

Teehey Lane Surgery - A Sagar

Quality Report

66-68 Teehey La, Wirral CH63 2JN

Tel: 0151 608 2519

Website: www.teehey lanemedical.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 25 August 2016

Date of publication: 24/11/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

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
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Teehey Lane Surgery - A Sagar	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 Teehey Lane Medical Centre on 25 August 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were not always effectively assessed and managed with particular regard to safeguarding.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- 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 and improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.

- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management.
- The registered manager did not demonstrate that they had the skills, experience and competencies to effectively manage and monitor the activity of the practice.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider must make improvements are:

Summary of findings

- Ensure the lead for safeguarding within the practice has the necessary knowledge and expertise to effectively monitor the systems and processes in place to mitigate risks to patients' safety and welfare.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Review the newly introduced system to monitor uncollected prescriptions, to ensure sustainability.

- Continue to provide appropriate training to improve the skills competencies and experience of the registered manager to ensure the management of the regulated activity is safe and effective. With particular regard to the management and oversight of safeguarding systems, practice systems and processes and the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

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.

- There was a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons learned from the investigation of significant events 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 systems, processes in place to with regard to keeping patients safe and safeguarded from abuse. However the member of staff responsible for safeguarding within the practice had insufficient knowledge of the systems and processes in place to enable them to effectively monitor the safety and wellbeing of patients at risk of abuse. The practice used electronic alerts on patents records to identify vulnerable children.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- The practice did not have an effective system to monitor uncollected prescriptions.

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



Summary of findings

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

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

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- There was a leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity.
- There was a governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. The registered manager demonstrated a lack of knowledge of the systems and processes in place to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.

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.
- 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 medicine needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. However the safeguarding lead had limited knowledge of the systems and processes used to monitor children's safety and wellbeing.
- Immunisation rates were in line with CCG averages 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.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

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 population group.

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



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 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 provided patients experiencing poor mental health with information about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.

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. 301 survey forms were distributed and 107 were returned. This represented 5% of the practice's patient list.

- 97% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 91% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 78% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 18 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients told us they felt respected, valued and cared for by the practice staff. They also told us they had confidence the clinicians that cared and treated them.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

The areas where the provider must make improvements are:

- Ensure the lead for safeguarding within the practice has the necessary knowledge and expertise to effectively monitor the systems and processes in place to mitigate risks to patients' safety and welfare.

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Review the newly introduced system to monitor uncollected prescriptions, to ensure sustainability.
- Continue to provide appropriate training to improve the skills competencies and experience of the registered manager to ensure the management of the regulated activity is safe and effective. With particular regard to the management and oversight of safeguarding systems, practice systems and processes and the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

Teehey Lane Surgery - A Sagar

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser, a second CQC inspector, a practice manager specialist adviser and an Expert by Experience.

Background to Teehey Lane Surgery - A Sagar

Teehey Lane Medical Centre is situated in the Bebington area of Wirral. There were 2100 patients on the practice register at the time of our inspection. The practice is situated in a residential area with over 25% of their patients being 65 years and over.

The practice has two GP partners, one male and one female, a practice nurse, a practice manager and a number of administration and reception staff.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday and extended hours are provided Monday 6.30pm to 8pm. There are also arrangements to ensure patients receive urgent medical assistance when the practice is closed. Out of hours patients are asked to contact the NHS 111 service to obtain healthcare advice or treatment.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract and has enhanced services contracts which include childhood vaccinations.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

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 25 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of 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 records and policies and procedures.
- 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:

Detailed findings

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

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

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was a 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 discussed with the practice the need to review the current significant event policy and procedure to ensure there is clarity as to what events would be considered significant. Following the inspection the practice provided evidence that showed the policy and procedure had been reviewed and amended.
- 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 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, the referral system was reviewed and further guidance issued to ensure referrals were made in a timely manner.

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. We discussed with the practice the need to monitor and review children and vulnerable adults' attendance at A&E departments, walk-in centres and GP out of hours to ensure appropriate care and support was being provided. The registered manager was the lead member of staff for safeguarding. However they demonstrated insufficient understanding of their role and responsibility and was unable to demonstrate knowledge of the monitoring systems in place to maintain children's safety and wellbeing. The lead member of staff had no knowledge of those children identified as at risk. GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. The lead GP for safeguarding was due to attend a safeguarding training update in October 2016. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3. Following the inspection the practice provided evidence that the registered manager had started to receive training and support to develop their role as safeguarding lead.

