

Dr Mark Hancocks (also known as Hallgate Surgery)

Quality Report

Hallgate Surgery
123 Hallgate
Cottingham
East Riding of Yorkshire
HU16 4DA
Tel: 01482 845832
Website: N/A

Date of inspection visit: 18 & 19 January 2016
Date of publication: 19/05/2016

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	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Dr Mark Hancocks (also known as Hallgate Surgery)	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Mark Hancocks (also known as Hallgate Surgery) on 18 & 19 January 2016. The practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Staff had 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.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

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.
- Patients affected by significant events received a timely apology and were told about actions taken to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data showed patient outcomes were above or comparable to the local CCG and 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 staff.
- Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national survey showed that 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. We observed a patient-centred culture.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- The practice 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. The practice had worked with the CCG through an enhanced service to develop 'The Care Home Scheme'. This ensured patients living in care homes had structured annual reviews which included a review of medication by a pharmacist, clinical care and advanced care planning and discussion of 'Do Not Resuscitate' decisions.
- 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.
- Telephone consultations were available for working patients who could not attend during surgery hours or for those whose problem could be dealt with on the phone.
- 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 that the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- 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 this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity.
- 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.
- There was a comprehensive risk register in place which was discussed and monitored at the practice meetings.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.

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.

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population. Patients over the age of 75 had a named GP.
- They were responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients were good for conditions commonly found in older people.
- The Care Home Scheme' ensured patients living in care homes had structured annual reviews which included a review of medication by a pharmacist, clinical care and advanced care planning and discussion of 'Do Not Resuscitate' decisions. There was also a system for reviewing patients after hospital admission to determine whether further admissions could be avoided. The practice had reviewed this service and identified that falls was a common reason for these patients being admitted to hospital or attending A/E. The practice discussed this with the care home managers and as a result the home had provided falls prevention training for all their staff.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- GPs and nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Nationally reported data for 2014/2015 showed that outcomes for patients with long term conditions were good. For example, performance for heart failure indicators was 100%; this was 1.9% above the local CCG average and 2.1% above the England average.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GPs worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Summary of findings

- The nurses had developed an information pack for newly diagnosed diabetic patients as there was always a gap between diagnosis and patients attending the 'Living with Diabetes' course.

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 or who failed to attend hospital appointments.
- Immunisation rates were high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 87.5%. This was 2.7% above the local CCG average and 5.8% above the England average.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw good examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses. The practice monitored any non-attendance of babies and children at vaccination clinics and worked with the health visiting service to follow up any concerns.

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 was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflected the needs for this age group.
- Telephone consultations were available every day with a call back appointment arranged at a time to suit the patient, for example during their lunch break.

Good



Summary of findings

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

Good



- The practice held registers of patients living in vulnerable circumstances which included travellers and those with a learning disability.
- Staff had received training in traveller health beliefs.
- The practice offered longer appointments for people with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- The practice told vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- Telephone interpretation services and information leaflets in different languages were provided when required.

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).

Good



- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed 90.6% of people diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the preceding 12 months. This was 6.4% above the local CCG average and 6.6% above the England average.
- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive care plan documented in their record in the preceding 12 months was 71.4%. This was 19.5% below the local CCG average and 16.9% below the England average. The practice had identified this as a risk and changed their working practices; in 2015/2016 100% of care plans had been completed for patients with mental health issues.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advanced care planning for patients with dementia.

Summary of findings

- The practice was the first in the CCG area to reach the target for diagnosing 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 people with mental health needs and dementia.
- One of the GPs had a GP with Specialist Interest qualification in mental health and had experience working in a mental health and substance misuse environment until the middle of 2014.
- The practice hosted a service for the primary care substance misuse counsellor and sign posted patients requiring support with drug and/or alcohol problems to counselling and support services.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The National GP patient survey results published in January 2016 showed the practice was performing above or similar to the local CCG and national averages. There were 227 survey forms distributed for Dr Mark Hancock and 118 forms were returned, a response rate of 52%. This represented 4.4% of the practice's patient list.

- 85% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared with a CCG average of 68% and a national average of 73%.
- 87% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with a CCG average of 86% and a national average of 85%.
- 93% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as good compared with a CCG average of 87% and a national average of 85%.
- 89% said they would recommend their GP surgery to someone new to the area compared to the local CCG average of 81% and the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we asked for Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards to be completed by

patients prior to our visit. We received 50 comment cards which were all very positive about the standard of care received. Patients said staff were polite and helpful and treated them with dignity and respect. Patients described the service as excellent and very good and said staff were friendly, caring, listened to them and provided advice and support when needed.

We spoke with five patients during the inspection. They also confirmed that they had received very good care and attention and staff treated them with dignity and respect.

