

Dr Durr and Partners

Quality Report

Broomfield Park Medical Centre,
Spon End, Coventry, CV1 3HQ

Tel: 024 7622 8606

Website: www.broomfieldparkmedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 4 October 2016

Date of publication: 17/01/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Requires improvement	
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	11
Areas for improvement	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Dr Durr and Partners	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14
Action we have told the provider to take	24

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Durr and Partners on 4 October 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 dignity, respect and compassion. Patients were involved with decisions about their care and treatment.
- Patient outcomes were mostly above average when compared with the Clinical Commissioning Group average and national average.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
 - Safety alerts for medicines were reviewed and actioned. Details of reviews and actions were recorded.
- There were clearly defined processes and procedures to ensure patients were safe and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events. These were discussed during staff meetings, although we noted they were not always minuted.
- Patients' needs were assessed and care delivered in line with current guidelines. Staff had the appropriate skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Care plans were in place for the most vulnerable patients, for example, those most at risk of unplanned admission to hospital.
- Urgent same day patient appointments were available when needed. Patients we spoke with said they were always able to obtain same day appointments.
- Patients said GPs gave them enough time and treated them with dignity and respect.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand.

Summary of findings

- Plans were in place to ensure the future of the practice, for example, a five year business plan and a succession plan for the replacement of the current GP partners when they retired.

The provider must make the following improvement:

- Ensure all medical safety alerts are monitored so that they are actioned in a timely manner.

The provider should make the following improvement:

- Ensure all staff meetings are fully minuted.

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 requires improvement for providing safe services.

Requires improvement



- Appropriate systems were in place for reporting and recording significant events. They were regularly reviewed in practice meetings and were shared with other stakeholders.
- Risks were assessed and well managed. However, the practice had not registered for one patient safety alert.
- Procedures were in place to ensure patients were kept safe and safeguarded from abuse. All staff had received appropriate safeguarding training at the required level for their role and further training had been arranged for the day after our inspection.
- When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received support, an explanation and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again and incidents were reviewed to ensure they were not repeated.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data available from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) 2014/15 demonstrated that patient outcomes were mostly above average when compared with the Clinical Commissioning Group average and national average. The practice scored 98% with an exception rate of 12%. This was above the CCG average of 94% with an exception rate of 9%.
- The practice used clinical audits to identify areas of improvement and acted upon their results.
- Care was delivered by staff according to current evidence based guidance.
- Care plans were in place for the most vulnerable patients, for example, those most at risk of unplanned admission to hospital.
- Practice staff had the necessary skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- We saw that staff worked with other health care professionals to provide 'joined up' care which met the range and complexity of patients' needs.

All staff received appraisals and had personal development plans

Summary of findings

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- The results of the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2016 showed patients rated the practice highly for aspects of care.
- Patients were treated with kindness and respect. Patient confidentiality was maintained.
- Patients we spoke with and patients who completed comment cards before our inspection were completely positive about all aspects of care and treatment they received at the practice.
- Easy to understand and accessible information about services was available for patients.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Patients told us they were always able to obtain a same day appointment when needed. Appointments were available on the day of our inspection.
- In addition to being able to make appointments with a named GP, patients could leave a message for a named GP and would be called back by them the same day (or the next available day if the GP was not in the practice).
- Children and elderly patients were prioritised for same day appointments.
- The practice building had good facilities and was equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand. 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.

- Appropriate processes were in place to monitor and improve quality and identify risk
- The management structure was clearly defined and staff knew who to raise concerns with. The practice had policies and procedures which outlined how it should operate and held regular governance meetings.
- Plans were in place to ensure the future of the practice, for example a five year business plan and a succession plan for the replacement of the current GP partners when they retired.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice had a clearly defined vision which explained how it delivered care and treatment to patients. Staff understood this vision and how it related to their work. This was linked to a five year development plan for the practice.
- The practice sought feedback from patients and staff. There was a Patient Participation Group (PPG). A PPG is a group of patients registered with a practice who worked with the practice team to improve services and the quality of care.

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.

