

Potterells Medical Centre

Quality Report

Station Road
North Mymms
Hatfield
Hertfordshire
AL9 7SN
Tel: 01707 273338
Website: www.potterells.net

Date of inspection visit: 17 August 2016
Date of publication: 24/11/2016

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	11
Areas for improvement	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Potterells Medical Centre	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Potterells Medical Centre on 17 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 some aspects of managing high risk medication needed strengthening.
- 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 good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a 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 are:

- Ensure arrangements are in place so that the results of patients monitored in hospital clinics are available to the GP for review prior to repeat prescribing.
- Continue to identify and support carers.

Summary of findings

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 support, 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. However some aspects of managing high risk medication needed strengthening.

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.

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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. For example in collaboration with the CCG and Public Health England the practice was offering routine testing all new patients for HIV in a bid to improve early detection.

- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- 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 vision and business plans to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were knowledgeable about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a 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 a governance framework which supported the delivery of the business plans and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- All patients over 75 had a named accountable GP.
- All these patients were offered an over 75s health check.
- The practice had identified 2% of the frailest patients at high risk of admissions to hospital (patients with multiple complex needs, and involving multiple agencies) and worked community services in planning support. The GPs had dedicated time to offer home visits to these patients.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice supported a local nursing home and visited twice a week for a ward round.
- The practice offered spirometry (lung function test) on site.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff supported by GPs had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- There was a system to identify patients at risk of hospital admission that had attended A&E or the out of hours service and these patients were regularly reviewed to help them manage their condition at home.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators were better than the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood glucose reading showed good control in the in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015), was 81%, compared to the CCG average of 76% 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- The practice employed a pharmacist to review patients on long term medication to ensure they had received the appropriate blood tests and monitoring.

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.
- 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 81%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.
- The practice provided a variety of health promotion information leaflets and resources for this population group.
- The practice offered referrals to family planning and related screening such as chlamydia screening.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of 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 through its branch at the University of Hertfordshire Medical Centre served up to 7000 patients during university term time. As part of this service the practice offered medical and pastoral care in a caring and reassuring environment to these national and international patients.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- The practice offered late evening appointments on Mondays 6.30pm till 9pm and on every other Saturday from 8.30am till 11.30am.
- The practice had enrolled in the Electronic Prescribing Service (EPS). This service enabled GPs to send prescriptions electronically to a pharmacy of the patient's choice.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients 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 support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice held regular health visitor liaison and multi-disciplinary team meetings to discuss the care needs of specific patients.
- The practice held regular review meetings involving district nurses, GP's and the local palliative care nurses for people that require end of life care and those on the palliative care register.
- 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 identified patients who were also carers and signposted them to appropriate support.

Good



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).

- 84% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was the same as the national average.
- The practice offered annual reviews to all patients on the mental health register which included physical checks.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 support groups and voluntary organisations including the community drugs and alcohol team.
- Patients could self refer to the local Wellbeing Team through the practice reception.
- Patients attending the hospital memory clinic with a diagnosis of dementia and who were stabilised on their medication were managed by the practice avoiding frequent visits to the hospital clinic.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended A&E 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.
- The practice supported a local nursing home and visited twice a week for a ward round to support patients with severe and advanced dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above the local and national averages. There were 366 survey forms distributed and 99 had been returned. This represented 27% return rate (less than 1% of the practice's patient list).

- 89% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to national average of 73%.
- 84% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 89% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.
- 86% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 80%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. All of the 36 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the care experienced. Patients felt the practice offered a helpful friendly and thoughtful service and staff were approachable and listening and had treated them with dignity and respect. A number of comments noted on high satisfaction with the reception staff. Two comment cards noted the difficulty in obtaining an appointment with a GP.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Ensure arrangements are in place so that the results of patients monitored in hospital clinics are available to the GP for review prior to repeat prescribing.

- Continue to identify and support carers.

Potterells Medical Centre

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 advisor and a practice manager specialist advisor.

