

Grassington Medical Practice

Quality Report

Grassington Medical Practice
9 Station Road
Grassington
BD23 5LS

Tel: 01756 752313

Website: www.grassingtonmedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 29 November 2016

Date of publication: 03/02/2017

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?		Good	
Are services effective?		Good	
Are services caring?		Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?		Good	
Are services well-led?		Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

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

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Grassington Medical Practice on 29 November 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good for providing safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led care for all of the population groups it serves.

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

- The ethos and culture of the practice was to provide good quality service and care to patients.
- Patients told us they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in care and decisions about their treatment.
- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered following best practice guidance.
- The practice had adequate facilities and was equipped to treat and meet the needs of patients. Information regarding the services provided by the practice and how to make a complaint was readily available for patients.
- Patients we spoke with were positive about access to the service. They said they found it generally easy to make an appointment, there was continuity of care and urgent appointments were available on the same day as requested.
- The practice of, and complied 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 supported a culture of openness and honesty which was reflected in their approach to safety.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- There were comprehensive safeguarding systems in place; particularly around vulnerable children and adults.
- The practice sought patient views how improvements could be made to the service, through the use of patient surveys, the NHS Friends and Family Test and the patient participation group (PPG).

Summary of findings

- There was a clear leadership structure in place.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)
Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Good



- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed
- There were systems in place for reporting and recording significant events and a nominated lead who dealt with them overall. Lessons were shared to ensure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- There was a nominated lead for safeguarding children and adults. Comprehensive systems were in place to keep patients and staff safeguarded from abuse.
- There were processes in place for the safe management of medicines. The practice received support from an Airedale Wharfedale and Craven Clinical Commissioning Group pharmacy technician.
- There were systems in place for checking that equipment was tested, calibrated and fit for purpose.
- There was a nominated lead for infection prevention and control.
- The partners and practice manager had weekly meetings where they discussed any management issues, significant events, complaints and any other business relating to the practice in a timely manner. Any learning was then shared with the practice team.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment. They assessed the need of patients and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- The practice used a recognised tool to identify patients who were considered to be at risk of frailty and unplanned admission to hospital.
- Regular clinical meetings and discussions were held between the GPs and nursing staff to discuss patient care and complex cases.
- Staff worked with other health and social care professionals, such as the community matron, district nursing, health visiting and local neighbourhood teams, to meet the range and complexity of people's needs.

Summary of findings

- End of life care was delivered in a compassionate and coordinated way.
- Clinical audits were undertaken and could demonstrate quality improvement.
- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were comparable to both local and national figures.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff. The practice was very proactive and supportive with regard to the learning and development of staff.
- Services were provided to support the needs of the practice population, such as screening and vaccination programmes, health promotion and preventative care.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- The practice had a strong patient-centred culture and we observed that staff treated patients with kindness, dignity, respect and compassion.
- Data from the National GP patient survey showed that patients rated the practice comparable to other local practices. Patients we spoke with and comments we received were mostly positive about the care and service the practice provided. They told us they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- When a GP was notified of a patient's death this was followed up with a telephone call to the next of kin by the person best known to the family on an individual basis if it was seen as appropriate.
- The practice was participating in the Serious Illness Care Programme UK which is a programme of structured conversations between the patient and doctor to identify what matters most to the patient and set the goals and priorities as they look ahead to their treatment and care.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- The practice worked with Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other local practices to review the needs of their population.

Summary of findings

- National GP patient survey responses and the majority of comments made by patients showed they found it easy to make an appointment.
- The practice offered pre-bookable, same day and online appointments. They also provided telephone consultations and text messaging reminders.
- Home visits and longer appointments were available for patients who were deemed to need them, for example housebound patients or those with complex conditions.
- The practice had adequate facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs
- There was an accessible complaints system. Evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised and learning was shared with staff.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions, including people with dementia.

Are services well-led?

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

- There was a clear leadership structure and a vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.
- There were governance arrangements in place. These included the identification of risk and policies and systems to minimise risk.
- The provider , and complied with, the requirements of the duty of candour. There were systems in place for reporting notifiable safety incidents and sharing information with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The partners supported a culture of openness and honesty.
- Staff were encouraged to raise concerns, provide feedback or suggest ideas regarding the delivery of services. The practice proactively sought feedback from patients through the use of patient surveys, the NHS Friends and Family Test and the patient participation group.
- Staff informed us they felt very supported by the GP partners and practice management.
- All staff had access to policies and procedures via the computer system.
- The practice produced a quarterly newsletter for patients updating them on what was happening in the practice and included any key seasonal health promotion messages.

