

St Andrews House Medical Centre

Quality Report

Stalybridge Resource Centre,
Stalybridge,
Tameside
SK15 2AU

Tel: **0161 3383181**

Website: www.standrewshousemedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 2nd June 2016

Date of publication: 07/07/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Good



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to St Andrews House Medical Centre	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at St Andrews House Medical Centre on 2 June 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns and to report incidents and near misses. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed, including those relating to recruitment checks.
- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered following best practice guidance. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and planned.
- Data showed patient outcomes were in line with or above those locally and nationally.
- Feedback from patients about their care was consistently and strongly positive.

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- The practice implemented suggestions for improvements and made changes to the way it delivered services as a result of feedback from patients.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure medical equipment is calibrated and an annual infection control audit is carried out.

Summary of findings

- Ensure children who do not attend for example hospital appointments are followed up in a timely manner.

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.

- There were system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and 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 people safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice worked closely with other organisations and with the local community in planning how services were provided to ensure that they meet people's needs.
- People could access appointments and services in a way and at a time that suited them. Telephone consultations were readily available and home visits, including the phlebotomy service, were provided to house bound patients.
- The practice implemented suggestions for improvements and made changes to the way it delivered services as a result of feedback from patients.
- 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. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

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

- There was a strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.

Good



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

Good



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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- A pharmacist was available to carry out medication reviews for patients over 75 and support patients with medication queries.
- The practice embraced the Gold Standards framework for end of life care. This included supporting patients' choice to receive end of life care at home.

People with long term conditions

Good



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.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- Where appropriate patients with more than one long-term condition were able to access a joint review to prevent them having to make multiple appointments.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met. For patients with complex needs, a named GP and practice nurse worked with relevant community and healthcare professionals to deliver multidisciplinary support and care. Multidisciplinary meetings were held to review patients' needs and to avoid hospital admissions.
- Patients with COPD and Asthma had self-management plans and access to medication at home for acute exacerbations and were directed to a structured education programme.

Families, children and young people

Good



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

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. We noted however children who had missed hospital appointments were not always followed up in a timely manner. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. Urgent on the day appointments were available for children.
- We saw good examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors. A midwife held antenatal clinics weekly.
- A contraceptive service including the fitting of contraceptive coils and implants was available for patients and offered to patients from other practices in the area. Urgent appointments were available for patients requesting emergency contraception.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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

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

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability. Vulnerable patients were identifiable with alerts noted on the secure computer system to ensure staff were alerted to needs.
- Annual reviews were provided for patients with learning disabilities, using a nationally recognised tool.

Summary of findings

- The practice was proactive in monitoring those patients identified as vulnerable or at risk. This included, monitoring A&E attendances, monitoring missed appointments from those known to be vulnerable and working with other services to ensure, where appropriate, information was shared to keep patients safe.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- It had told vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good



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

- 77% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months.
- 68% of patients with poor mental health had a comprehensive care plan documented in the record agreed between individuals, their family and/or carers as appropriate.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- It carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations. The practice promoted self-referral to the local “Healthy Minds” service.
- It had a system in place to follow up patients who may have been experiencing poor mental health and had attended accident and emergency.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support people with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in January 2016 showed the practice had mixed results compared to the local and national averages. There were 111 responses and a response rate of 30%, representing 2% of the practice population.

- 83% find it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared with a CCG average of 71% and a national average of 73%.
- 86% find the receptionists at this surgery helpful compared with a CCG average of 85% and a national average of 87%.
- 91% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with a CCG average of 82% and a national average of 85%.
- 79% describe their experience of making an appointment as good compared with a CCG average of 71% and a national average of 73%.
- 82% would recommend this surgery to someone new to the area compared with a CCG average of 73% and a national average of 78%

The practice invited patients to complete the NHS Friends and Family test (FFT) either when attending the surgery or online. The FFT gives every patient the opportunity to feed back on the quality of care they have received.

Results from the responses received between January and April 2016 showed 55% would be 'Extremely likely', 20% 'likely', 7% 'unlikely' and 5% 'Extremely unlikely' to recommend St Andrews House Medical Centre to Friends or family.

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 which were all positive about the standard of care received and included individual praise for clinical and non clinical staff. The 12 patients we spoke with were complimentary of the staff, care and treatment they received.

St Andrews House Medical Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Inspector. The team included a GP specialist advisor and an expert by experience. Experts by Experience are members of the public who have direct experience of using services.