We looked at the results of the 'Family and Friends' (F&Fs) survey results for December 2014 to December 2015. They were also very positive about the care and treatment received and patients said they were able to get appointments when they needed them.

Feedback on the comments cards, from patients we spoke with and the F&Fs surveys reflected the results of the national survey. There was a common theme that patients were very satisfied with the care and treatment received.

Dr Mark Hancocks (also known as Hallgate Surgery)

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Inspector and included a GP Specialist Advisor and a Practice Manager Specialist Advisor.

Background to Dr Mark Hancocks (also known as Hallgate Surgery)

Hallgate Surgery is located on Hallgate in the centre of Cottingham and is on local bus routes. Public car parks are located close by disabled parking is available on the street outside the practice. The practice is in an adapted house and there is disabled access, consulting and treatment rooms are available on the ground floor. The practice provides services under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract with the NHS North Yorkshire and Humber Area Team to the practice population of 2632, covering patients of all ages.

The proportion of the practice population in the 65 years and over age group is above the England average. The practice population in the under 18 age group is below the England average. The practice scored eight on the deprivation measurement scale, the deprivation scale goes from one to ten, with one being the most deprived. People living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services.

The practice has two GP partners, both male, a regular female locum GP provides one session per week on a Wednesday morning. There are two practice nurses and one health care assistant, all female. There is a practice manager, an assistant practice manager and a team of administration, reception and secretarial staff.

The practice is a teaching practice for medical students from the Hull York Medical School.

The practice is open between 8.30am to 6.00pm Monday to Friday; telephone lines are open from 8.00am. Appointments are available from 8.30am to 11.00am and 3.00pm to 5.30pm Monday to Friday. The practice, along with all other practices in the East Riding of Yorkshire CCG area have a contractual agreement for the Out of Hours provider to provide OOHs services from 6.00pm. This has been agreed with the NHS England area team.

The practice has opted out of providing out of hours services (OOHs) for their patients. When the practice is closed patients use the 111 service to contact the OOHs provider. Information for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is available in the waiting area and in the practice information leaflet.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our comprehensive inspection programme. We carried out an announced inspection to check whether the provider is meeting the

Detailed findings

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

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

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

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

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

- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We reviewed policies, procedures and other information the practice provided before and during the inspection. We carried out an announced visit on 18 & 19 January 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including two GPs, the senior practice nurse and the health care assistant. We also spoke with the practice manager, assistant practice manager, a receptionist and the secretary.
- Spoke with five patients who used the service.
- Reviewed 50 comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients
- Observed how staff spoke to, and interacted with patients when they were in the practice and on the telephone.

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

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).
- Patients affected by incidents received a timely apology and were told about actions taken to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of incidents and they were discussed at the practice meetings.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, when prescribing an ointment the prescriber picked the wrong dose from the list of ointments available as the higher dose which should not have been picked appeared first on the list. The practice liaised with the local medicines management team at the CCG to look at a solution. The list of ointments was amended to reduce the risk of prescribers picking the wrong dose when searching for this ointment in future.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard adults and children from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies and procedures 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 staff told us they had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to safeguarding children level three.
- Information telling patients that they could ask for a chaperone if required was visible in the waiting room and consulting rooms. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service check (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. One of the practice nurses was the infection prevention and control (IPC) lead who liaised with the local IPC teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received training. Infection control monitoring was undertaken throughout the year and annual infection control audits were completed. Action was taken to address any improvements identified.
- The practice had purchased 'Super Kids Hygiene Squad' activity books for children which were available in the waiting room. These contained tips in a child friendly format on how to reduce infections and information about washing hands.
- The arrangements for managing medicines in the practice, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. Following an incident high risk medicines had been removed from the repeat prescriptions list. GPs now checked that monitoring bloods were up to date before re-authorising a repeat prescription for a high risk medicine. 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. Prescription 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 five personnel files and found that appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of

Are services safe?

identification, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. We noted in one file that two references had not been obtained.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patients and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available and a poster with details of responsible people. The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment 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 also had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health, infection control and legionella.
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a system in place for

the different staff groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty. Staff we spoke with told us they provided cover for sickness and holidays and locums were engaged when required.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received basic life support training.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen, with adult and children's masks.
- There was a first aid kit and accident book available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.
- The practice had a 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 peoples' 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 for 2014/2015 showed the practice achieved 93.9% of the total number of points available, with 9.4% exception reporting. (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). Lower exception reporting rates are more positive. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed;

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 97.2%. This was 8.9% above the local CCG and England average.
- Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed 90.6% of people diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the preceding 12 months. This was 6.4% above the local CCG average and 6.6% above the England average.
- The percentage of patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) who had had a review,

undertaken by a healthcare professional, including an assessment of breathlessness in the preceding 12 months was 84.2%; this was 4.9% below the local CCG average and 5.6% below the national average.