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

Good



- The practice provided proactive, responsive and person-centred care to meet the needs of the older people in its population. All elderly patients had a named GP.
- The practice worked closely with other health and social care professionals, such as the district nursing and local neighbourhood teams, to ensure housebound patients received the care and support they needed.
- The practice participated in Airedale Wharfedale and Craven Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) initiatives to reduce the rate of elderly patients' acute admission to hospital.
- Patients who were considered to be at risk of frailty were identified and support offered as appropriate.
- Personalised care plans were in place for those patients who were considered to have a high risk of an unplanned hospital admission and patients were reviewed as needed.
- Health checks were offered for all patients over the age of 75 who had not seen a clinician in the previous 12 months.
- Patients were signposted to other local services for access to additional support, particularly for those who were isolated or lonely.
- The practice delivered a successful Enhanced Primary Care Scheme to assist with the care of complex patients and reduce hospital admissions. Data was being collected to show the impacts for patients but it was too early to demonstrate what those impacts were.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- The GPs had lead roles in the management of long term conditions and were supported by the nursing staff. Annual reviews were undertaken to check patients' health care and treatment needs were being met. Holistic reviews were undertaken with patients who had several co-morbidities, which avoided the need for multiple appointments.
- The practice maintained a register of patients who were a high risk of an unplanned hospital admission. Care plans and support were in place for these patients.

Summary of findings

- 84% of diagnosed diabetic patients had a blood sugar level within the normal limits in the preceding 12 months (CCG average 84%, national average 78%).
- 93% of patients with a physical or mental health condition had a smoking status recorded within the last 12 months (CCG average 95% and national averages of 94%).
- 83% of patients diagnosed with asthma, on the register, had received a review in the last 12 months (CCG average 77% and national average 75%).
- The practice identified those patients who had complex needs. The practice ensured that those patients with life limiting conditions were on the palliative care register. These patients were discussed at the Gold Standards Framework (GSF) meeting to ensure the correct support and care was delivered.
- Patients nearing the end of their life had access to a 'Goldline' telephone service providing them with support and advice.
- The practice delivered a diabetic clinic with the support of a specialist nurse which included the initiation of insulin for patients..

Families, children and young people

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

- The practice worked with midwives, health visitors and school nurses to support the needs of this population group. For example, through the provision of ante-natal, post-natal and child health surveillance clinics.
- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk
- Patients and staff told us children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. All children who required an urgent appointment were seen on the same day as requested.
- Immunisation uptake rates were in line with the CCG and national rates for all standard childhood immunisations.
- 81% of eligible patients had received cervical screening in the last five years (CCG average 84% and national average 82%).
- Appointments were available with both male and female GPs.
- There was a weekly health visitor led baby clinic at the surgery.

Good



Summary of findings

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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

- The needs of these patients 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 offered a range of health promotion and screening that reflected the needs for this age group.
- Health checks were offered to patients aged between 40 and 74 who had not seen a GP in the last three years.
- Students were offered public health recommended vaccinations prior to attending university.
- Travel health advice and vaccinations were available.
- The practice utilised electronic booking of appointments, prescribing and telephone appointments to provide improved access for working people.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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

- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in children, young people and adults whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. They were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice could evidence a number of children who were on a child protection plan (this is a plan which identifies how health and social care professionals will help to keep a child safe).
- Patients who had a learning disability received an annual review of their health needs and a care plan was put in place. Carers of these patients were also encouraged to attend, were offered a health review and signposted to other services as needed.
- We saw there was information available on how patients could access various local support groups and voluntary organisations.
- When a GP was notified of a patient's death this was followed up with a telephone call to the next of kin by the person best known to the family if this was seen as being appropriate.

Summary of findings

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice regularly worked with multidisciplinary teams in the case management of people in this population group, for example the local mental health team.
- Patients and/or their carer were given information on how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- 97% of patients diagnosed with dementia had received a face to face review of their care in the preceding 12 months (CCG average 89%, national average 84%).
- 87% of patients who had a complex mental health problem, such as schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses, had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record in the preceding 12 months (CCG average 94% and national averages of 88%).
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs or dementia and offered flexible appointments.
- Deprivations of Liberty Safeguards were written in the patient's clinical notes.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey distributed 107 survey forms of which 63 were returned. This was a response rate of 59% which represented over 1% of the practice patient list. The results published in July 2016 showed the practice was performing slightly better than national averages. For example:

- 73% of respondents described their experience of making an appointment as good (CCG and national average 73%)
- 93% of respondents said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 85% national average 87%)
- 96% of respondents said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw or spoke to (CCG average 96% and national average 95%)
- 100% of respondents said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw or spoke to (CCG and national average 97%)

As part of the inspection process we asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients. We received 28 comment cards. There were 21 comments all positive, many using the words 'very good' and 'excellent' to describe the service and care they had received and citing staff as being friendly, helpful and caring. An additional seven comments were largely positive but mentioned issues with regard to getting appointments and continuity of care issues. Several of the comments praised individual members of staff.