Background to St Andrews House Medical Centre

St Andrews House Medical Centre provides primary medical services in Stalybridge, Tameside from Monday to Friday. The surgery is open:

Monday: 8.00am to 6.00pm

Tuesday: 8.00am to 8.00pm

Wednesday: 8.00am to 6.00pm

Thursday: 8.00am to 6.00pm

Friday: 8.00am to 6.00pm

Appointments with a GP are available:

Monday: 9.00am to 12.30pm and 2.30pm and 6.00pm

Tuesday: 8.00am to 1.00pm and 4.00pm to 6.00pm.
Additional evening appointments 6.30pm to 8.00pm.

Wednesday: 8.00am to 1.00pm and 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Thursday: 8.30am to 12.30pm and 2.00pm to 5.30pm

Friday: 9.00am to 12.30pm and 2.30pm to 5.30pm

Telephone consultations were also available during the day and at the end of surgery each day. The practice also participates in a local out of hours scheme in which patients are able to access GP appointments at a local hub evenings and weekends.

Stalybridge is situated within the geographical area of Tameside and Glossop Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

St Andrews House Medical Centre is responsible for providing care to 5544 patients.

The practice consists of three GP partners, one of whom was female, nurses and a health care assistant. The practice is supported by a practice manager, primary care quality improvement manager, receptionists and administrators.

When the practice is closed patients are directed to the out of hours service.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

We also looked at how well services are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks like for them. The population groups are:

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions
- Families, children and young people
- Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

- People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable
- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information about the practice. We asked the practice to give us information in advance of the site visit and asked other organisations to share their information about the service.

We carried out an announced visit on the 2 June 2016. We reviewed information provided on the day by the practice and observed how patients were being cared for.

We spoke with 12 patients, one of whom was a member of the patient participation group and eight members of staff, including GPs, practice manager, deputy manager, reception and administration staff.

We reviewed 21 Care Quality Commission comment cards where patients and members of the public had shared their views and experiences of the service.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was an open and transparent approach and a system in place for reporting and recording significant events and clinical events. People affected by significant events received a timely and sincere apology and were told about actions taken to improve care. Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was also a recording form available for consistency. The practice carried out an analysis of complaints and significant events on an annual basis to identify any patterns or trends.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. All significant events and incidents were written up and presented at clinical meetings, following which action plans were implemented.

Safety was monitored using information from a range of sources, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance, local CCG and NHS England. This enabled staff to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture of safety.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard adults and children from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a named GP lead for safeguarding adults and children. The leads attended local safeguarding meetings and attended where and when possible case conferences and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. The practice held monthly safeguarding meetings within the practice. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role.
- A notice was displayed in the waiting room, advising patients that a chaperone was available, if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a disclosure and barring check (DBS).

(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).

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available. The practice carried out regular fire risk assessments. All of the electrical equipment was checked to ensure it was safe to use, however clinical equipment was not routinely checked or calibrated to ensure it was working properly, we raised this with the practice and they took steps to address this.
- Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were followed. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. However since moving into the new premises two years ago an infection control audit had not been undertaken.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). Regular medication audits were carried out with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams to ensure the practice was prescribing in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored.
- Staff recruitment checks were carried out and the four files we reviewed showed recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the DBS.
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty to meet patients' needs.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency. All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available. The practice had a defibrillator available on the

Are services safe?

premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. There was also a first aid kit and accident book 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 fit for use.

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 discussion during clinical meetings.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice participated in the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF). (This is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The practice used the information collected for the QOF and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. Current results were 89.5% of the total number of points available, with 4.2% exception reporting. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets and were in line or above the national average in a number of clinical outcomes. Data from 2014/15 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators were below the CCG and national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 54% compared to 78% in the CCG and England. We noted during our inspection from data presented by the practice there was an improvement in year and we were told once the full time nurse was in post outcomes for patients would continue to improve.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was comparable to the CCG and national average.
- Performance for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) related indicators were above the CCG and national average.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been a range of clinical and non clinical audits completed in the last two years, all were either in the process or completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example improvements in their levels of antibiotic prescribing to be more in line with the England average of 5%.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed members of staff that covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality. We noted however this was not formally documented.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during clinical sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, facilitation and support for the revalidation of doctors and nurses.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring people to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of peoples' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place and were minuted. We noted these were routinely attended by district nurses, health visitors and Macmillan nurse.

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.
- Clinical staff had undertaken training in relation to the MCA 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 patients' mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear GPs would assess the patient's capacity and, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment.

