

Hersham Surgery

Quality Report

The Surgery
Pleasant Place
Walton On Thames
Surrey
KT12 4HT

Tel: 01932 229033

Website: www.hershamsurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 20 September 2016

Date of publication: 01/03/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Hersham Surgery	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13
Action we have told the provider to take	23

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Hersham Surgery on 20 September 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- 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.
- 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, with the exception of recruitment checks.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- 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.

We saw one area of outstanding practice:

The practice provided an Excellence in Insulin Management programme for the Clinical Commissioning Group. This improved access to insulin initiation therapy within the community. The programme included:

- Having appropriately trained and competent staff who could initiate insulin therapy.

Summary of findings

- Staff from the practice training GPs and staff from other local practices.
- Providing a GP diabetes mentor for other local practices.

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- Ensure that medical indemnity insurance is in place for all clinicians.
- Ensure that recruitment checks in accordance with practice policy are completed when staff are employed.

- Ensure that all appropriate policies are up to date and easily accessible to all staff.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Review confidentiality in upstairs waiting area.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

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

Requires improvement



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed, with the exception of recruitment checks, medical indemnity insurance for clinicians, and out of date information in the business continuity plan.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were 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.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- 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.

Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice provided an Excellence in Insulin Management programme for the CCG. The programme included initiating insulin therapy, training GPs and staff from other local practices and providing a diabetes mentor for other local practices. The practice has also taken part in a pilot scheme with the CCG to reduce falls in older people.
- Patients said 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.

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 it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings. We noted that the business continuity plan contained some out of date information.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group had been formed in January 2016 and was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits with GPs and nurses and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice provided weekly surgeries at the retirement village.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- 88% of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last was 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was higher than the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 80% and the England average of 78%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.
- The practice have recently employed a clinical pharmacist whose role would involve managing the medicines of patients with long term or complex conditions.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

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

Good



Summary of findings

- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- 81% of eligible female patient's notes recorded that a cervical screening test had been performed in the preceding five years which is comparable with the CCG average of 80% and the England average of 81%.
- 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.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- The practice offered electronic prescribing which allowed the patient to choose a pharmacy for their prescription to be sent to which could be close to their place of work.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice provided a separate waiting area for patient who wish to maintain their privacy.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice provided weekly surgeries at a dementia unit.
- 95% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the CCG average of 85% and the England average of 84%.
- 100% of patients with severe and enduring mental health problems had a comprehensive care plan documented in their records within the last 12 months which is comparable to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 89%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.
- The practice hosted a psychology counselling service. This ensured patients could access this service in a community setting.

Good



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 in line with local and national averages. Of the 219 survey forms were distributed and 127 were returned. This represented approximately 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 80% of patients who responded found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 67% and the national average of 73%.
- 72% of patients who responded were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 76%.
- 88% of patients who responded described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 85%.

- 84% of patients who responded said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 80% 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. We received 36 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received although five cards also mentioned difficulty booking appointments. Patients told us that they were pleased with the care they received and found everyone friendly, helpful and caring, and that staff acted professionally.

We spoke with two patients during the inspection. Both patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The NHS Friends and Family Test results show that 96% of patients who responded would have recommended this practice to their friends and family.

Hersham Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Hersham Surgery

Hersham Surgery is based in a purpose built property in Hersham village. The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with NHS England. (GMS is one of the three contracting routes that have been available to enable commissioning of primary medical services). The practice is part of NHS North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

At the time of our inspection there were approximately 8,000 patients on the practice list. The practice has a higher than average number of patients aged over 65 years and a slightly higher than average number of patients from birth to nine years. The practice has a lower than average number of patients aged 10 to 34 years old. The practice has a highest number of patients aged over 65 years in the CCG. The practice provides care and treatment to the residents of a large retirement village as well as several other large residential and nursing homes. The practice also has a lower than average number of patients with long standing health conditions. Deprivation amongst children is low when compared to the population nationally. Deprivation among older people is higher than the CCG average but still low when compared to the population nationally. Overall the practice is in the second least deprived decile nationally.

The practice has five GP partners (three male and two female) and is in the process of recruiting a salaried GP. They are supported by two practice nurses, a clinical pharmacist, three phlebotomists, a practice manager, a deputy practice manager, a reception manager and a team of clerical and reception staff.

Hersham Surgery is a training practice so it takes supernumerary registrars who are qualified doctors completing their specialist training as GPs. At the time of our inspection there was one registrar attached to the practice. The practice also takes medical students who are in their final year.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday and does not offer extended hours appointments. When the practice is closed patients are advised to call NHS 111 where they will be given advice or directed to the most appropriate service for their medical needs.

