

Weoley Park Surgery

Quality Report

112 Weoley Park Road

Birmingham B29 5HA

Tel: 0121 4721965

Website: <http://www.weoleyparksurgery.co.uk/>

Date of inspection visit: 6 September 2016

Date of publication: 20/10/2016

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	7
What people who use the service say	10
Areas for improvement	10
Outstanding practice	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Weoley Park Surgery	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Weoley Park Surgery on 6 September 2016. Overall the practice is rated as Good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had appropriate 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 had an active patient participation group which influenced practice development.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.
- The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area.

Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

We saw one area of outstanding practice:

- There was a highly active, motivated and engaged patient participation group (PPG) in place which met regularly every six to eight weeks. The PPG had repeatedly engaged with patients which included carrying out detailed and comprehensive surveys. There were many examples of where the PPG had engaged with the practice and contributed to positive improvements within the previous 12 months, including helping to design the practice premises from a patient perspective, designing and

maintaining the practice website with the aim of making it easier to use and navigate for patients, and working with the practice to set up an on-site programme of regular sessions run by external organisations to support patients.

However, there was an area of practice where the provider should make improvements:

- The practice should take steps to increase the number of health checks carried out for patients registered as having a learning disability.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)
Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Good



- There was a comprehensive safety system in place with a focus on openness, transparency and learning if things went wrong.
- All staff were aware of their responsibilities and committed to reporting incidents. There were dedicated incident recording forms and an incidents and alerts log. We saw evidence that incidents had been consistently recorded, reported and reviewed.
- The practice identified and used opportunities to learn from incidents to support continuous improvement. We saw evidence that incidents and learning points were documented and discussed with staff during weekly meetings which contributed to staff awareness.
- The practice carried out analysis of significant events and these had been discussed outside of the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, clear information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were in line with or above regional and national averages. The most recent published results showed that the practice achieved 98% of the total number of points available.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.

Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs

Summary of findings

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the National GP Patient Survey published during July 2016 showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care. For example 92% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%. 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared with the CCG and national averages of 95%.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.

We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example the practice had introduced 'sit and wait' clinics to provide greater access for patients
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had appropriate facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision with quality and safety as its top priority. The strategy to deliver this vision had been produced with stakeholders and was regularly reviewed and discussed with staff.
- High standards were promoted and owned by all practice staff and teams worked together across all roles.

Good



Summary of findings

- Governance and performance management arrangements had been proactively reviewed and took account of current models of best practice.
- There was a high level of constructive engagement with staff and a high level of staff satisfaction.
- The practice had an engaged and active patient participation group which influenced practice development. For example, contributing to the design and specification of the premises, and carrying out patient surveys resulting in improvements.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.
- The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice directed older people to appropriate support services.
- All patients aged 75 and over were offered an annual health check.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and national averages. For example 95% of patients with diabetes on the register received influenza immunisation in the last 12 months compared with CCG and national averages of 94%. The practice's exception reporting rate for this indicator was 15% compared with the CCG average of 17% and the national average of 18%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency attendances. Immunisation rates were 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. We saw evidence to confirm this.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice provided combined parent and baby clinics carrying out post-natal and early child development checks.
- We saw positive examples of engagement and joint working with midwives and health visitors.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflected the needs for this age group.
- Appointments were offered to accommodate those unable to attend during normal working hours.
- Performance for cervical indicators was broadly in line CCG and national averages. For example the percentage of women aged 25-64 receiving a cervical screening test in the last five years was 75% compared with CCG and national averages of 80% and 82% respectively.

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 homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice had 32 patients registered as having a learning disability and had completed health checks for 18 of these patients in the last 12 months.

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 informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 71 patients as carers (1.5% of the practice list).

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- Performance for mental health related indicators was higher than CCG and national averages. For example the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the last 12 months was 100% compared with CCG and national averages of 91% and 88% respectively. The practice's exception reporting rate for this indicator was 3% compared with the CCG average of 8% and the national average of 13%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The National GP Patient Survey results were published during July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 313 survey forms were distributed and 108 were returned. This represented a 35% response rate and 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 75% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by telephone compared with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 70% and the national average of 73%.
- 95% of patients said the last appointment they got was convenient compared with the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 92%.
- 85% 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%.

- 74% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared with the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We reviewed 28 comment cards and almost all of these were fully positive about the standard of care received. Patients said they felt the practice offered a high quality service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. There were a small number (five) of negative comments relating to the difficulty in getting appointments.

We spoke with 11 patients during the inspection. All 11 patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

However, there was an area of practice where the provider should make improvements:

- The practice should take steps to increase the number of health checks carried out for patients registered as having a learning disability.