- Older patients were given personalised care which reflected their needs.
- Care plans were in place with the most vulnerable older patients (2%) and used with multi-disciplinary teams to reduce unplanned hospital admissions. These patients had an alert placed on their patient records to ensure clinical staff were aware.
- Over the last 12 months all patients aged 75 and over had been invited for a health check. This included blood tests, fracture assessment, frailty assessment, and checks for depression and dementia. From those checks, the practice identified patients who needed further investigation and referred them appropriately.
- The most vulnerable patients were given reviews which included both the patient and their carer if they had one. The practice also liaised with the district nursing team when appropriate, to ensure the right package of care was provided.
- Home visits were offered to patients who could not reach the practice.
- Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients were good for conditions commonly found in older people.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- The practice had a register of patients with long term conditions to enable their health to be effectively monitored and managed.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- Patients had a named GP and a review every six to 12 months to monitor their condition and ensure they received correct medicines. This also included carers if the patient had one. The frequency of the review depended on the severity of the patient's condition

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice achieved a 96% flu vaccination record for diabetes patients during 2015-2016. This was above the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 93% and the national average of 94%.
- The practice was well equipped for less able patients. A hearing aid loop was in place, a wheelchair was available, and patients letters could be sent in large print format and in an appropriate 'easy read' style for patients with learning disabilities.

Families, children and young people

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

- A total of 82% of eligible patients had received cervical screening in the last 12 months. This was similar to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 81% and the national average of 81%.
- There were appointments outside of school hours and the practice building was suitable for children and babies.
- Outcomes for areas such as child vaccinations were in line with the average for the CCG.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and the local health visitor. Midwife appointments were available at the practice every week.
- A regular multi-disciplinary team meeting was held with the midwife and health visitor. This reviewed the child protection register and non-attendance for immunisations and checks.
- A full range of family planning and sexual health services were available within the practice building.

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 practice ensured it provided services to meet the needs of the working age population, For example, extended hours appointments were available on Monday evenings and Saturday mornings.
- Telephone consultations were available for patients who were unable to reach the practice during the day.
- Patients could leave a message for a named GP and would be called back by them the same day (or the next available day if the GP was not in the practice).

Good



Summary of findings

- Regular reviews of the appointment system were held to ensure patients could access the service when they needed to. This had recently resulted in additional telephone appointments being made available.
- A full range of services appropriate to this age group was offered, including travel vaccinations and smoking cessation.

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



- The practice had a register of patients who were vulnerable to enable their health to be effectively monitored and managed. This included patients with a learning disability.
- The practice supported vulnerable patients to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Longer appointments were available for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice worked with other health care professionals to provide care to vulnerable patients, for example, the district nursing team and community matron. Vulnerable and complex patients were discussed at the regular multi-disciplinary team meeting.
- Staff could recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities to share appropriate information, record safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours. Staff training has included recognition of many forms of abuse and neglect, for example physical and sexual abuse.

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).

Good



- The practice had a register of patients with poor mental health to enable their health to be effectively monitored and managed.
- The practice worked with multi-disciplinary teams to provide appropriate care for patients with poor mental health. This included patients with dementia.
- Patients were signposted to appropriate local and national support groups.
- The practice used an appropriate 'easy read' style for letters sent to patients with learning disabilities.

Summary of findings

- Staff demonstrated a good working knowledge of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

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 above local and national averages. 372 survey forms were distributed and 76 were returned, a 20% completion rate.

- 94% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 73%.
- 86% 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 91% and the national average of 76%.
- 95% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.

- 93% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 78% and 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 21 comment cards, all of which made completely positive comments about all aspects of care received at the practice.

We spoke with 9 patients during the inspection. Four patients were members of the Patient Participation Group (PPG). A PPG is a group of patients registered with the practice who worked with the practice team to improve services and the quality of care. All the patients we spoke with said they always received excellent care and could always obtain appointments when they needed one.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

- Ensure medical safety alerts are monitored so that they are actioned in a timely manner.

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure all staff meetings are fully minuted.

Dr Durr and Partners

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 and an 'Expert by Experience'.

