivered services as a consequence of feedback from patients.

# Summary of findings

## The six population groups and what we found

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

### Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.

Good



### People with long term conditions

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

- All these patients had a named GP and an annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.
- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management.
- Consultations and support were available by telephone. Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- The practice also used the information they collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and their performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients

Good



### Families, children and young people

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

- 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.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- Nationally reported data showed 86.9% of women aged 25-64 had had a cervical screening test performed in the preceding 5 years (01/04/2010 to 31/03/2015), this was higher than the national average figure for England (77.1%).

Good



# Summary of findings

## Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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

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

## People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability. The practice had identified patients with a learning disability.
- The practice worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- 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)

Good



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

- 71.4% of people diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months compared to the national average 84.0%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- 100% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses have had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) compared to the national average 88.5%.

# Summary of findings

- Staff had a good understanding of how to support people with mental health needs and dementia.

# Summary of findings

## What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 2 July 2015 showed the practice was performing above the local CCG and national averages in most areas, 306 survey forms were distributed and 109 were returned (5.2% of the practice list).

- 98% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 75% and a national average of 73%.
- 99% found the receptionists at this surgery helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% and a national average of 87%.
- 93% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 87% and a national average of 85%.
- 98% said the last appointment they got was convenient compared to the CCG average of 95% and a national average of 92%.

- 92% described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 76% and a national average of 73%.
- 45% usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen compared to the CCG average of 60% and a national average of 65%.

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 positive about the standard of care received, however two comment cards raised issues around difficulty getting appointments.

We spoke with three patients during the inspection. All three patients said that they were happy with the care they received and thought that staff were approachable, committed and caring.



# Dr Kalwant Singh Koonar

## 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 advisor, a CQC inspector manager and a practice manager specialist advisor.

### Background to Dr Kalwant Singh Koonar

Dr Koonar occupies purpose built GP premises in Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire. They have a Primary Medical Services (PMS) contract and also offer enhanced services, for example; extended hours, minor surgery and facilitating timely diagnosis and support for people with dementia.

There are 2072 patients on the practice list and the majority of patients are of white British background. The proportion of the practice population in the 65 years and over age group is similar to the England average. The practice population in the under 18 age group is similar to the England average. The practice scored eight on the deprivation measurement scale which indicates the area is not very deprived. People living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. The overall practice deprivation score is similar to the England average (the practice is 13.9 and the England average is 23.6).

The practice has two GP Partners, both male. There is one practice nurse and one health care assistant. There is a practice manager and four receptionist and administration staff.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Mondays to Fridays and has extended hours until 7.30pm on Tuesdays.

Appointments are available Monday to Friday 9.20am to 11.20am and 5pm to 6pm and until 7.20pm on Tuesday. Patients requiring a GP outside of normal working hours are advised to contact the local Out Of Hours Service or NHS 111.

### Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive inspection programme.

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 that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 24 November 2015.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including one GP, the practice manager, the practice nurse, three receptionist and administration staff and we spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how people were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members

# Detailed findings

- 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 are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks 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 also a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, people received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

### Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and 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 relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level 3.
- All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a disclosure and barring check (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). Chaperone posters were not displayed in reception but the practice resolved this by the end of the inspection.

- 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 lead who liaised with the local infection control teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- We checked medicines stored in the treatment rooms and medicine refrigerators and found they were stored securely with access restricted to authorised staff. There were adequate stocks of emergency medicines and oxygen and a procedure was in place to manage stocks effectively.
- The ordering and storage of vaccines was well managed, and a cold chain policy was in place. (Cold chain is term is used to describe the cold temperature conditions in which certain products need to be kept during storage and distribution). Vaccines were administered by nurses and healthcare assistants using directions that had been produced in line with legal requirements and national guidance.
- Blank prescription forms were handled in accordance with national guidance and the practice kept them securely.
- We reviewed three personnel files and found that 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. 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

## Are services safe?

also had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises, such as control of substances hazardous to health, infection control and legionella.