- The practice employed a counsellor who saw patients referred to them by the GPs working at the practice. There was no formal referral system in place to determine the type of issues that were to be referred to the counsellor. There has also been no risk assessment carried out to determine whether the referral was safe and appropriate. Following the inspection the practice provided evidence that showed a referral system had now been put in place that included a risk assessment.
- 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)
- 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

Are services safe?

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.

- There were arrangements in place for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions, the system did not include a system which included the review of high risk medicines. The system in place to manage uncollected prescriptions was not robust and did not support effective monitoring of uncollected prescriptions. Following the inspection the practice provided a detailed policy and procedure that had been implemented to ensure uncollected prescriptions and the monitoring of high risk medicines were actioned monthly and patients were contacted. The practice employed a pharmacist who worked at the practice one day a week and carried out regular medicines audits. The practice worked with the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing.
- We reviewed six personnel files and found overall appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. We discussed with the practice the need to ensure all recruitment checks were held at the practice including insurance indemnity cover and references for locum GPs. Following the inspection the practice provided copies of all documents that were missing at the time of the inspection.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the

reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

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

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 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

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 96% of the total number of points available. The practice 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) was 3.4% compared to the CCG and national average of 9.2%.

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

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average.
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 92% compared to the national average of 88%.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 74% compared to the national average of 77%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national average.

- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 96% compared to the national average of 88%.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 96% compared to the national average of 90%.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 94% compared to the national average of 84%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been four clinical audits completed in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included the identification of patients with atrial fibrillation (irregular heartbeat) who required clinical assessment.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as: the treatment provided to those patients prescribed anti coagulation medicines (a type of drug that reduces the body's ability to form clots in the blood).

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions such as diabetes, asthma and COPD (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease).

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, 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.
- The majority of staff understood the relevant consent and decision making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. The safeguarding lead had no understanding of the Mental Capacity Act or deprivation of liberty safeguards (DoLS).
- 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 lifestyle choices. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 71%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 74%. 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 for the vaccinations given were lower than the CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 83% to 92% and five year olds was 86%. The practice told us they worked with the health visitor service and Public Health England to improve vaccination uptake.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 18 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with five members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were very happy 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 were in line with the CCG and national average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 85% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and the national average of 89%.
- 82% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 87%.
- 94% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 95%.

- 85% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 97% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 98% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 91% 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.

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:

- 85% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 86%.
- 82% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care which was the same as the national average of 82%.
- 93% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Are services caring?

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 157 patients as carers (7% of the practice list). The practice placed alerts on

carer's records to support the clinicians to be aware of the extra support and care carers may need. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on a Monday evening until 8pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for 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 for example yellow fever vaccination.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday and extended hours appointments were offered Monday 6.30pm to 8pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 96% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 97% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess whether a home visit was clinically necessary; and

the urgency of the need for medical attention. 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 for example, a poster and information leaflets were displayed in the waiting area.

We looked at two complaints received in the last two years and they were dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints which had included a review of the referral system, to ensure referrals were processed in a timely manner.

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 quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.

However, the registered manager demonstrated insufficient understanding of the systems in place to identify, manage and then to implement actions to mitigate risks. We discussed this issue with the registered manager who acknowledged that improvements were needed to ensure he was able to monitor the practice's performance and safety effectively. The registered manager confirmed he would ensure he undertook appropriate training such as safeguarding and Mental Capacity Act 2005 training and would seek support to become more confident with the systems and processes that governed the activity of the practice.

Leadership and culture

The GP partners 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). 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. However, due to the registered manager's lack of knowledge and skills there was a lack of oversight of the practice's activities.

- 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.
- Following the inspection the practice provided evidence that showed training and support was being provided to the registered manager to improve the skills and knowledge required to effectively monitor the activities of 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 and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, annual appraisal and general discussions. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

The practice told us they were working towards becoming a teaching practice for medical students.

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 Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 13 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safeguarding service users from abuse and improper treatment How the regulation was not being met: The lead for safeguarding within the practice did not have the necessary knowledge and expertise to effectively monitor the systems and processes in place to mitigate risks to patients' safety and welfare. Regulation 13(1)(2)