Outstanding practice

We saw one area of outstanding practice:

- There was a highly active, motivated and engaged patient participation group (PPG) in place which met regularly every six to eight weeks. The PPG had repeatedly engaged with patients which included carrying out detailed and comprehensive surveys. There were many examples of where the PPG had engaged with the practice and contributed to

positive improvements within the previous 12 months, including helping to design the practice premises from a patient perspective, designing and maintaining the practice website with the aim of making it easier to use and navigate for patients, and working with the practice to set up an on-site programme of regular sessions run by external organisations to support patients.

Weoley Park Surgery

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, a practice manager specialist adviser and an expert by experience. (Experts by experience are members of the inspection team who have received care and experienced treatments from a similar service.)

Background to Weoley Park Surgery

Weoley Park Surgery is a purpose-built premises situated in Selly Oak, Birmingham and serves patients within the Weoley Castle residential suburban district in south-west Birmingham. The practice is part of the Birmingham South and Central CCG. The practice is well served by the local bus network and there is accessible parking. The practice and facilities are fully accessible to wheelchair users.

The practice provides primary medical services to approximately 4880 patients in the local community. The practice population is approximately 70% White British with the majority of the remaining patients being Asian/Asian British.

The clinical staff team consists of two male and one female GP partners, a nurse prescriber, a healthcare assistant and a GP trainee. (A GP trainee is a qualified doctor undergoing a period of further training in order to become a GP.)

The clinical team is supported by a practice manager, a practice administrator and a team of five administrative and reception staff.

The practice is open from 8am to 6.30pm on weekdays except for Wednesdays when it is open from 8am to 1pm only. Practice telephone lines are also open at these times.

GP surgery appointment hours are 9am to 12pm and 4pm to 6pm on weekdays (9am to 12pm only on Wednesdays). The nurse's clinic takes place on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays from 8.30am to 5pm, and on Fridays from 8.30am to 1pm. The health care assistant is available from 8am to 2pm on weekdays. There is a midwife's clinic from 1.30pm to 3pm on Thursdays.

When the practice is closed services are provided by South Doc Services, a GP co-operative based in Birmingham. Patients are directed to this service by a fully automated telephone system. The walk-in centre provides urgent care services between 8am and 8pm every day. The practice also pays extra for home visits.

Further out of hours services are provided by the Primecare Birmingham Cross City 111 service.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before inspecting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. These organisations included NHS England and the Birmingham South and Central CCG Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). We carried out an announced inspection on 6 September 2016. During our inspection we:

- Spoke with a range of managerial, clinical and non-clinical staff and spoke with patients who used the service;
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members;
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients, and;
- Reviewed a total of 28 comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

- Is it safe?

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

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

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions
- Families, children and young people
- Working age people (including those recently retired and students)
- People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable
- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia).

Please note that when referring to information throughout this report, for example any reference to the Quality and Outcomes Framework data, this relates to the most recent information available to the CQC at that time.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was a strong comprehensive safety system in place with a focus on openness, transparency and learning if things went wrong. There was a well-established process for reporting and recording significant events.

- All staff were aware of their responsibilities and committed to reporting actual incidents, potential incidents and near misses. There were dedicated incident recording forms and an incidents and alerts log. We saw evidence that incidents had been consistently recorded, reported and reviewed. 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).
- The practice identified and used opportunities to learn from incidents to support continuous improvement. We saw evidence that incidents and learning points were documented and discussed with staff during weekly meetings. Two administrative staff gave examples of how discussing safeguarding concerns at staff meetings contributed to their understanding and awareness of safeguarding issues.
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, clear information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of significant events and had a dedicated form for logging circumstances, learning points and actions. We saw evidence that significant events had been discussed outside of the practice, for example with the district nurse and other practices locally.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, MHRA alerts (Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Alerts), patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these

were discussed. The practice had a dedicated medical safety alerts process in place which described associated risks, mitigations and actions. We saw evidence that alerts were acted upon and actions were documented.

We saw evidence that lessons learnt were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, information about vaccine safety for children was documented in detail, shared with practice staff and identified as an area to communicate to GP trainees to support learning and improvement.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. The practice had specific child and adult safeguarding policies which were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings and provided reports for other agencies where necessary. The practice had processes in place for maintaining a register of children at risk.
- Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three. We saw evidence that safeguarding was discussed during practice meetings.
- Notices in the waiting room and consultation rooms 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)
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There were medical, clinical and administrative leads for infection control who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to

Are services safe?

date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Infection control was included in all staff induction programmes.