Background to Dr Durr and Partners

Dr Durr and Partners is located in the Spon End district of Coventry, an urban area to the north west of Coventry city centre. It is run as a partnership had 7633 patients registered at the time of our inspection. Between January 2015 and October 2016 the practice had an increase of approximately 2000 patients due to the closure of another local GP practice and the opening of a nearby 'retirement village'. In addition, there is a branch surgery, The Health Centre, located at Warwick University where a further 9,907 patients are registered. The two practices serve very different communities, although patients can make appointments at either practice. The main practice has a community with a large elderly and ethnic population, whereas the branch surgery primarily serves students of many nationalities. We did not inspect the branch surgery as part of this inspection.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with NHS England. The GMS contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities. The practice is part of a local GP federation – the GP Alliance. A group of practices who work together to share best practice and maximize opportunities to improve patient outcomes.

There are eight partner GPs (three male and five female) within the practice. There are also three practice nurses, one of whom is a nurse practitioner and therefore able to issue prescriptions. They are supported by a practice manager and administrative and reception staff.

The practice is also an approved training practice for doctors who wish to become GPs. A GP trainee is a qualified doctor who is training to become a GP through a period of working and training in a practice. Only approved training practices can employ GP trainees and the practice must have at least one approved GP trainer.

The practice is open from 8.00am to 6.30pm during the week. Appointments are available from 8am to 11am and from 2pm to 5.50pm, although there is no afternoon session on Thursdays, appointments are available at the branch surgery. Outside of these times, a duty GP is available and urgent appointments can be made outside of these times by arrangement with the practice.

Extended hours appointments are available on Mondays from 6.30pm to 7.40pm, or on Tuesdays after a public holiday and also on Saturday mornings.

When the practice is closed, patients can access out of hours care provided by Virgin Healthcare through NHS 111. The practice has a recorded message on its telephone system to advise patients. This information is also available on the practice's website.

Home visits are available for patients who are unable to attend the practice for appointments. There is also an online service which allows patients to order repeat prescriptions and book new appointments without having to telephone the practice. Telephone appointments are available for patients who are unable to reach the practice during normal working hours.

Detailed findings

The practice treats patients of all ages and provides a range of medical services. This includes minor surgery and disease management such as asthma, diabetes and heart disease.

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 our inspection, 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 inspection on 4 October 2016. During our inspection we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, nursing staff, the 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.
- We reviewed policies, procedures and other information the practice provided before the inspection.

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

Dr Durr and Partners had an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of significant events and we examined five that had occurred had been correctly recorded, investigated and discussed fully with staff in the next available staff meeting. Lessons to be learnt had been identified and implemented. We did however notice that details of discussions were not always fully recorded in meeting minutes.
- Staff we spoke with described the incident reporting procedure and we saw the recording form. 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 how when things went wrong during care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, were given an explanation, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

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, when concerns arose about a patient's diagnosis following discharge from hospital, the practice took prompt action to give appropriate treatment. The investigation carried out by the practice revealed the hospital had not provided complete or follow-up information. The practice raised this with the appropriate organisations involved.

Overview of safety systems and processes

We were satisfied the practice had appropriate systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse, which included:

- Systems in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These were based on relevant legislation and local requirements issued by Coventry City Council's safeguarding team. Staff told us how they could access these policies and we saw evidence of

them. They 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 who had been trained to level 3 for child safeguarding, as had all other clinical staff. GPs, nursing and administrative staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.

- There were appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene within the practice. We observed the premises to be visibly clean and tidy. A nurse practitioner was the infection control clinical lead who had received appropriate training and kept up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Six monthly infection control audits were undertaken and the latest had been carried out in June 2016. This had not identified any areas of concern, but the nurse practitioner explained the action that would be taken if anything was identified.
- A regular multi-disciplinary team meeting was held with the midwife and health visitor. This reviewed the child protection register and non-attendance for immunisations and checks.
- There were suitable arrangements in place for managing medicines within the practice. This included emergency medicines and vaccines which were kept in the practice. Processes were in place for the handling of repeat prescriptions. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use.
- There were Patient Group Directions (PGDs) in place to allow the nurse practitioner to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- The practice had not registered to receive alerts issued by MHRA (Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency). This was rectified after our inspection. Evidence was supplied to show the practice had retrospectively reviewed all alerts issued during the last 12 months and taken any appropriate action. A revised procedure was also put in place to ensure staff were fully informed of alerts and to record the actions that needed to be taken going forward.