Health promotion and prevention

Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice. These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition, patients with poor mental health and those requiring advice on their diet and smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice and where they required emotional and or psychological support the practice referred them to the Healthy Minds service.

The practice had a comprehensive screening programme. The practice uptake for the cervical screening programme was 79% which was in line with the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG averages. For example, NHS England figures showed in 2015, 87.5% of children aged 24 months had received the measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccination.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients, NHS health checks for people aged 40–74 and annual health checks for carers.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect. The observed the GPs had an excellent knowledge of their patients including their personal circumstances which may impact on their health and wellbeing.

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

All of the 21 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with one member of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were very satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. The 12 patients we spoke with highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required. The support from both clinical and administration staff was also highlighted with patients commenting staff went above and beyond to meet patient's needs.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were happy with how they were treated and that this was with compassion, dignity and respect.

The practice had scores on consultations with doctors and nurses comparable to national and CCG scores. For example:

- 89% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 89%.
- 88% said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 87%.

- 96% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94% and national average of 95%
- 90% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 85%.
- 93% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 91%.
- 99% of respondents had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw or spoke to compared to the CCG average of 98% and national average of 97%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients we spoke with and comment cards received, told us that health issues were discussed with them and 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.

Results from the national GP patient survey we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. These results were higher than local and national averages. For example:

- 90% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 83% and national average of 86%.
- 84% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 81% and national average of 82%

Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language and an extended appointment would be book if an interpreter was required.

The practice used care plans to understand and meet the emotional, social and physical needs of patients, including those at high risk of hospital admission.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

Are services caring?

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 0.3% of the practice list as carers. All clinicians had information to pass onto patients they identified as carers during consultations. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them where appropriate. This 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 worked with the local CCG to plan services and to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, attending locality meetings and working with other health and social care professionals, this included neighbourhood teams.

Services were planned and delivered to take into account the needs of different patient groups and to help provide and ensure flexibility, choice and continuity of care. For example;

- The practice offered extended hours one evening a week and participated in a local out of hours scheme in which patients were able to access GP appointments at a local hub evenings and weekends.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability or those who required them.
- Home visits were readily available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these, this included visits from GPs, nurses and phlebotomy.
- Anticoagulation clinics were provided which was also available via home visits for housebound anticoagulation patients.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- Patients who had two or more long term conditions such as asthma or diabetes were invited to attend one review to avoid them having to visit the practice multiple times for each condition.
- A phlebotomy service was available daily and via home visits for house bound patients.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations which were available on the NHS and patients were referred to other clinics for vaccines only available privately.
- A weekly Community Drugs Team clinic was provided in house for patients.

Access to the service

Appointments with a GP were available:

Monday: 9.00am to 12.30pm and 2.30pm and 6.00pm

Tuesday: 8.00am to 1.00pm and 4.00pm to 6.00pm.

Additional evening appointments 6.30pm to 8.00pm.

Wednesday: 8.00am to 1.00pm and 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Thursday: 8.30am to 12.30pm and 2.00pm to 5.30pm

Friday: 9.00am to 12.30pm and 2.30pm to 5.30pm

Telephone consultations were also available during the day and at the end of surgery each day.

The practice regularly monitored the demand on the service and the number of appointments available and the appointment system had evolved over the last few years in response to patient demand and feedback. If it was identified that pre bookable appointment availability was low GPs would add additional clinics to ensure patients did not have to wait for routine appointments.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was at or above compared to the local and national averages. For example the GP survey results showed:

- 78% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 72% and national average of 75%.
- 83% of patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 71% and national average of 73%.
- 85% of patients describe their overall experience of this surgery as good compared to the CCG average of 81% and national average of 85%.

The practice had a system in place to assess:

- whether a home visit was clinically necessary; and
- the urgency of the need for medical attention.

This was achieved by the GP on call or GP triage in which a GP would telephone the patient or carer in advance to gather information to allow an informed decision to be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system in place for handling complaints and concerns. Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England. There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.

We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint.

The practice kept a complaints log for written and verbal complaints. We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency.

Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

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 throughout the practice including consultation rooms. Staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- An 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.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners and managers were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with

patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment::

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so. GP business meetings were held fortnightly, clinical meetings monthly and administration meeting quarterly.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received.
- The 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 told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.
- The practice had carried out targeted evaluation and survey of services in addition to learning from feedback sought from the PPG, National GP survey and Friends and Family test.