Background to Potterells Medical Centre

Potterells Medical Centre situated in North Mymms, Hatfield, Hertfordshire is a GP practice which provides primary medical care for approximately 15,900. A branch of this practice, the University of Hertfordshire Medical Centre, is located within the university campus in Hatfield. This branch can serve up to 7000 patients during university term time. The practice maintains one patient list and patients can access either practice. We did not inspect the University of Hertfordshire Medical Centre branch at this time as it was not term time. Together they provide primary medical care to the residents of Welham Green, Brookmans Park, the university campus and surrounding areas.

Potterells Medical Centre provides primary care services to local communities under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract, which is a nationally agreed contract between general practices and NHS England. The practice population is predominantly white British along with a small ethnic population of Asian and Eastern European origin.

The practice has five GPs partners (two female and three male) and three salaried GPs (one female and two male). There are nine practice nurses. The nursing team is supported by a health care assistant. There is a pharmacist

also employed by the practice. There is a practice manager who is supported by a team of administrative and reception staff. The local NHS trust provides health visiting and community nursing services to patients at this practice.

The practice provides training to doctors studying to become GPs.

Patient consultations and treatments take place on ground level. There is a car park outside the surgery with adequate disabled parking available.

The practice is open Monday to Friday from 8am to 6.30pm except on Monday when the practice is open till 9pm. The practice offers appointments every other Saturday morning. There is a variety of access routes including telephone appointments, on the day appointments and advance pre bookable appointments.

When the practice is closed services are provided by Herts Urgent Care via the 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. We carried out an announced inspection on 17 August 2016.

During our inspection we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including the GPs, nursing staff, administration and reception staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being assisted.
- 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.

- The staff we spoke knew the reporting process used at the practice and there was a recording form available. Staff would inform the practice manager or a GP of any incidents. The incident 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 support, 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. There was a consistent approach to investigations.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. For example, the practice had strengthened their procedures for reviewing patients with abnormal urine test results following an investigation of an incident.

The practice had a process in place to act on alerts that may affect patient safety, for example from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). We reviewed a recent safety alert related to prioritising requests for home visits and found appropriate actions had been taken as recommended.

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. A GP was the lead for safeguarding. A GP was the lead for safeguarding. The

GPs provided reports, attended safeguarding meetings and shared information with other agencies where necessary. There were regular meetings with the Health Visitor to discuss patients who were on the child protection register. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities. Staff had received or had future update training dates for the appropriate level of safeguarding training for their role. GPs were trained to the appropriate level to manage child (level 3) and adult safeguarding.

- A notice in the waiting and clinical rooms advised patients that chaperones were available if required. Only clinical staff acted as chaperones. They were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. Hand wash facilities, including soap dispensers were available throughout the practice. There were appropriate processes in place for the management of sharps (needles) and clinical waste. There was an infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention team to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. An annual infection control audit was 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. The practice employed a pharmacist whose role was to carry out repeat prescription reviews. The pharmacist checked that repeat prescriptions were in line with current guidance and patients that required monitoring had been followed up. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG medicines management team and the in-house pharmacist, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. For example the practice

Are services safe?

had audited the antibiotic prescribing for patients with urinary tract infections and found prescribing had improved in line with current guidelines. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The Health Care Assistant was trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.

- We reviewed the system in place to assess and manage risks to patients on high risk medicines. For the majority of patients there were adequate checks. However for patients who had their blood monitoring tests done in hospital clinics for anticoagulant monitoring these results were not readily available to the GP for review prior to repeat prescribing. The practice told us that this was beyond their control and was currently under discussion for a resolution. The practice shared with us their current arrangements with the hospital clinics. This included a notification system to the practice if the patient had not attended for blood monitoring as well as a system to notify the practice if the monitoring results necessitated a change to the repeat prescription. In addition the practice had also recently implemented a system of telephoning the patient prior to issuing a repeat prescription to check if they had a recent blood test result.
- We reviewed two 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. 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 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).

