

Queens Street Medical Practice

Quality Report

149 Queen Street,
Whitehaven,
Cumbria,
CA28 7BA

Tel: 01946 694457

Website: www.queenstreetmedicalpractice.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 3rd August 2017

Date of publication: 27/09/2017

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 Queens Street Medical Practice	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Queens Street Medical Group on 3rd August 2017. 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.
- 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.
- Risks to patients were assessed and generally well managed. The system to identify when risk assessments required reviewing was being improved at the time of inspection.
- 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 the management team.
- 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.

There were areas of practice where the provider should make improvements:

- Request and keep copies of references for new members of staff.

Summary of findings

- Continue to put in place systems to identify risk assessments and policies which need to be updated, and update those which have passed their renewal date.
- Keep to the established programme of meetings for the nursing, admin and reception teams.

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.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and generally well managed, however some risk assessments and policies required updating. The practice was in the process of identifying those that required action.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Performance for diabetes related indicators was higher than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 89.8%.
- 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, published in July 2017, showed patients rated the practice higher than others for all aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Summary of findings

- There was a carers' lead who offered support, and the practice had identified 81 patients as carers (2% of the practice list).
- The practice employed a Care Coordinator who could visit patients in their own homes to offer support and to direct them to other services as required.
- 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.

Good



- 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.
- 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.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- 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 leadership responsibility was shared across the team.
- The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity, however some risk assessments and policies required updating.
- The practice held regular governance meetings, however during the past 12 months the meetings for the nursing, administration and reception teams had not been held as frequently as the meeting schedule indicated they should.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- 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.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. There was a patient participation group.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in their population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice employed a care coordinator who could visit older patients in their own homes to offer support and to direct them to other services as required.
- Performance for conditions associated with older patients, such as Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, was better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available for this condition, compared to the national average of 95.9%.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was higher than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 89.8%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 higher than national average for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 90%, which was in line with the local and national average of 81%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that 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 those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients who needed them.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



Summary of findings

- There was a carers' lead who offered support, and the practice had identified 81 patients as carers (2% of the practice list).

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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100% of the total points available in 2015/16 (national average 92.8%).
- 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.
- In 2015/16, 87% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face-to-face meeting in the last 12 months. This was above the national average of 84%.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- There was 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, published in July 2017, showed the practice was performing above local and national averages. 259 survey forms were distributed and 127 were returned. This represented a 49% response rate and approximately 2.5% of the practice's patient list.

- 90% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by telephone compared to the national average of 71%.
- 92% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 84%.
- 93% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 88% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who had just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 77%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 20 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Commonly used words included 'excellent', 'kind', 'helpful', 'caring' and 'considerate'.

We spoke with five patients during the inspection. All of these patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Request and keep copies of references for new members of staff.
- Continue to put in place systems to identify risk assessments and policies which need to be updated, and update those which have passed their renewal date.
- Keep to the established programme of meetings for the nursing, admin and reception teams.

Queens Street Medical Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Queens Street Medical Practice

Dr Graham John Ironside is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide primary care services.

The practice provides services to approximately 4,200 patients from one location:

- Queens Street Medical Practice, 149 Queen Street, Whitehaven, Cumbria, CA28 7BA.

We visited this location on this inspection.

The practice was registered with CQC previously but had not been inspected. They changed their registration on 2 February 2016 to reflect the change from a partnership to a single-handed GP practice. The other member of the former GP partnership, and other staff, continue to work at the practice carrying out the same roles and responsibilities.

The practice is located in a converted building in the centre of Whitehaven, which is rented by the practice. Patient facilities are situated on the ground floor and first floor. There is a lift for patients to use as well as disabled toilet facilities, wheelchair and step-free access to all consulting and treatment rooms.

The practice has 15 members of staff, including the lead GP (male) and one salaried GP (female), a nurse practitioner (female), two practice nurses (female), a practice manager, an administrator/care-coordinator, a medicines manager/clinical interface manager, a practice secretary, a head receptionist, and five reception and administration staff, including an apprentice. At the time of inspection, the practice had an interim practice manager in place, as well as a long-term locum GP in addition to the two permanent doctors. The practice was also actively seeking a healthcare assistant.