The service is provided from the following location:

The Surgery

Pleasant Place

Walton On Thames

Surrey

KT12 4HT

The NHS Friends and Family Test results show that 96% of patients who responded would recommend this practice to their friends and family.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as

Detailed findings

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 20 September 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, clinical pharmacist, nurses, phlebotomists, managers, administrative and reception staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, an error occurred where an urgent referral was not sent. This was investigated and as a result all clinicians were given refresher training on urgent referrals and a system was put in place to check that urgent referrals were sent.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their

responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three. All other staff were trained to at least child safeguarding level one.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed five personnel files and found that not all appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, in four of the personnel files there were missing references and in one file registration with the appropriate professional body had not been checked. We also found that the practice did not have evidence of medical indemnity insurance for one of the practice nurses. When we brought this to

Are services safe?

the attention of the practice they took immediate action and suspended the nurse from clinical practice until the medical indemnity insurance was confirmed. The CCG were also informed.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. The practice had carried out an evacuation fire drill within the last six months which included staff and patients. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff. We noted that the business continuity contained some information that was out of date.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 99.6% of the total number of points available with 10% clinical exception rate (national average 10%). (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015-2016 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the national average. For example; 88% of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose routine blood test showed their average blood sugar levels was 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was higher than the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 80% and the England average of 78%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the national average. For example; 95% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the England average of 84%. Also 100% of patients with severe and enduring mental

health problems had a comprehensive care plan documented in their records within the last 12 months which is higher than the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 89%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been two clinical audits completed in the last twelve months and both 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, we saw recent action had been taken as a result of an audit of self monitoring of blood glucose by diabetic patients using insulin. This included a change to the system that monitored testing strips prescribed and the introduction of further patient education.

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.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support,

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 81%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates met the national 90% target for three of the four indicators for vaccinations given to under two year olds and reached 89.7% for the remaining indicator. Childhood immunisation rates were comparable to CCG and national averages for five year olds. For example 91% of five year olds received MMR dose one compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 94%.

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 the downstairs rooms could not be overheard. However, we noted that some conversations, from the upstairs staff only rooms and one consultation room, could be overheard by patients in the upstairs waiting area.
- 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 service experienced, although five cards also mentioned difficulties in booking appointments. 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 one 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. The practice was above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 90% of patients who responded said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 89% and the national average of 89%.
- 85% of patients who responded said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

- 93% of patients who responded said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 92%.
- 91% of patients who responded said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 85%.
- 93% of patients who responded said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 91%.
- 87% of patients who responded said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 84% 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:

- 89% of patients who responded said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 86%.
- 82% of patients who responded said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 82%.
- 85% of patients who responded said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.

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

Are services caring?

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available. Longer appointments were booked when a translator was used.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The practice are trustees for a charity started with a bequeath from a previous GP partner to help local people in financial difficulties, which has included help with prescription charges.

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 158 patients as carers, of which two were young carers (2% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. The practice had organised a carer's event for October 2016 where further information about support would be available. Scheduled to attend were members of the patient participation group local carer's charities and some of the local care homes.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice provided an Excellence in Insulin Management programme for the CCG. The programme included initiating insulin therapy, training GPs and staff from other local practices and providing a diabetes mentor for other local practices. The practice has also taken part in a pilot scheme with the CCG to reduce falls in older people.

- There were longer appointments available for patients who needed them. For example, those with a learning disability and those who used a translator.
- Home visits were available with both GPs and practice nurses for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice ran weekly surgeries at the local retirement village and the care homes and dementia home they provided care for.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice was unable to install a lift to improve access, as the current building would not accommodate this. Patients who had limited mobility were seen in rooms located on the ground floor.
- The practice hosted a psychology service which allowed access to this service in a community setting.
- The practice provided a separate waiting area for patients who wished to maintain their privacy.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. 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.

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.

- 71% of patients who responded were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 76%.
- 80% of patients who responded said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 67% and 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.

All requests for home visits were passed to the duty GP to assess. This could include telephoning the patient or carer in advance to gather information to allow for an informed decision to be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

quality of care. For example, a patient with a hearing impairment complained that it was difficult to communicate at the practice; as a result the practice had made a portable hearing loop system available.

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. We noted the business continuity plan contained some out of date information.
- 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, with the exception of recruitment checks including medical indemnity insurance for clinicians.

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

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

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. The PPG was started in January 2016 and met quarterly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example; the PPG suggested changes to the appointment system to make it easier for patients to see their preferred GP, feedback from the PPG indicated that the changes had improved the system.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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 provided an Excellence in Insulin Management programme

for the clinical commissioning group (CCG). The programme included initiating insulin therapy, training GPs and staff from other local practices and providing a diabetes mentor for other local practices. The practice has also taken part in a pilot scheme with the CCG to reduce falls in older people.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

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

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures	<p>Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment</p> <p>The registered provider did not ensure that care and treatment was provided in a safe way. The provider had failed to do all that is reasonable practicable to mitigate risks by not having an update to date business continuity plan.</p> <p>They had also failed to identify the risks posed by not ensuring staff were appropriately insured and recruited.</p> <p>This was in breach of regulation 12(1)(2) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.</p>
Family planning services	
Maternity and midwifery services	
Surgical procedures	
Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	