

The Surgery - Dr Mangwana and Partners

Quality Report

510 Fulham Palace Road,
Fulham,
London,
SW6 6JD
Tel: 020 7736 6305
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 18 July 2017
Date of publication: 17/08/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Requires improvement 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to The Surgery - Dr Mangwana and Partners	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13
Action we have told the provider to take	24

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Mangwana and Partners, The Surgery on 17 November 2015. The practice was rated as requires improvement for providing effective and responsive services and the overall rating for the practice was requires improvement. The full comprehensive report on the November 2015 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for The Surgery – Dr Mangwana and Partners on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

This inspection was an announced comprehensive follow up inspection on 18 July 2017 to check for improvements since our previous inspection. Overall the practice is now 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 a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems to minimise risks to patient safety. However, there was no effective system in place to monitor patients on high risk medicines.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients we spoke with said they could make an appointment with a named GP in a reasonable timeframe and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had adequate facilities and was equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.

Summary of findings

- There was a leadership structure although not all staff were clear on who to report to with specific concerns. Staff felt supported by management however some staff said they would like more opportunities for career progression.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. Examples we reviewed showed the practice complied with these requirements.

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- Ensure the proper and safe management of higher risk medicines

In addition, the provider should:

- Implement a register of vulnerable children to manage and review risk

- Provide more support for staff to develop their roles within the practice
- Continue to identify and support patients who are carers
- Clarify the governance structure with clear lines of responsibility
- Consider ways to improve child immunisation uptake rates
- Develop a comprehensive program of quality improvement including clinical audit
- Formalise the strategy to deliver the practice vision

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as requires improvement for providing safe services.

- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices to minimise risks to patient safety. However we identified shortfalls in respect of the monitoring of patients on high risk medicines.
- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed, we found there was an effective system 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 were informed as soon as practicable, 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.
- Staff demonstrated that they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- The practice had adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national average.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge 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.
- End of life care was coordinated with other services involved.

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.

Good



Summary of findings

- Survey information we reviewed showed that 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 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.

- The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting conditions, including patients with a condition other than cancer and patients living with dementia.
- Patients we spoke with said they could get an appointment with a named GP in a reasonable timeframe and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had adequate facilities and was equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and evidence from three examples reviewed showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. However, there was no formal strategy to deliver it.
- There was a staffing structure, staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities and the GPs had lead roles in key areas. However, some staff we interviewed were unclear on who to report to with specific concerns.
- An overarching governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received inductions, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. In three examples we reviewed we saw evidence the practice complied with these requirements.

Good



Summary of findings

- The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents and sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on. The practice engaged with the patient participation group.

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.

- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs.
- Older patients were provided with health promotional advice and support to help them to maintain their health and independence for as long as possible.
- The practice worked collaboratively with other healthcare professionals in providing care and services to older people.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff supported the GPs in long-term disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading was 140/80 mmHg or less was 87% compared to the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 78%.
- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- There were emergency processes for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.
- All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for 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



Summary of findings

Families, children and young people

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

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found there were systems 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 accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Immunisation rates were below average for all standard childhood immunisations. The practice were aware of this and were looking at ways to improve performance.
- Patients told us, on the day of inspection, that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- The practice provided support for premature babies and their families following discharge from hospital.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice offered family planning, contraception and maternity advice services.
- The practice had emergency processes for acutely ill children and young people and for acute pregnancy complications.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of these populations had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care, for example, extended opening hours until 8pm.
- 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.

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. However, there was no register of vulnerable children.
- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice had information available for vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed knew how to recognise signs of abuse in children, young people and adults whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. They were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and dementia.
- 89% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had their alcohol consumption recorded in the preceding 12 months, which was comparable to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 89%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.
- The practice had a system to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 6 July 2017. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and eighty four survey forms were distributed and 97 were returned. This represented 1.8% of the practice's patient list.

- 82% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 85%.
- 69% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.

- 73% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 76% and 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 29 comment cards, 26 of which were positive about the standard of care received. Three comment cards highlighted issues with waiting times to see a GP.