Are services safe?

- The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of Coventry and Rugby Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) pharmacy team and a local pharmacy, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. A monthly meeting was held with a CCG pharmacist.
- Systems were in place for monitoring the prescribing of high-risk medicines, for example warfarin, a medicine to increase the time blood takes to clot.
- There was a notice in the waiting room to inform patients that chaperones were available if required. Clinical staff 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.
- We saw processes were in place to carry out recruitment checks prior to employment. For example, proof of identity, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the DBS.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed by the practice.

- Risks to patient and staff safety were monitored in an appropriate way, for example, fire safety (latest risk assessment carried out in July 2016), disposal of clinical waste and legionella checks. Any concerns were raised by the practice at a quarterly tenant's meeting.
- All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use (last checked April 2016) and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. This had also last been checked in April 2016.

- There were systems in place to ensure the practice was safely staffed to enable patient needs to be met. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty. Staff were able to cover for each other when absent.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available, securely stored and staff knew how to access these.
- The practice had a defibrillator (which provides an electric shock to stabilise a life threatening heart rhythm) available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. There was a first aid kit and accident book available.
- There were emergency medicines securely kept on the premises which were easily accessible to staff. Checks were regularly made on these medicines to ensure they were within date and therefore suitable for use.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. Arrangements were in place to use facilities at the branch surgery and a nearby practice if the practice building was unavailable. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff. Copies were kept by key staff at home so they could access them if the practice building became unusable.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

We were shown how 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. NICE is the organisation responsible for promoting clinical excellence and cost-effectiveness and for producing and issuing clinical guidelines to ensure that every NHS patient gets fair access to quality treatment.

- There were 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 (2014-2015) showed that the practice achieved 98% of the total number of points available with 12% exception reporting. This total was above the Coventry and Rugby Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 94% and the practice's exception reporting was higher than the 9% average within the CCG. (A CCG is a group of general practices that work together to plan and design local health services in England. They do this by 'commissioning' or buying health and care services.) We discussed this with GPs and were told the influx of new patients from a practice that had recently closed and a newly opened local 'retirement village' had been a factor, but the practice was working to lower this figure and had put an action plan in place.

Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients were unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines could not be prescribed because of side effects. For example:

- Coronary heart disease. The practice achieved 100% with an exception rate of 0%. The overall score was above the CCG average of 95% with an exception rate of 4%.
- Hypertension (high blood pressure). The practice achieved 83% with an exception rate of 3%. This was similar to the CCG average of 83% with an exception rate of 4%.
- Dementia. The practice achieved 91% with an exception rate of 13%. This was above the CCG average of 84% with an exception rate of 8%. The exception rate had increased following the opening of the local 'retirement village' and the practice was currently reviewing its patients there, almost all of whom had recently moved into the area.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- A programme of clinical audit was in place and findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, an audit on patients referred to secondary health care (for example, hospital consultants), reduced the number of rejected referrals by ensuring information on routine and less regular referrals was aligned with the CCG referral guidelines. The practice has continued to monitor this.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation and peer review. Results were also shared with other practices the practice had a close working relationship with.

Effective staffing

Practice staff at the practice had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

- An induction programme was in place for newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and confidentiality. New staff received a period of mentoring with an established member of staff. This included locum GPs and the practice had a locum induction pack.
- There was a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of developmental needs in place. Staff received training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

their work. We saw evidence of ongoing support and coaching. Staff who administered vaccines and took samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training. This included an assessment of competence.

- Practice staff had received training that included safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Training was regularly updated.
- For planned and long term GP absence, the practice occasionally used locum GPs known to the practice and had appropriate checks carried out.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

All information needed by staff to enable them to plan and deliver patient care was easily available to them:

- Information included care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Patients at risk of unplanned hospital admissions (2% of the patient list) had care plans in place.
- Information was shared with other services appropriately, for example when referring patients to other services, such as for secondary health care appointments.