- 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 that 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.
- The practice had oxygen with adult and children's masks available. The practice did not have a defibrillator however a risk assessment had been done and none was deemed necessary due the response times of the ambulance service.
- 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 fit for use.
- The practice had a 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 peoples' 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).

Results from 2014/2015 showed the practice achieved 92.3% of the total number of points available. Practices can exclude patients which is known as 'exception reporting', to ensure that practices are not penalised where, for example, patients do not attend for review, or where a medication cannot be prescribed due to a contraindication or side-effect. Lower exception reporting rates are more positive. The practice exception reporting rate was 4.9% which was below the local CCG and the national average. All results were at or above CCG and national averages with the following exceptions;

- Performance for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease related indicators was below the CCG and national average; 74.3% compared to the CCG Average of 96.6% and the England average of 96%
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was better than the CCG and national average; 100% compared to the CCG average of 99.2% and England average of 97.8%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the CCG and national average; 100% compared to the CCG Average 90.6% and England average of 92.8%.

- There had been five clinical audits completed in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in applicable local audits and findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent audits undertaken regarding treatment of gout resulted in an amended process to ensure patients were being monitored in line with clinical recommendations.

### Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed non-clinical members of staff that 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 e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions and administering vaccinations.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals and meetings. Staff were having regular appraisals and we saw records showing appraisals had been undertaken in previous years.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff made use of 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. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets was also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring people to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity

# Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

of people's needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital.

## Consent to care and treatment

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

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

## Health promotion and prevention

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support. These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives and carers. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 85.3% which was comparable to the CCG average of 84.9% and the national average of 81.8%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 86.7% to 93.3% and five year olds from 95.7% to 100%.

Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 73.3% and for at risk groups 58.56%, these were above the CCG and national averages. The practice offered the shingles vaccine. Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups on the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

# Are services caring?

## Our findings

### Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We observed that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated people 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 and that 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
- Patients' confidentiality was respected however conversations at the reception desk could be overheard.

All of the 13 patient CQC 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 also spoke with a member of the patient participation group. They 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 published in July 2015 showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was similar to the CCG and national average in most areas for its satisfaction scores on consultations with doctors and nurses with the exception of:

- 98% of respondents find it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 75% and the national average 73%.
- 82% of respondents with a preferred GP usually get to see or speak to that GP compared to the CCG average of 65% and the national average 60%.
- 92% of respondents describe their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of average 76% and the national average 73%.

### Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us that 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 on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views. Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.

### Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Patients told us that following discharge from hospital, their usual GP visited them and was contactable via a mobile phone.

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.

- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and for patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

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 CCG and national averages. For example:

- 92% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 86%.
- 87% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 79% and national average of 81%.
- 87% of respondents say the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 91% and national average 90%.
- 85% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 85%.

### Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours surgeries were offered 6.30pm to 7.30pm on Tuesday. Urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above the local CCG and national averages. People told us on the day that they were able to get appointments when they needed them.

- 84% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 75%.
- 98% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 75% and national average 73%.
- 92% patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average 73%.
- 45% patients said they usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time compared to the CCG average of 60% and the national average 65%.

The practice provided facilities for community physiotherapy service for the wider community which reduced the need for patients to travel to the local general hospital.

### 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. There was a poster displayed in the waiting area and information was on the practice website.

We looked at the complaints received in the last 12 months and found they were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a complaint was received from a parent following an alert by the practice regarding use of an inappropriate vaccine by a locum member of staff. The patient had been informed, an apology made and the patient invited to return for the correct vaccine. The parent was invited to meet with the practice and was satisfied once an explanation had been made.



# 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 on the website. Staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a strategy for the following 12 months which outlined how they would continue to deliver their vision, however this was not documented.

### Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks and issues and implementing mitigating actions
- Continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements

### Leadership, openness and transparency

The partners in the practice had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. The staff found the GPs approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty.

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- the practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology

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

- Staff told us that the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings, felt confident in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, by the partners and practice manager.

### 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.

· It had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG).

· Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were not satisfied with the appointment system. The practice discussed this with the staff and now offered daily telephone triage with the GP and Practice Nurse to ensure patients spoke with medical staff on the day they contacted the practice.