

Dolphins Practice

Quality Report

Dolphins Practice
Nightingale Primary Care Centre
Butlers Green Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 4BN
Tel: 01444 414767
Website: www.dolphinspractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 10 August 2016
Date of publication: 13/10/2016

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Dolphins Practice	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dolphins Practice on 10 August 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. However, the use of blank computer prescription paper for use in printers was not tracked.
- 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 there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day. However, results from the national GP patient survey showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was lower than local and national average.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Track and record the use of blank computer prescriptions.

Summary of findings

- Look at ways of to improve patients' satisfaction with access to care and treatment to include phone access and opening hours.
- Keep exception reporting rates under review in areas where they are higher than the local and national average. (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).

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients who used services were assessed and the systems and processes to address these risks were implemented to ensure patients were kept safe. Although prescription pads were tracked and recorded, blank computer prescription paper for use in printers was not tracked in accordance with national guidelines.
- Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks had not been undertaken for administration staff who acted as chaperones. However the practice had undertaken a risk assessment in relation to this.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national average.
- 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.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



Summary of findings

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice in line with national and clinical commissioning group (CCG) averages for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We 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.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and clinical commissioning group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was lower than local and national averages.
- There was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- The practice offered information in braille on request.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.

Good



Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active and engaged well with the practice.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in 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 offered weekly visits, by a named GP, to the care homes in the locality.
- The practice offered longer appointments to patient over the age of 75.

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 better than or similar to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) and national averages. For example, patients with diabetes who had a blood pressure reading in the preceding 12 months of 140/80mmHg or less was 87% which was better than the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 78%.
- 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.

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.

Good



Summary of findings

- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 83%, which was in line with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 84% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- There was a nurse led teenage health clinic offering advice on sexual health and lifestyle.
- We saw positive examples of 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 reflects the needs for this age group.
- Patients who preferred not to attend the practice in person were able to consult with their GP by email.

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 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.

Good



Summary of findings

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 performance for the management of patients diagnosed with dementia was similar to local and national averages; 86% of these patients had received a face-to-face review within the preceding 12 months compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 84%.
- The practice performance for management of patients with poor mental health was similar to the local and national averages. For example, 95% of patients with severe and enduring mental health problems had a comprehensive care plan documented in their records within the last 12 months compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 88%.
- 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 in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing lower than local and national averages. Of the 263 survey forms which were distributed, 114 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 43% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 78% and the national average of 73%.
- 74% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 76%.
- 77% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 85%.

- 66% 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 83% and the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received ten comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients commented that they were confident in the care provided and treated respectfully.

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.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Track and record the use of blank prescription stationery.
- Look at ways of to improve patients' satisfaction with access to care and treatment to include phone access and opening hours.

- Keep exception reporting rates under review in areas where they are higher than the local and national average. (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).

Dolphins Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC lead inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Dolphins Practice

Dolphins Practice is situated in the town of Haywards Heath, West Sussex and operates from:

Dolphins Practice
Nightingale Primary Care Centre
Butlers Green Road
Haywards Heath West Sussex

RH16 4BN

The practice provides services for approximately 12,000 patients living within the Haywards Heath area. The practice holds a Primary Medical Services (PMS) contract with NHS England for the

provision of primary care services. (Personal Medical Services (PMS) agreements are locally agreed contracts between NHS England and a GP practice.) The practice has slightly higher numbers of people aged 65 and older compared to the national average. Deprivation amongst children and older people is very low when compared to the population nationally. The practice has more patients with long standing health conditions and health related problems affecting their daily lives than the national average, which could mean an increased demand for GP services.

As well as a team of five GP partners and four salaried GPs (six female and three male), the practice also has six

practice nurses, three health care assistants and a phlebotomist. A practice manager and an assistant practice manager are employed and there is a team of receptionists and administrative clerks. The practice also has on-site midwives and health visitors who run weekly clinics. There is also a massage therapist and an acupuncturist operating from the same site.

The practice is a training practice for GP trainees and foundation level two doctors.

Dolphins Practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm on weekdays and appointments are available from 8am to 6.30pm on weekdays. Extended hours appointments are available on Mondays, Tuesdays and Fridays from 7.30am to 8am and on Saturdays from 9am to 10.30am. (Saturday clinics are hosted, through a reciprocal arrangement, by another local GP practice on alternate weeks). There are phone appointments available with GPs throughout the day according to patient need. Routine appointments are bookable up to six weeks in advance. Patients are able to book appointments by phone, online or in person. The practice has a phone consultation system for patients with urgent healthcare needs.

Patients are provided with information on how to access the duty GP or the out of hour's service by calling the practice or by referring to its website.

The practice is registered to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures; treatment of disease, disorder and injury; maternity and midwifery services; family planning; and surgical procedures.

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

Detailed findings

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 10 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Visited the practice site.
- Spoke with a range of staff (the practice management team, GPs and nurses) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Reviewed questionnaires completed by administration staff.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, a patient's blood results that had been received on a Friday and appropriately marked as an alert for review by the GP as they were outside of normal range were not seen by the GP until the following Monday. The patient was being cared for by another healthcare provider so the appropriate action had been taken, however the practice recognised a need to ensure alerts were viewed immediately by placing them on the main page of the computer system. The change in protocol was cascaded to staff.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly

outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three, nurses were trained to level two and all other staff were trained to at least 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, however a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check had not been undertaken for administrative staff who acted as chaperones. The practice had undertaken a risk assessment in relation to this which stated that chaperones who have not received a DBS check should never be left alone with patients. (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. One of the practice nurses was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. However blank prescription paper for use in printers was

Are services safe?

not tracked in accordance with national guidance. The practice contacted us the day after our inspection with an updated policy for prescription security which included protocol for tracking prescription paper for use in printers in accordance with national guidance. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. She received 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. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.