Practice staff worked with other health and social care professionals to meet patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This resulted in a 'joined up' package of care with other providers. For example, when referring patients for family planning or sexual health matters.

Consent to care and treatment

We were told how practice staff obtained patients' consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

- When care and treatment was provided for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- We saw that staff understood the consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- 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

Patients in need of additional support were actively identified by the practice. For example:

- Smoking cessation advice was available from the practice. Over the last 12 months, 43 patients received smoking cessation advice and 32 had stopped smoking as a result
- Patients who received palliative (end of life) care and carers.
- Patients with a long term condition.
- Patients who need additional support, such as dietary advice.
- The practice offered additional support for diabetic patients.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was the same as the CCG and national averages. 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 cancer (60% of patients screened). This was above the national average of 58% and breast cancer screening (68% of patients screened). This was just below the national average of 72%. 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.

Outcomes for areas such as child vaccinations were in line with the average for the CCG. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 98% to 100% which was comparable to the CCG range of 96% to 99% and five year olds from 93% to 100% which was comparable to the CCG range of 91% 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

During our inspection of the practice we saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect at all times.

- We received 14 comment cards from patients, all of which made completely positive comments about the standard of care received.
- Reception staff told us when patients needed privacy to discuss sensitive issues they were offered a private room.
- There were curtains in consultation rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.

We spoke with four members of the Patient Participation Group (PPG). A PPG is a group of patients registered with the practice who worked with the practice to improve services and the quality of care. 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 were caring and respected patients, gave patients the time they needed and treated patients in the way they would like to be treated themselves.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2016 showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was largely above the average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 98% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 94% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.
- 94% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 79% national average of 85%.

- 85% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 90% national average of 91%.
- 86% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients we spoke with told us they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment. They told us clinical staff listened to them. Every patient we spoke with told us they were given enough time by GPs. Comments made by patients on the comment cards completed before our inspection supported this.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2016 showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were largely above local and national averages. For example:

- 87% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 86%.
- 97% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%.
- 80% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 85%.

We saw how the practice provided assistance to enable patients to be involved in decisions about their care:

- There was a translation service available for patients who did not have English as a first language. Notices were displayed in the reception area about this. The service was regularly used.
- Information was displayed in other languages and additional information could be provided in other languages on request.
- A wide range of information about health awareness and locally available support groups was displayed in the waiting room.

Are services caring?

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Literature was available in the waiting room to publicise local and national support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 2.6% of the practice list (198 patients) as carers. We discussed this with GPs and the practice manager and were told how the practice has worked to identify 'hidden carers', something particularly common in the ethnic population groups served by the practice, where there was sometimes a significant cultural barrier in place.

Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. This included Coventry Carers Association and networking. Patients could also be referred to, or refer themselves to appointments with an Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) counsellor. All carers were also offered a carer's assessment.

GPs contacted families following bereavement. Patients were also signposted to relevant support services.

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 the Coventry and Rugby Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.

- Between January 2015 and October 2016 the practice had an increase of approximately 2000 patients due to the closure of another local GP practice and the opening of a nearby 'retirement village'. Many of the latter patients had complex health needs, including dementia. The practice had put a plan in place to review these patients, the majority of whom were new to the area. This had adversely affected some areas of the practice's performance data, but the practice staff had identified this and had kept this under review.
- Extended hours appointments were available on Monday evenings and Saturday mornings. Appointments were also available at the branch surgery.
- Same day appointments were available for all patients when required. Appointments were available on the day of our inspection.
- A translation service was available for patients who did not speak English as a first language.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and those initially diagnosed with diabetes. Patients who failed to attend for their annual health check were contacted by telephone.
- Patients who needed to discuss more than one health concern could book a double length appointment on request.
- The practice also offered telephone consultations for patients who could not attend the practice during normal working hours.
- Clinical staff made home visits to patients who were unable to reach the practice.
- Travel vaccinations were available.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8.00am to 6.30pm during the week. Appointments were available from 8am to 11am and from 2pm to 5.50pm, although there was no afternoon session on Thursdays, appointments were available at the branch surgery. Outside of these times, a duty GP was available and urgent appointments could be made outside

of these times by arrangement with the practice. Extended hours appointments were available on Mondays from 6.30pm to 7.40pm, or on Tuesdays after a public holiday and on Saturday mornings. Additionally, patients could leave a message for a named GP and would be called back by them the same day (or the next available day if the GP was not in the practice).