- The percentage of patients with asthma, who had had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that included an assessment of asthma control, was 67.6%. This was 9.2% below the local CCG average and 7.7% below the England average.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been 10 clinical audits completed in the last year with one completed audit and some observational studies. We looked at four audits in detail; all of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and were being monitored.
- The practice participated in applicable local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.

Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, an audit was done to check if the blood pressure (BP) in young patients with diabetic retinopathy was within the range recommended by NICE guidelines. The practice identified these patients and looked at their last BP reading. This identified 10 patients whose BP was not within the recommended range. The practice asked them either to attend the practice to have their BP checked or to monitor it at home. Of the ten patients, seven monitored their BP at home, one was still to return their BP readings, one was being reviewed by the GP and one had declined to be involved in the audit. The results showed five of the seven patients whose BP had been monitored were now within the range recommended by NICE.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed members of staff that covered such topics as safeguarding, fire safety, infection prevention and control, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions,

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme. Nursing staff had completed training in diabetes and chronic obstructive airways disease.

- 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 these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during staff meetings, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, clinical supervision and support for the revalidation of the GPs and nurses.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. 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 test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets was also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when people were referred to other services.
- The practice kept a record of all referrals made and the practice rang to check that all two week wait urgent referrals had been received by the relevant service.

Staff worked together, and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place quarterly and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Consent to care and treatment

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. Staff had undertaken MCA training. Staff sought patients' consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance. The process for seeking consent was monitored through review of records to ensure it met the practices responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.
- 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, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment.

Health promotion and prevention

Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice.

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition, those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation and those with mental health problems. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- The practice referred and sign posted people who needed support for alcohol or drug problems to local counselling services.

The practice had a comprehensive screening programme. Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 87.5%; this was 2.7% above the local CCG average and 5.8% above the England average. 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.

Data from 2014/2015 showed childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were high and were above or comparable to the CCG and national averages for children aged 12 months, two and five years. For example,

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

rates for 14 of the 18 immunisations were 100%. Flu vaccination rates for clinical at risk groups and for those over 65 years of age were similar to the local CCG and national average.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Nationally reported data from 2014/2015 showed the percentage of patients aged 45 or over who had a record of blood

pressure in the preceding five years was 92%, this was 1.1% above the local CCG average and 1% above the England average. Appropriate follow-ups on the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified. The practice had done opportunistic monitoring of blood pressure and pulse for patients attending flu vaccination clinics. This had identified patients who were at increased risk of strokes.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We observed throughout the inspection that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and they were treated 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 and that confidential 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 50 patient CQC comment cards we received were very 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 five patients. They told us they were very satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Patients said staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in January 2016 showed patients were very satisfied with how they were treated and that this was with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was similar to or above the local CCG and national average for questions about how they were treated by the GPs, nurses and receptionists. For example:

- 95% said the last GP they saw was good at giving them enough time compared to the CCG average of 91% and national average of 87%.
- 93% said the last GP they saw was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 91% and national average of 89%.
- 86% said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 88% and national average of 85%.

- 99% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw or spoke to compared to the CCG average of 97% and national average of 95%.
- 96% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at giving them enough time compared to the CCG average of 95% and national average of 92%.
- 96% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 93% and national average of 91%.
- 95% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 91%.
- 94% said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw or spoke to compared to the CCG average of 98% and national average of 97%.
- 88% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 87%.

We looked at the results of the 'Family and Friends' (F&Fs) survey results for December 2014 to December 2015. They were also very positive about the services delivered.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

Results from the national GP patient survey we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. The results were above the local CCG and national average, for example:

- 91% said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 86%.
- 89% said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 82%.

Are services caring?

- 96% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 91% and national average of 90%.
- 87% said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 85%.

Patients told us they were given information and support when newly diagnosed with conditions, for example diabetes and said staff discussed exercise and healthy lifestyles with them. The nurses had developed an information pack for newly diagnosed diabetic patients as there was always a gap between diagnosis and patients attending the 'Living with Diabetes' course.

Telephone interpretation services were available and information leaflets in different languages were provided when required. There was no notice in the reception area informing patients this service was available.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

There was information available in the waiting room for patients about how to access a number of support groups and organisations. The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice did not have a carers' register however one was set up during the inspection. The practice did 'social prescribing' and sign posted carers to the local memory café and local centres for support and advice.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, the practice would send a bereavement card or visit them. This was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service. GPs gave their personal telephone numbers to care homes so staff could contact them on a weekend if they wanted to discuss a palliative care patient.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice worked with the local CCG to plan services and to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, the practice had worked with the CCG through an enhanced service to develop 'The Care Home Scheme'. This ensured patients living in care homes had structured annual reviews which included a review of medication by a pharmacist, clinical care and advanced care planning and discussion of 'Do Not Resuscitate' decisions. There was also a system for reviewing patients after hospital admission to determine whether further admissions could be avoided. The practice had reviewed this service and identified that falls was a common reason for these patients being admitted to hospital or attending A/E. The practice discussed this with the care home managers and as a result the homes provided falls prevention training for all their staff.