- 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. 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 and most of the administration team were multi-skilled which meant they able to cover each other's roles at times of unexpected absence.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.

The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 99% of the total number of points available.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/2015 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than or similar to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) and national averages. For example, patients with diabetes who had a blood pressure reading in the preceding 12 months of 140/80mmHg or less was 87% which was better than the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 78%; and the percentage of patients with diabetes who had a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 94% which was similar to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 88%.
- The practice performance for management of patients with poor mental health was similar to the local and national averages. For example, 95% of patients with severe and enduring mental health problems had a comprehensive care plan documented in their records within the last 12 months compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 88%.

- The practice performance for the management of patients diagnosed with dementia was similar to local and national averages. For example 86% of these patients had received a face-to-face review within the preceding 12 months compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 84%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was similar to the local and national averages achieving 78% in comparison with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 84%.
- The exception reporting for the practice was higher than the CCG and national averages (17% compared to 14% in the CCG and 9% nationally). (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).

The practice told us they were working to reduce the levels of exception reporting and they were currently reviewing their recall system.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been four clinical audits completed in the last two years, all of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, there was an audit of the numbers of patients registered at the practice who were diagnosed with coeliac disease to ensure they had been correctly diagnosed and were receiving appropriate care.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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 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 an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 83%, which was in line with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 84% 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 demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. There were 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 encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. The percentage of female patients between the ages of 50 and 70 years old who had breast screening in the preceding three years was 77%, which was similar to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 72%. The

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

percentage of patients between the ages 60 and 69 years old of who had bowel screening in the preceding 30 months was 65%, which was similar to the CCG average of 65% and the national average of 58%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were comparable to CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 93% to 99% (93% to 97% CCG) and five year olds from 95% to 99% (86% to 96% CCG).

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

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

We spoke with three members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff 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 similar to local and national averages for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 81% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 85%.
- 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 91% and the national average of 91%.
- 78% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful which was lower than the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 87%.

- 86% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 89%.
- 83% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 87%.
- 91% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 95%.

The practice responded to the scores relating to the helpfulness of receptionists and told us that they had some recent staff changes in reception which patients had responded positively to. One of the CQC comment cards mentioned the reception team in particular saying how accommodating and helpful they were.

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.

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 mixed. For example:

- 77% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 86%.
- 82% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 82%.
- 79% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 85%.

Are services caring?

The practice commented that, until recently, they had been going through a period of change in staff which they felt was reflected in these scores. All of the four patients we interviewed on the day of inspection responded positively when asked the same questions.

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. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 207 patients as carers (2% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and for patients aged over 75.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice provided weekly visits, by a named GP, to the care homes in the locality.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- Patients who preferred not to attend the practice in person were able to consult with their GP by email.
- The practice offered information in braille on request.
- There was a nurse led teenage health clinic offering advice on sexual health and lifestyle.

Access to the service

The practice was open for appointments between 8am until 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours appointments were available on Mondays, Tuesdays and Fridays from 7.30am to 8am and on Saturdays from 9am to 10.30am. (Saturday clinics were hosted, through a reciprocal arrangement, by another local GP practice on alternate weeks). There were phone appointments available with GPs throughout the day according to patient need. Routine appointments were bookable up to six weeks in advance. Patients were able to book appointments by phone, online or in person. The practice also had a phone consultation system for more urgent needs.

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

- 48% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 73%.
- 70% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 76% and the national average of 78%.

The practice told us they had looked at ways to improve patient satisfaction in these areas and had recently introduced a phone triage service which allowed patients to either receive their consultation by phone or to be allocated a same day appointment according to their needs. This new system appeared to be popular with patients with patients commenting that they were happy with this service.

People told us on the day of the inspection that appointments were available 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.

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 an effective system in place for handling complaints and concerns.

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system on posters and in leaflets available in the waiting room.

We looked at 12 complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency with dealing with the complaint. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality

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

of care. For example, a patient complained that the appointment she had been given was not suitable as the treatment she required was beyond the scope of the nurse clinic she was allocated to. The practice responded with an

apology and ensured the patient had an appropriate appointment. The complaint was discussed in an educational session so that the reception team were aware of the scope of practice of the nursing team.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a statement of purpose which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so. We noted team away days were held every three months and a session on mindfulness, to help staff learn ways to deal with difficult situations and stress, was included on the agenda.
- Lunchtime educational sessions were held for clinical staff on a weekly basis along with daily coffee break discussions of complex cases.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.
- The practice commented that they had experienced recent changes in staff including GPs, the reception team and the nursing team. We observed a resilient team who told us they were happy in their roles and who were positive about the future.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

monthly, carried out patient surveys, organised regular educational events for patients, published a quarterly patient newsletter and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. The most recent PPG patient survey was conducted in 2015 and the results helped the practice to improve patient access to appointments, for example by suggesting an increase in the numbers of staff available to answer phones at busy times.

- 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.

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. There was clear evidence of succession planning for example the lead

nurse was due to retire and a new lead nurse had been appointed in advance of this. One of the health care assistants had recently passed her return to work nursing qualification.

The practice told us they were continually looking for more innovative ways of working including working. Recent changes which had been implemented included:

- The appointment of a prescribing administrator to ensure medicine were prescribed/issued quickly and effectively
- The practice introduced personal assistant roles which allowed non clinical staff to work more closely with clinical staff. This allowed the GPs to spend more time caring for patients.
- Care coordinators were introduced to sign post patients to appropriate health and social care service.

The practice had received an award for 'best community teacher' for medical students and we saw evidence of the positive feedback they had received from students who had placements at the practice.