We spoke with four patients during the inspection. All four patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. However, all four patients did express dissatisfaction with getting through to the practice by phone.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

- Ensure the proper and safe management of higher risk medicines

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Implement a register of vulnerable children to manage and review risk
- Provide more support for staff to develop their roles within the practice

- Continue to identify and support patients who are carers
- Clarify the governance structure with clear lines of responsibility
- Consider ways to improve child immunisation uptake rates
- Develop a comprehensive program of quality improvement including clinical audit
- Formalise the strategy to deliver the practice vision

The Surgery - Dr Mangwana and Partners

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to The Surgery - Dr Mangwana and Partners

Dr Mangwana and Partners, The Surgery provides GP primary medical services to approximately 5,500 patients living in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract (GMS is one of the three contracting routes that have been available to enable the commissioning of primary medical services).

The practice is situated in a fairly affluent part of the borough with a high percentage of working age people and it is situated within walking distance of Charing Cross hospital. The practice is a member of a network of 11 practices which has a combined population of approximately 50,000 patients.

The practice team consists of a male GP partner and a female GP partner providing five clinical sessions each. The partners are supported by locum GPs (12 sessions), practice nurse (12 hours), healthcare assistant (24 hours), practice manager (23 hours) and a small team of administrators / receptionists.

The practice opening hours are between 8am and 8pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday and between 8am and 1pm on Thursdays. Appointments are from 8.30am to 1pm daily and from 4.30pm to 8pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday. The practice is open throughout the opening hours however phone lines are closed between 1pm and 3pm. For out of hours care patients are directed to the local out of hours provider.

The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of maternity and midwifery services, diagnostic and screening procedures and treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

The practice provides a range of services including maternity care, childhood and travel immunisations, chronic disease management, 24 hour blood pressure monitoring, spirometry, phlebotomy and wound care.

Why we carried out this inspection

We undertook a comprehensive inspection of Dr Mangwana and Partners, The Surgery on 17 November 2015 under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The practice was rated as requires improvement for providing effective and responsive services and was therefore rated as requires improvement overall. We issued three requirement notices to the provider in respect of good governance, receiving and acting on complaints and staffing. The provider sent us an action plan which stated they would be compliant by 31 August 2016.

Detailed findings

We undertook an announced comprehensive follow up inspection of Dr Mangwana and Partners, The Surgery on 18 July 2017. This inspection was carried out to check for improvements since our previous inspection.

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 18 July 2017. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including two GP partners, healthcare assistant, practice manager and three non-clinical staff and spoke with four patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed a 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.
- Visited all practice locations.
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver care and treatment plans.

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 living 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

At our previous inspection on 17 November 2015, we rated the practice as good for providing safe services.

When we undertook a comprehensive follow up inspection on 18 July 2017 the arrangements for monitoring patients on high risk medicines was not adequate. The practice is now rated as requires improvement for providing safe services.

Safe track record and learning

There was a system 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).
- From the sample of seven documented examples we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed. The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, a patient seen for a routine consultation noticed that there was inaccurate information on their medical notes. The practice took action to update the information. The incident was discussed and learning shared and the patient received an apology.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to minimise risks to patient safety.

- Arrangements for safeguarding 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. Although safeguarding arrangements were adequate staff were confused who the lead was. In addition, there was no register of vulnerable children to manage and review risk.
- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three, other clinical staff level two and non-clinical staff level one.
- 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. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- A GP partner was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC 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 generally minimised risks to patient safety (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal).

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions. Repeat prescriptions were signed before being dispensed to patients and there was a reliable process

Are services safe?

to ensure this occurred. However we identified shortfalls in the monitoring of patients on high risk medicines. We reviewed three patients on methotrexate (a drug used to treat inflammatory

arthritis, certain types of cancer and other diseases) and found that the GPs had not checked that they had received a blood test before issuing a repeat prescription.

- The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group 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 to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The healthcare assistant was trained to administer vaccines and medicines and patient specific prescriptions or directions from a prescriber were produced appropriately.