- The practice had a detailed infection control audit tool in place which included actions to address non-compliance and allocated leads. This reviewed for example the building environment, sharps handling and disposal, protective equipment and waste management. We saw that audits were undertaken annually and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- There were comprehensive arrangements in place for managing medicines, which included emergency medicines and vaccines. This included obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal. Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines.
- The practice carried out regular medicines audits to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions, receiving mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All

electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly and there were comprehensive, detailed records of this. Records showed that all equipment had been tested during the last 12 months. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty. Staff were able to cover each other's roles.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in the reception area and all consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available. There were detailed processes in place for reviewing equipment safety and comprehensive logs showing that this had been carried out regularly.
- 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. There was a stringent process in place to monitor emergency medicines and the drugs in the GPs' bags.

Are services safe?

- 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. Copies of the plan were kept off-site.

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

The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. We observed that staff could access current NICE guidelines by using the practice intranet. Staff told us and we saw evidence that guidance and standards were discussed at weekly clinical meetings. Staff used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.

The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 98% of the total number of points available. This is higher than the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and national averages of 97% and 95% respectively.

QOF exception reporting relates to patients on a specific clinical register who can be excluded from individual QOF indicators. For example, if a patient is unsuitable for treatment, is newly registered with the practice or is newly diagnosed with a condition.

- The practice's clinical exception rate was 6% compared with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and national averages of 9%.
- The practice's public health exception rate was 4% compared with the CCG average of 11% and the national average of 6%.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or any other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014-15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. For example 95% of patients with diabetes on the register received influenza immunisation in the last 12 months compared with CCG and national averages of 94%. The practice's exception reporting rate for this indicator was 15% compared with the CCG average of 17% and the national average of 18%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was higher than CCG and national averages. For example the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the last 12 months was 100% compared with CCG and national averages of 91% and 88% respectively. The practice's exception reporting rate for this indicator was 3% compared with the CCG average of 8% and the national average of 13%.
- Performance for hypertension related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with hypertension (high blood pressure), whose last measured blood pressure was under the recommended level, was 79% compared with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 84%. The practice's exception reporting rate for this indicator was 1% compared with the CCG average of 3% and the national average of 4%.
- Performance for asthma related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. For example the percentage of patients with asthma, on the register, who had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months was 78% compared with CCG and national averages of 76% and 75% respectively. The practice's exception reporting rate for this indicator was 2% compared with the CCG average of 3% and the national average of 8%.

QOF performance was closely monitored at all times. Where QOF targets were not met individual cases were reviewed by a clinician and discussed with other members of the clinical team. The practice had a documented approach to exception reporting which was followed consistently.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice had carried out three clinical audits in the last two years.
- One of these was a completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. This focussed on minor surgery and associated safety and service protocols, and resulted in an increase in referral accuracy.

Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, an audit into the use of oral nutrition supplements resulted in a reduction in unnecessary prescribing and improvements in the quality of patient clinical records.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, clinical staff could evidence a range of specialist training such as shingles and mental health.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received a documented appraisal within the last 12 months.
- All staff had received training that included safeguarding, fire safety awareness, and basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training as well as external training events, seminars and conferences.

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 and medical records which were up to date and investigation and test results which were dealt with daily by the doctors requesting the tests or through a buddy system if they were not available.
- 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. There was a well-established coding and information handling system.

Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a regular basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs. For example clinical staff held multidisciplinary team meetings every two months with case managers and district nurses.

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support. This included patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition, and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking or alcohol intake. Patients were signposted to relevant services locally where required.
- A range of advice including diabetes care and management, prostate health, asthma management and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) was available from practice staff and from local support groups.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 75%, which was slightly lower than the CCG average of 80% and 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 ensured a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

The practice had rates of breast and bowel cancer screening that were in line with the CCG and slightly lower than national averages. For example, 66% of females aged

50 to 70 were screened for breast cancer in the last 36 months compared with CCG and national averages of 65% and 72% respectively. 45% of people aged 60 to 69 were screened for bowel cancer in the last 30 months compared with CCG and national averages of 46% and 58% respectively.

The practice was aware of their screening rates and staff told us they used appointments to inform patients of the importance of attending screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were slightly higher than CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 91% to 96% and for five year olds from 88% to 98%. The CCG averages ranged from 79% to 96% for under two year olds and from 84% to 95% for five year olds.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients, and NHS health checks for patients aged from 40 to 74. All patients aged 75 and over were offered an annual health check. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consulting 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. Staff told us that there were rooms available for this.