The practice is part of North Cumbria clinical commissioning group (CCG). Information taken from Public Health England places the area in which the practice is located in the fourth more deprived decile. In general, people living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. The practice population profile roughly reflects the national average. The number of patients between the ages of 45 and 54 and 65 and 69 is slightly higher than average, while there are slightly fewer patients than the national average between 25 and 39.

The surgery is open from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday, with the exception of Wednesday when the practice closes at 4pm but a doctor remains on call until 6.30pm. Extended hours are offered on Monday and Friday until 7.30pm. Telephones at the practice are answered from 8am until 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. Outside of these times a message on the telephone answering system redirects patients to out of hours or emergency services as appropriate. The service for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is provided by the NHS 111 service and Cumbria Health on Call Ltd (CHoC).

Detailed findings

The practice provides services to patients of all ages based on a General Medical Services (GMS) contract agreement for general practice.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 3rd August 2017. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of 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 also saw evidence that a training session had been booked for the autumn to strengthen the significant event reporting system further.

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, following a significant event, the practice made changes to their repeat prescriptions procedure to ensure patients were receiving the medication they required.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child safeguarding level three.
- 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 nurse practitioner was the infection control clinical lead; they liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse) and had procedures in place to manage them safely. There were also arrangements in place for the destruction of controlled drugs.
- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment for the most recent member of staff employed. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate

Are services safe?

checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. The practice told us they had updated their recruitment procedure since those staff members had been employed to ensure references were obtained. On the day of inspection there was also no checklist to ensure the medical indemnity and professional registration of the permanent clinical staff and long-term locum was in place. However, we did see that these staff did have the relevant cover and registration and a system has now been established to check this regularly.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and generally well-managed, however some improvements were required.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety, and the practice was in the process of improving these. While risk assessments and policies were in place, there was no system for identifying when these had been carried out. As such, when the staff member responsible for organising these had to take a leave of absence from the practice, it was unclear to those standing in which risk assessments needed to be updated, and as a result we saw on the day of the inspection that the fire risk assessment and the health and safety risk assessment had recently passed their review dates. However, the practice were working to resolve this problem and had put a number of new systems in place, as well as identifying non-essential policies and risk assessments that could be removed. Other risk assessments had been identified as requiring renewal and had been updated, for example 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. Staff worked the same days and hours each week, and this was set to ensure enough staff were on duty. We were told by various members of staff that when staff members took leave or were absent through sickness, people were flexible to change their hours and provide cover.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results showed the practice had achieved 100% of the total number of points available, compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 97.7%, and the national average of 95.3%. The practice exception reporting rate was lower than the local and national averages at 6.7% (CCG average 10.2%, national average 9.8%). (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).

Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was higher than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 89.8%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was higher than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 92.8%.
- Performance for asthma related indicators was above the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available, compared to the national average of 97.4%.

- Performance for conditions associated with older patients, such as Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, were better than the national average. The practice achieved 100% of the total points available for this condition, compared to the national average of 95.9%.

Since the change of registration the practice has continued to achieve good QoF performance. Results provided to us relating to 2016/17 showed that the practice had achieved 100% of the total points available, with an exception reporting rate of 6.4%. As these results are unverified and have not yet been published nationally we are unable to compare them to local and national averages.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- We saw seven examples of clinical audits completed in the last two years where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, and peer review.

Findings were used by the practice to improve services, such as reducing the rates of prescribing certain medications and ensuring patients were taking medicines which were most effective for their conditions.

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 updates 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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.
- 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. The practice had also commissioned additional training for all their staff: blind awareness training to improve the care offered to patients with impaired vision; and “Prevent” training (to spot the signs of radicalisation).

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 weekly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient’s mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient’s capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- Other services, such as counselling, were available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice’s uptake for the cervical screening programme was 90%, which was above the CCG and national averages 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 ensuring a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged their patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. Data from Public Health England from 2015/16 showed that:

- 78% of females, 50-70, were screened for breast cancer in last 36 months, compared to the national average of 73%.
- 63% of people, 60-69, were screened for bowel cancer in the last 30 months, compared to the national average of 58%.

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

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were better than national averages. For example, they achieved a score of 9.8 for childhood immunisation rates

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

for the vaccinations given to under two year olds (national average 9.1) and had achieved 97% and 94% for vaccinations given to five year olds (national average from 87.7% to 93.9%).

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.
- Patients celebrating a 90th or 100th birthday were sent a card from the practice team.