- There was a rota system in place for the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty. Practice staff covered for each other during times of annual leave.

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 with adult pads. The practice had risk assessed the non provision of child pads with appropriate controls in place for this eventuality. There was oxygen available with adult and children's masks.
- 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 used 'Map of Medicine' which is an electronic system to access clinical guidelines and pathways. New guidance and changes in practice were discussed during clinical meetings.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records. For example the practice had reviewed patents receiving treatment for breast cancer following a medicines safety update to ensure they followed prescribing guidelines on drug interactions.

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 100% of the total number of points available.

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

- Performance for diabetes related indicators were above the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood glucose reading showed good control in the in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015), was 81%, compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 78%. Exception reporting for this indicator was 12% compared to a CCG average of 9% and national average of 12%. (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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diagnosed psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) was 100% where the CCG average was 92% and the national average was 88%. Exception reporting for this indicator was 19% compared to a CCG and national average of 13%.

We reviewed the exception reporting and found that the practice had made every effort to ensure appropriate decision making.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been ten clinical audits completed in the past two year, three 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, following an audit of patients receiving a medicine to reduce the risk of getting blood clots the practice had changed the way this medicine was prescribed to take account of a safety alert concerning interactions with other prescribed medicines.

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, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions such as diabetes hypertension and COPD (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease).
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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. They had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training as well as protected learning afternoons which occurred twice each year.

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 with palliative care needs to other services including with the out of hours service and community nursing services.
- There was a process to communicate with the district nurse and health visitor. The pathology service were able to share patient clinical information and results electronically. There was a system to review patients that had accessed the NHS 111 service overnight and those that had attended the A&E department for emergency care.
- There was an information sharing system to review patients attending Herts Urgent Care.

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 primary health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs and those that needed end of life care.

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 assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The practice gained written consent for minor surgery which were scanned and maintained in the patient's records. One GP was trained to perform level 2 skin procedures. As part of this role the GP checked all reports relating to skin samples, sent to the laboratory for analysis, had been received and compared the results with the original diagnosis for completeness of treatment.
- Verbal consent was obtained prior to insertion of an intrauterine device (IUD or coil) which was recorded on the patient's records.

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 and those at risk of developing a long-term condition, those patients with mental health problems and patients with learning difficulties. Patients were offered regular health reviews and signposted to relevant support services.
- We saw a variety of health promotion information leaflets and resources, for example, on smoking cessation sexual health and immunisations.
- The practice provided a variety of health promotion information leaflets and resources for children and young people for example the provision of chlamydia testing.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice offered screening for HIV to all new patients.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 82% 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 also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Results showed:

- 65% of patients attended for bowel screening within six months of invitation compared to national average of 58%.
- 71% attended for breast screening within six months of invitation which was similar to the national average of 73%.

- Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds was 63% to 100% (CCG average: 93% to 97%) and five year olds from 73% to 100% (CCG average: 96% to 98%). The lower percentages referred to infant meningitis C and pneumococcal vaccinations respectively which the practice confirmed as 99% achieved on checking their records.

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 36 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the care experienced. Patients felt the practice offered a helpful friendly and thoughtful service and staff were approachable and listening and had treated them with dignity and respect. A number of comments noted on high satisfaction with the reception staff. Two comment cards noted the difficulty in obtaining an appointment with a GP.

We spoke with a member 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.

For example:

- 92% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 91% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG and the national average of 95%.

- 86% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 91% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 88% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 88% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 86%.
- 81% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 81% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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.

Are services caring?

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 140 patients as carers (less than 1% of the practice list). The practice attributed this low number to the fact that half of the practice list comprised of students attending the University of Hertfordshire. The practice had identified a carer's

champion who provided information and directed carers to the various avenues of support available to them. This included referral to Carers in Hertfordshire which supported people in their caring role. There was a dedicated carers information board in the patient waiting area. The practice offered annual health checks as well as flu and shingles vaccination to carers.