When the practice was closed, patients could access out of hours care provided by Virgin Healthcare within the same building through NHS 111. The practice had a recorded message on its telephone system to advise patients. This information was also available on the practice's website.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2016 showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above local and national averages, apart from satisfaction with the practice's opening hours.

- 80% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 76%.
- 94% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 73%.

We discussed patient access with the GP partners and practice management. The practice had managed to have some improvements made to the telephone system, but there were limitations because this was the responsibility of the building's landlord. However, practice staff did advise patients of the best times to call the practice when the incoming lines were usually less busy.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

There was a clear and effective system in place for handling complaints and concerns.

- The practice complaints procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- The practice had designated the practice manager to handle all complaints received.
- Information about how to complain was clearly displayed in the waiting room and in the practice patient leaflet.

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

- An annual complaints summary was prepared and discussed to review progress and any potential trends.
- Patients were invited into the practice to discuss concerns face to face, but we noted few chose to take this option.

Six complaints had been received within the last 12 months and we reviewed three of these. Patients received an appropriate explanation and apology. Complaints were

reviewed annually to ensure lessons had been learnt and any errors made had not been repeated. The practice acted on concerns raised by patient complaints; for example, by changing the process used to record prescriptions issued by the hospital onto patient's notes. We spoke with one patient who had previously made a complaint to the practice. The patient told us the matter had been handled appropriately and within the timescales published within the complaints procedure.

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 clearly defined direction and vision 'to provide patients with a first class integrated healthcare service in a caring and well managed environment'. Staff we spoke with understood this and how it related to their individual roles.

Governance arrangements

The practice had a governance framework in place which facilitated the delivery of care and reflected the practice values. This ensured that:

- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained and changes were made when concerns were identified. For example, by introducing double length appointments for patients with more than one medical concern to discuss with a GP. This reduced the occasions patient appointments ran late.
- The practice had a five year business development plan and five year vision to safeguard the future development of the practice. This included succession plans for the GP.
- Policies and procedures were tailored to the practice and were available to all staff. They were reviewed annually and staff were informed of any changes.
- There were clear arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks. All concerns were raised and fully discussed in staff meetings.
- The practice is a member of a local GP federation – the GP Alliance, a group of practices that work together and share ideas to improve patient care.
- The practice benchmarked itself against local GP practices it had working relationships with and the practice manager held meetings with other practice managers as part of the on-going development of the practice. Learning from good practice, significant events and complaints was shared at these meetings.

Leadership and culture

We saw how the lead GP and management team had the necessary experience and skills to run the practice and provide appropriate high quality care to patients. Staff we spoke with told us the partners were fully approachable and listened to staff ideas and concerns. Staff also told us how open the lead GP and management were and they felt they could easily raise any concerns they had.

There were systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment. The partners encouraged a culture of openness, approachability and honesty. Staff we spoke with confirmed this. There were appropriate systems in place at the practice to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

- Patients affected were supported, given an explanation and a verbal and written apology.
- There was a clearly defined management structure in place and staff were supported. Staff told us there was a culture of openness within the practice.
- Staff we spoke with told us they felt valued and supported. All staff were involved in discussions at meetings and in appraisals and were invited to identify opportunities to improve the service offered by the practice.
- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings and we saw minutes of meetings to confirm this. Staff told us they could raise any issues at team meetings.

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 an active Patient Participation Group (PPG). A PPG is a group of patients registered with a practice who worked with the practice to improve services and the quality of care. The PPG met twice yearly, carried out patient surveys and discussed developments within the practice.
- The practice had recently carried out its own patient survey.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The practice gathered and used feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion.
- Results from the NHS Friends and Family Test during the last six months, showed that 93% of patients who responded were either likely or highly likely to recommend the practice to friends and family.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment At the time of the inspection the practice could not be assured that care and treatment were always provided in a safe way. This was because they were not receiving alerts issued by the MHRA (Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Agency).