We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, evidence of satisfactory conduct in previous employments in the form of references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the DBS.

Monitoring risks to patients

There were procedures for assessing, monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety.

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.

- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments 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).
- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system to ensure enough staff were on duty to meet the needs of patients.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had adequate arrangements 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 oxygen available on the premises with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available. The practice did not have a defibrillator available on the premises however a risk assessment was in place to mitigate risk. At the inspection we were told that a decision had been made to purchase defibrillator and we were shown evidence that one had been ordered from a supplier.
- 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 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

At our previous inspection on 17 November 2015, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing effective services as the arrangements in respect of staff training and clinical audits needed improving.

These arrangements had significantly improved when we undertook a comprehensive follow up inspection on 18 July 2017. The provider is now rated as good for providing effective services.

Effective needs assessment

Clinicians were aware of relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- The practice had systems to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 95% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and national average of 95%. Clinical exception reporting was 9% which was below the CCG average of 12% and the national average of 10% (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).

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading was 140/80

mmHg or less was 87% compared to the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 78%. Exception reporting was 10% compared to the CCG average of 12% and the national average of 9%.

- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care plan has been reviewed in a face to face review in the preceding 12 months was 88% compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average 84%. Exception reporting was 0% compared to the CCG average of 7% and the national average of 7%.

There was some evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- There had been three clinical audits commenced in the last year, one of these was a completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. The audit was carried out to improve bowel cancer screening uptake. The initial audit identified 42% of patients invited for bowel screening in quarter one of 2016 were non-responders. To improve uptake following the initial audit promotional posters were displayed in the practice, promotional material in different languages was also made available. A second cycle of the audit showed that 24% of patients invited for bowel screening in quarter two of 2016 were non-responders, an improvement of 18% on the initial audit. After the second cycle further actions were implemented and a third cycle was proposed in 6-8 months time.

Effective staffing

Evidence reviewed showed that staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months. However, some staff we spoke to said they had discussed continual professional development they would like to do for career progression during appraisals, but this had not been provided by the practice.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- From the sample we reviewed we found that 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. Information was shared between services, with patients' consent, using a shared care record. Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

The practice ensured that end of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of different patients, including those who may be vulnerable because of their circumstances.

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 GPs assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- All staff had completed a training module on the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support and signposted them to relevant services. 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.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme for 2015/16 was 67%, which was below the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 81%. However, unpublished data for 2016/17 showed an improvement to 77%. There was a policy to offer telephone or written 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. There was also a poster in the patient waiting area encouraging patients to attend. There were failsafe systems 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.

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer. Uptake rates from 2015/16 were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example:

- Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in the last 36 months was 67% compared to the CCG average of 60% and the national average of 73%.

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

- Persons, 60-69, screened for bowel cancer within six months of invitation was 46% compared to the CCG average of 40% and the national average of 56%.

Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates were below average. For example data from 2015/16 for the vaccines given to under two year olds averaged 75%

compared to the national standard of 90%. Uptake rates for five year olds ranged from 54% to 85% (CCG; 65% to 86%, national 88% to 94%). The practice were aware of the poor performance and were considering ways to improve.

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

At our previous inspection on 17 November 2015, we rated the practice as good for providing caring services.

When we undertook a comprehensive follow up inspection on 18 July 2017 we found the practice was providing caring services and therefore remains good for providing caring services.

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

During our inspection we observed that 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.
- Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.
- Patients could be treated by a clinician of the same sex.

Twenty six of the 29 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. Three comment cards highlighted issues with waiting times to see a GP.

We spoke with five patients including one member of the patient participation group (PPG). They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comments highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was in line with others or above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 90% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 85% and the national average of 89%.
- 87% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 81% 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 94% and the national average of 95%
- 86% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 86%.
- 88% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 91%.
- 89% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 92%.
- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 97%.
- 87% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 91%.
- 90% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback from the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views. We also saw that care plans were personalised.

Children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and recognised as individuals.

Are services caring?

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 82% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 86%.
- 79% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 82%.
- 89% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 90%.
- 83% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital.