Almost all of the 28 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were fully positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and all staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. There were a small number of negative comments (five) relating to the difficulty in getting appointments.

We spoke with two representatives of the patient participation group (PPG). The PPG is a group of patients registered with a practice who work with the practice to improve services and the quality of care. They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 94% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 89% and the national average of 91%.

- 92% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.
- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared with the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt consulted about and 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.

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

- 88% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 86%.
- 93% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 90%.

The practice provided facilities to help patients be involved in decisions about their care. Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.

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 local support groups was available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 71 patients as carers (1.5% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support

Are services caring?

available to them. Patients who were carers told us that they were signposted to local support services. The practice was working with the PPG to explore further support for carers.

The practice had recently worked with the PPG to set up an on-site programme of regular sessions run by external organisations to support patients, including those who are isolated or vulnerable. This included sessions on preventing falls and Alzheimer's disease. None of these sessions had yet taken place.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them directly and a member of the practice team would send a sympathy card. This was followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and by signposting to an appropriate support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.

- The health care assistant held early morning appointments on weekdays starting at 8am for patients on their way to work.
- There were double appointments available for any patients needing them, or triple appointments for those with complex needs.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for those patients with medical problems that required same day consultation.
- The practice provided combined parent and baby clinics carrying out post-natal and early child development checks.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS.
- There was a hearing loop and translation services available, and staff could demonstrate awareness of the difficulties and issues faced by patients with hearing impairments.
- The practice and all facilities were fully accessible for wheelchair users and there were automatic doors, a wheelchair friendly reception desk, disabled toilets and a lift in place.
- There was adequate onsite parking with designated disabled parking spaces.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8am to 6.30pm on weekdays except for Wednesdays when it was open from 8am to 1pm only. Practice telephone lines were also open at these times.

GP surgery appointment hours were 9am to 12pm and 4pm to 6pm on weekdays (9am to 12pm only on Wednesdays). The nurse's clinic took place on Mondays, Tuesdays and

Thursdays from 8.30am to 5pm, and on Fridays from 8.30am to 1pm. The health care assistant was available from 8am to 2pm on weekdays. There was a midwife's clinic from 1.30pm to 3pm on Thursdays.

When the practice was closed services were provided by South Doc Services, a GP co-operative based in Birmingham. Patients are directed to this service by a fully automated telephone system. The walk-in centre provided urgent care services between 8am and 8pm every day. Further out of hours services were provided by the Primecare Birmingham Cross City 111 service.

Pre-bookable appointments could be booked up to eight weeks in advance, and we saw that urgent appointments were available for people that needed them.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published during July 2016 showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was in line with local and national averages.

- 70% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 76%.
- 75% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by telephone compared with the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.

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

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. Reception staff would take details to pass to a GP, who would consider and evaluate the information before telephoning the patient to discuss their needs and gather further information. Staff told us that this would allow for an informed decision to be made on prioritisation according to clinical need.

We saw that alternative emergency care arrangements were made 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. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

There was an active review of complaints and comments and these were managed and responded to. We saw that the practice had an effective system in place for handling complaints and concerns.

- The practice complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person (the practice manager) who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system including information in reception and on the practice website.
- A dedicated complaints and comments form was available to patients in the reception area.

We looked at the two complaints which had been received in the last 12 months and found that each of these were handled in a satisfactory and timely way. Complainants were responded to in each case and apologies had been given where appropriate.

Patients told us that they knew how to make complaints if they wished to.

There was an active Patient Participation Group (PPG) in place who worked with the practice to identify and respond to concerns.

We saw evidence that lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, the practice had made changes to appointments by introducing 'sit and wait' clinics to provide greater access for patients.

The practice was going through the process to recruit a clinical pharmacist to improve access and to increase appointments.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision and values, driven by quality and safety which reflected compassion, dignity, respect and equality. There was a clear and realistic strategy that had been developed with regular engagement of patients who used the service and the staff team.

- The practice had values which were to provide the highest quality, personalised care; to engage with patients and the community to improve care; and to support and encourage staff development. We found evidence that staff knew, understood and were supportive of these values. They regularly discussed ways to implement and maintain those values and each member of staff we spoke to said that they followed the examples of the GPs and practice manager.
- The practice had a well-implemented strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values, and these were regularly monitored.
- We saw that the GPs and practice manager were aware of future challenges which included recruitment, increasing access demands, the evolving national context and increasing costs. They had identified issues and had plans in place to continue delivering high quality care. For example one of the GP partners was due to retire and we found evidence of effective succession planning through ongoing recruitment and selection processes.