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 NHS East and North Hertfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example in collaboration with the CCG and Public Health England the practice was offering routine testing to all new patients for HIV in a bid to improve early detection.

- The practice offered late evening appointments on Monday 6.30pm till 9pm and every other Saturday from 8.30am till 11.30am.
- The practice provided telephone triage and ring back service by a duty GP at the patient's request where appropriate.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and others with complex needs.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice supported a local nursing home and visited twice a week for a ward round.
- Patients over 75 had a named accountable GP and were offered the over 75 health check by a dedicated nurse.
- The practice offered spirometry (lung function test) on site.
- The practice had identified 2% of the frailest patients at high risk of admissions to hospital (patients with multiple complex needs, and involving multiple agencies) and worked community services in planning support. The GPs had dedicated time to offer home visits to these patients.
- There was a system to identify patients at risk of hospital admission that had attended A&E or the out of hours service and these patients were regularly reviewed to help them manage their condition at home.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice offered referrals to family planning and related screening such as chlamydia screening.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS.

- There were disabled facilities and translation services available. There was a hearing loop available.
- There was a phlebotomy service available on site provided by the local NHS trust.
- The practice employed a pharmacist to review on long term medication had received the appropriate blood test and monitoring.
- Online services were available for booking appointments and request repeat prescriptions.
- Through the Electronic Prescribing System (EPS) patients could order repeat medications online and collect the medicines from a pharmacy near their workplace.

Access to the service

The practice was open Monday to Friday from 8am to 6.30pm except on Monday when the practice was open until 9pm. The practice was open on every other Saturday from 8.30am till 11.30am. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 75% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 79%.
- 89% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

People 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.

The reception staff were all aware of how to deal with requests for home visits and if they were in any doubt would speak to a GP. Home visit requests were assessed and managed by a GP.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- The practice manager was the responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw there was a poster in the waiting area that informed patients of the complaints procedure. There was also information on the practice website.

We looked at 11 complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these had been satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and action had been taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, raising awareness for clinical staff of the need to forward plan care for patients returning home while ill abroad.

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 aimed to work in partnership with patients, their families and carers towards a positive care experience and understanding, involving them in decision making about their treatment and care.
- The practice had supporting business plans which reflected the aims and objectives and were regularly monitored.
- The practice held six monthly planning meeting off site in the evening to discuss vision and values and agree future business plans.

Governance arrangements

The practice had a governance framework which supported the delivery of the business plans 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 electronically on their desktops.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. However some aspects of managing high risk medication needed strengthening.

Leadership and culture

The practice prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the GPs and the practice manager 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 there were unexpected safety incidents:

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support and explanation.
- They kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

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

- There was a regular schedule of practice and partner meetings at the practice in addition to those for individual staff groups and multi-disciplinary teams to attend.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise and discuss any issues at the meetings and felt confident in doing so and supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and well supported and knew who to go to in the practice with any concerns. 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.
- There were named members of staff in lead roles. For example there were nominated GP leads for safeguarding, diabetes, asthma and COPD. There were also nurse led clinics for patients with respiratory conditions such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, coronary heart disease and diabetes. The leads showed a good understanding of their roles and responsibilities and all staff knew who the relevant leads were.

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. We spoke

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

with the chair of the PPG who told us that they had worked with the practice on several initiatives. For example they had participated in 'Patient Experience Observation' whereby they had observed patients in the practice patient waiting areas. This involved observation of the environment, information provision and care at reception. The observation had reported that patients had been treated with due concern respect and dignity.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. They told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run. The practice also participated in protected learning time called 'Target meetings' hosted by the CCG open to all practice staff where specific training and discussion about practice matters were discussed.

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.

- The practice had worked in collaboration with the CCG and Public Health England the practice was offering routine testing all new patients for HIV in a bid to improve early detection.
- The practice had recently employed a pharmacist to carry out repeat prescription reviews. By doing this the practice aimed to ensure patients on repeat medications were appropriately followed up with any monitoring requirements prior to issuing a repeat prescription.