We spoke with five patients, including two members of the patient participation group (PPG). They told us they were extremely satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey, published in July 2017, showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was above average for satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example, of those who responded:

- 97% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and the national average of 89%.
- 93% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 86%.
- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 95%.
- 95% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 86%.
- 100% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 91%.
- 97% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 91% 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.

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 the same as or above local and national averages. For example, of those who responded:

- 89% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 86%.
- 88% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 82%.
- 99% say the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 90%.

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

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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 81 patients as carers (approx. 2% of the practice list). Patients were asked if they were carers or had a carer when they joined the practice. The practice had a care coordinator who acted as the carers' lead. They liaised with the local carers

Are services caring?

organisation. Other written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. There was a poster in the waiting area so that patients knew who they could contact for support.

The care coordinator also visited older patients in their own homes to offer them support, and to direct them to other services as required. They worked closely with other agencies to ensure that these patients were able to be cared for at home and avoid admissions to hospital.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, the 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.

- Extended opening hours were offered on Monday and Friday until 7.30pm.
- There were longer appointments available for patients who needed them, including those with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS, as well as some that were only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice had commissioned additional training for all their staff: blind awareness training to improve the care offered to patients with impaired vision; and "Prevent" training (to spot the signs of radicalisation).
- The surgery offered an International Normalised Ratio (INR) clinic for patients prescribed warfarin. (The INR is a blood test which needs to be performed regularly on patients who are taking warfarin to determine their required dose). This meant patients did not have to make a journey to hospital for this service.
- Patients could order repeat prescriptions and book GP appointments online.
- Other services were based at the practice site to offer services that would benefit their patients, such as counselling.
- In response to an increase in patient list size during the past 18 months the practice had employed a nurse practitioner to help meet demand.

Access to the service

The surgery was open from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday, with the exception of Wednesday when the practice closed at 4pm but a doctor remained on call until 6.30pm.

Extended hours were offered on Monday and Friday until 7.30pm. Telephones at the practice were answered from 8am until 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. Outside of these times a message on the telephone answering system redirected patients to out of hours or emergency services as appropriate.

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them. We checked the appointment system in real time on the afternoon of the inspection and saw that urgent appointments were available the following day. The appointment system was reviewed weekly to ensure the number of embargoed appointments was meeting demand.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey, published in July 2017, showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above the local CCG and national averages. Of those who responded:

- 90% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by telephone compared to the national average of 71%.
- 84% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 76%.
- 92% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 84%.

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had an effective system in place for handling complaints and concerns.

- Their 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, such as a summary leaflet.

We looked at the five complaints logged during 2016/17, and found that lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

to improve the quality of care. For example, the system for undertaking checks on prescriptions which came into the practice from other services was improved as a result of a complaint.

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. This had been developed with staff during a practice away day.
- The practice had a strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and these 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, as well as those of others.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. The practice was in the process of updating and streamlining their policies at the time of inspection.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. However, some risk assessments had recently passed their review date, and the practice was in the process of putting in place new systems to alert them when reviews were required.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection, the management 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.

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 and 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. However, they told us that the meetings for admin, reception and nursing teams had not been held as frequently as intended.
- 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. There had been a number of changes in staffing at the practice over the past 12 months, but staff told us that they had felt supported throughout this time and it had not affected staff morale. Patients we spoke to also told us that they had not noticed any negative impact of these changes on the care received.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. They 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. Staff also told us they felt supported in their careers and were able to request training to support their roles.

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

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

- The practice had set up a patient participation group (PPG) to gather feedback from patients. They also carried out surveys and looked for feedback in the compliments and complaints received. The PPG received emails from the

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

practice but no regular meetings had yet been established. The practice and members of the PPG told us that it was the plan to meet more frequently in future and that this had been discussed with members of the group. Members of the PPG told us they felt able to give feedback to the practice and felt that they were listened to.

· The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff were given lead roles across the practice, and were actively encouraged to take ownership of how the practice was run. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve the practice.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and participated in local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example:

- We saw evidence that a training session had been booked for the autumn to strengthen the significant event reporting system further.
- The practice had commissioned additional training for all their staff: blind awareness training to improve the care offered to patients with impaired vision; and “Prevent” training (to spot the signs of radicalisation).
- The practice engaged well with other local agencies and partners. This included looking into shared recruitment to address the difficulties in recruiting staff in the area.