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. Support for isolated or house-bound patients included signposting to relevant support and volunteer services.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 47 patients as carers (0.8% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. For example, posters were displayed in the waiting area requesting patients to inform the practice if they were a carer. Support offered to carers included, double appointments, priority appointments within 24 hours, winter flu jabs, information for professional support and advice and carers network contact information.

Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 17 November 2015, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing responsive services as the arrangements in respect of receiving and acting on complaints needed improving.

These arrangements had significantly improved when we undertook a comprehensive follow up inspection on 18 July 2017. The provider is now rated as good for providing responsive services.

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population:

- The practice offered extended hours on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday from 6.30pm to 8pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability, carers, patients whose first language was not English and those with complex needs.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Telephone consultations were available and online services including appointment booking and repeat prescription requests.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions. There were early and ongoing conversations with these patients about their end of life care as part of their wider treatment and care planning.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice sent text message reminders of appointments and test results.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were accessible facilities, which included a hearing loop, and interpretation services available.

- The practice offered a remote booking service where patients could book appointments for the same evening at two other local practices.

Access to the service

The practice opening hours were between 8am and 8pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday and between 8am and 1pm on Thursdays. Appointments were from 8.30am to 1pm daily and from 4.30pm to 8pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday. The practice was open throughout the opening hours however phone lines were closed between 1pm and 3pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was comparable to local and national averages.

- 75% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 77% and the national average of 76%.
- 87% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 71%.
- 82% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 84%.
- 73% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 81%.
- 69% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.
- 46% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 53% and the national average of 58%.

Patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them. Although a few patients commented that the waiting time to see a preferred GP and the waiting time after their

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

appointment time was often long. All four patients we spoke to expressed dissatisfaction with getting through to the practice on the phone. The practice were aware of this and they were looking into ways to improve it.

The practice had a system to assess:

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

In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system for handling complaints and concerns.

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.

- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system including a leaflet available in the patient waiting area.

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found they were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way and with openness and transparency. Lessons were learned from individual concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a complaint was received from a patient regarding lack of appropriate care and treatment of their condition by the practice, a local specialist GP and the hospital. A detailed response was sent to the patient highlighting that there was no negligence in treatment. The practice accepted that the referral to the specialist could have been initiated sooner and there should have been better communication between the practice and other healthcare professionals. The patient received a written apology and learning was shared amongst staff.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 17 November 2015, we rated the practice as good for providing well-led services.

When we undertook a comprehensive follow up inspection on 18 July 2017 we found the practice was providing well-led services and therefore remains good for providing well-led services.

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

- The practice had a clear strategy which reflected the vision and values however it had not been formalised and there were no supporting business plans to deliver it.

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 and ensured that:

- There was a staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs had lead roles in key areas. For example, the male GP partner led on infection control and safeguarding children. However, not all staff we interviewed were clear on lines of accountability within the practice.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. These were updated and reviewed regularly.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained. Practice meetings were held quarterly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.
- Clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements although a comprehensive program of quality improvement was not in place.

- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. However, we did identify issues with respect to the monitoring of patients on high risk medicines.
- We saw evidence from minutes of a meetings structure that allowed for lessons to be learned and shared following significant events and complaints.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).

The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. From the sample of three documented examples we reviewed we found that the practice had systems 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 written correspondence.

There was a clear leadership structure 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. Minutes were comprehensive and were available for practice staff to view.
- 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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice. However, some staff we spoke to said they would like more opportunities for career progression which had been identified in their personal development plans but not actioned.

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

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients and staff. It proactively sought feedback from:

- patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and a suggestions box in the patient waiting area. The PPG had recently started to meet regularly, and

submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the practice had purchased additional seating with arm rests for the patient waiting area.

- the NHS Friends and Family test, complaints and compliments received
- 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.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

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

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Maternity and midwifery services Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment Care and treatment must be provided in a safe way for service users How the regulation was not being met: The registered persons had not done all that was reasonably practicable to ensure proper and safe management of medicines. In particular: The management of patients on high risk medicines, including methotrexate. Regulation 12(1)