Governance arrangements

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

- The GPs and practice manager promoted the values and ethos of the practice to motivate them to succeed.
- There was a clear staffing structure and staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. Staff worked closely together and were able to support each other in their roles which included covering for each other when necessary.

- All 15 clinical domains (for example asthma, hypertension, diabetes and learning disabilities) were allocated both a clinical and administrative lead. Lead roles and specialist areas were shared amongst the staff team and we saw evidence that appropriate training and guidance was provided. We saw evidence that this helped administrative staff to provide effective support to clinicians across the clinical domains.
- Practice specific policies and procedures were implemented and were easily accessible to all staff in electronic form. Staff demonstrated they were aware of their content and where to access them. Policies and procedures were all recently reviewed by the practice manager and subject to version control, with subsequent review dates identified and documented.
- Governance and performance management arrangements were in place and were proactively reviewed.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained including discussion at meetings and the sharing of information with staff.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements. We saw evidence of changes to policies, procedures and working practices as a result of clinical and internal audit.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. The practice had systems for ensuring that oversight and monitoring of the full range of risk assessments and risk management was available in one place to promote consistency and effective governance.
- The practice had systems for ensuring that oversight and monitoring of all staff training and updates was in place and we saw that this was used effectively.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners and the practice manager demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us and were able to evidence they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care and we saw this during the inspection.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Staff told us the partners and the practice manager were approachable and always took the time to listen to, encourage and involve all members of staff. Staff received protected time for learning and were encouraged to complete training and attend courses which helped them improve services for patients such as mental capacity training, safeguarding, equality and diversity, and customer care.

We found that there were high levels of staff satisfaction. Staff told us they were proud of the organisation and spoke highly of the culture and support provided. There were consistently high levels of constructive staff engagement and all staff had at least one lead area of responsibility. Lead roles and specialist areas were shared amongst the staff team and we saw evidence that appropriate training and guidance was provided. We saw evidence that this helped administrative staff to provide effective support to clinicians across the clinical domains. Staff at all levels were actively encouraged to raise concerns and there was a zero blame culture with a focus on learning and improvement.

All of the staff we spoke to told us that patient satisfaction was important to the practice and this was demonstrated throughout.

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, clear 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 told us that they felt supported by management.

- Staff told us the practice held regular practice meetings. These took place once a week. Staff told us a wide range of issues were discussed including clinical matters, safeguarding, and learning and improvement. Two

administrative staff gave examples of how discussing safeguarding concerns at staff meetings contributed to their understanding and awareness of safeguarding issues.

- Staff told us there was an open, zero blame culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported by the partners in the practice and the practice manager. 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.
- Staff told us the partners arranged social events which helped with team building and effective communication.

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. Patients told us they felt consulted and engaged and that staff communication was excellent.

There was a highly active, motivated and engaged patient participation group (PPG) in place which met regularly every six to eight weeks. The PPG was a member of the National Association for Patient Participation (NAPP). (NAPP is a national, patient-led organisation working with PPGs to promote effective patient engagement and involvement.)

We saw that the PPG had repeatedly engaged with patients which included carrying out detailed and comprehensive surveys. There was a formalised agenda with standing items including reports from the PPG chair, PPG secretary and the practice manager. Minutes and action logs were produced following each meeting in a consistent format which included allocated leads for tasks and deadlines. PPG meetings were regularly attended by two members of practice staff including the practice manager.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

There were many examples of where the PPG had engaged with the practice and contributed to positive improvements within the previous 12 months. This included:

- Contributing to the design and specification of the practice premises from a patient perspective for example considering ease of access.
- Designing the practice information leaflet.
- Designing, implementing and reporting on a survey concerning patient access to the practice which led to the introduction of regular 'sit and wait' clinics. Patients told us they had noticed improvements in accessing appointments since this was introduced.
- Designing and maintaining the practice website with the aim of making it easier to use and navigate for patients.
- Working with the practice to set up an on-site programme of regular sessions run by external organisations to support patients, including those who are isolated. This included sessions on preventing falls and Alzheimer's disease.

We spoke with two PPG members who told us the practice was always open and honest, and worked constructively with them to help effectively deliver the best quality care.

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 in the best interests of the patients.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice.

The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example:

- The practice was a pilot for physician's associate training being delivered by the University of Birmingham.
- The practice GPs had worked with another practice locally to provide primary care services to local forensic psychiatry units.
- Two of the GPs were working with the CCG to produce a medicines management local improvement scheme (LIS) designed to reduce prescribing and prescriptions waste.

We saw that the practice had identified and discussed future challenges and was working towards addressing them. This included consideration of issues affecting Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) across Birmingham.