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

- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- There were 60 patients from the local traveller community registered with the practice.
- Appointments could be made on line, via the telephone and in person.
- Telephone consultations were available for working patients who could not attend during surgery hours or for those whose problem could be dealt with on the phone.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Urgent access appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities available. Patients who could not climb stairs were seen in the consulting and treatment rooms on the ground floor.
- There was no hearing loop but staff could take patients to a private area or ask them to write things down if they had difficulty communicating.
- The practice was the first in the CCG area to reach the target for diagnosing patients with dementia. They were asked to share what they had done with other practices at the practice managers' meeting.

- The practice identified their patients who were at high risk of attending accident and emergency or having an unplanned admission to hospital. Care plans were developed to reduce the risk of unplanned admissions or A&E attendances.
- One of the GPs had a GP with Specialist Interest qualification in mental health and had experience working in a mental health and substance misuse environment until the middle of 2014.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in January 2016 showed that patient's satisfaction with the service was above the local CCG and national average. This reflected the feedback we received on the day. For example:

- 93% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as good compared with a CCG average of 87% and a national average of 85%.
- 89% said they would recommend their GP surgery to someone new to the area compared to the local CCG average of 81% and the national average of 78%.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am to 6.00pm Monday to Friday; telephone lines were open from 8.00am. Appointments were available from 8.30am to 11.00am and 3.00pm to 5.30pm Monday to Friday. The practice, along with other practices in the East Riding of Yorkshire CCG area had a contractual agreement for the Out of Hours provider to provide OOHs services from 6.00pm. This had been agreed with the NHS England area team.

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them. If patients needed to be seen urgently they would be provided with an appointment that day and staff explained they may have a wait until the GP saw them. Patients we spoke with confirmed this. One patient told us of an occasion when they had attended the practice without an appointment as they were feeling unwell, they had been seen straight away and then admitted to hospital.

Results from the national GP patient survey published in January 2016 showed that patient's satisfaction with how

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

they could access care and treatment was above or comparable to the local CCG and national average. This reflected the feedback we received on the day. For example:

- 74% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the local CCG average of 73% and national average of 75%.
- 85% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared with a CCG average of 68% and a national average of 73%.
- 82% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the local CCG average of 73% and national average of 73%.
- 87% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with a CCG average of 86% and a national average of 85%.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system in place for handling complaints and concerns. The practice did not keep a record of verbal complaints.

- The practice complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- Information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. Information was displayed in the waiting room, the complaints leaflet and in the patient information leaflet.

We looked at one complaint received in the last 12 months and found this was satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. For example, the patient and their relative were involved in the complaint investigation and the practice was open when dealing with the complaint. They were satisfied with the outcome.

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 mission statement however this was not displayed for patients and staff. Staff knew and understood the values in the mission statement.
- The practice had a strategy for the following 12 months regarding how they would continue to deliver their vision.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the practice standards to provide 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.
- There was a comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit and monitoring was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.
- There was a comprehensive risk register in place which was discussed and monitored at the weekly practice meeting.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The partners and practice manager had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. The partners, practice manager and assistant practice manager were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. This requires any patient harmed by the provision of a healthcare service to be informed of the fact and an appropriate remedy offered, regardless of whether a complaint has been made or a question asked about it. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents:

- Patients affected by significant events received a timely apology and were told about actions taken to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- They kept records of written correspondence and verbal communication.

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

- Staff told us that regular team meetings were held.
- Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, by the GPs, practice manager and assistant practice manager. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice. The GPs, practice manager and assistant practice manager encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients, the public and staff. It proactively sought patients' feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service. The practice had tried to establish a Patient Participation Group (PPG), including a virtual PPG but had been unsuccessful.

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through surveys, suggestions and complaints received. Following feedback from patients on the lack of a female GP a regular female locum was now employed to provide a session on a Wednesday morning.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The practice had also gathered feedback from staff, generally 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. For example, following suggestions from staff the telephone was now manned from 8.00am so that patients requiring same day appointments could ring

the practice early. The nursing team had also introduced a handover book so that messages could be left for other members of the team to pick up when they came on duty.

Continuous improvement

There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and looked to improve outcomes for patients in the area.