During the inspection we spoke with four patients and members of the patient participation group. Comments received from them were very positive and they had high praise for the practice and staff. All confirmed they were happy with the care they received from any of the clinicians. We were given many examples of good care and support they had received.

Grassington Medical Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team comprised of a CQC Lead Inspector and a GP specialist advisor.

Background to Grassington Medical Practice

Grassington Medical Practice is a member of the Airedale Wharfedale and Craven Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). Personal Medical Services (PMS) are provided under a contract with NHS England. They also offer a range of enhanced services, which include:

- Childhood vaccination and immunisations
- The provision of influenza and pneumococcal immunisations
- Facilitating timely diagnosis and support for patient with dementia
- Extended hours access
- Improving online access

Grassington Medical Practice is located at Grassington Medical Centre, 9 Station Road, Grassington BD23 5LS which is a rural village in North Yorkshire and is within the 10% least deprived localities in England.

The practice has been part of the Ilkley and Grassington Group Practice (known as IG Medical) since 2015 and has been integrating services, policies and procedures over the previous 12 months. Due to the merging of the practices some data specific to Grassington Medical Practice is unavailable, but is now published as part of IG Medical.

The practice is situated in an adapted, former commercial premises. There are facilities for people with disabilities. There are car parking facilities on site with designated disabled parking.

The practice has a patient list size of approximately 4000 patients, who were equal ratio of male and female but predominantly over 50 years of age. The practice has close links with local residential care homes, where some registered patients reside.

At the Grassington surgery there are two GP partners (one male partner and one female associate partner), two salaried GPs (both female) and regular support from the Ilkley Moor GP's. There were two practice nurses and one health care assistant. There is a practice manager who works across both Ilkley and Grassington surgeries and there is a team of administration and reception staff based at Grassington, including a head of patient services, a patient services supervisor and clinical systems support. The practice also has the support of a CCG employed medicines management pharmacist.

The practice is open between Mondays to Friday 8.00am to 6.30pm. The practice offers late night surgeries until 7.30pm on Tuesdays for those not able to attend in normal surgery. The practice offered a range of appointments throughout the opening hours. When the practice is closed out-of-hours services are provided by Local Care Direct, which can be accessed via the surgery telephone number or by calling the NHS 111 service.

The practice has good working relationships with local health, social and third sector services to support provision of care for its patients. (The third sector includes a very diverse range of organisations including voluntary, community, tenants' and residents' groups.)

Detailed findings

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 and inspection programme. 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 that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations, such as NHS England and Airedale Wharfedale and Craven CCG, to share what they knew about the practice. We reviewed the latest 2015/16 data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and the latest national GP patient survey results (July 2016). We also reviewed policies, procedures and other relevant information the practice provided before and during the day of inspection.

We carried out an announced inspection on 29 November 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff, which included a GP, a nurses, a practice manager and several members of reception and administration staff.
- Spoke with four patients.
- Reviewed 28 comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and treated in the reception area.

- Spoke with two members of the patient participation group, who informed us how well the practice engaged with them.
- Looked at templates and information the practice used to deliver patient care and treatment plans.

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

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

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

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

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 comprehensive system in place for reporting, recording and investigating significant events.

- The partners promoted a culture of openness, transparency and honesty and we saw there was a comprehensive 'being open' policy in place.
- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and complete the electronic incident recording form. The practice was also aware of their wider duty to report incidents to external bodies such as Airedale Wharfedale and Craven CCG and NHS England. This included the recording and reporting of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour.
- When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, we were informed patients received support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We saw evidence the practice carried out a thorough analysis of significant events as part of IG Medical. We saw several examples where the practice had changed or developed systems arising from the learning taken from significant events. For example patients were complaining of an inability to make telephone contact with the surgery at 8am and obtain an appointment. This was identified by the practice as a risk to patients who had an urgent need to be seen and a frustration across the system. The practice introduced a GP telephone triage system for all calls requesting a GP appointment. At the start of the telephone triage introduction they received 247 calls for appointments. These requests resulted in only 147 actual appointments being required. As the system became embedded with staff and patients, the practice could demonstrate a reduction in the actual number of appointments patients needed. This was due to many issues which could be dealt with by a clinician over the telephone. There has also been a reduction in the number of complaints regarding telephone access to appointments.
- All significant events relating to medicines were monitored by the local CCG medicines management team. Any concerns or issues were then fed back to the practice to act upon.

- All safety alerts were cascaded to staff, discussed at practice meetings and actioned as appropriate.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.

- Arrangements which reflected relevant legislation and local requirements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. Policies clearly outlined whom to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. We saw laminated posters displaying safeguarding information and contact details, in all the consulting and treatment rooms. The GP acted in the capacity of safeguarding lead and had been trained to the appropriate level three. We were told the GP safeguarding lead worked closely with health visitors, and although attendance at safeguarding case conferences was difficult, the practice always ensured that reports were submitted when requested. The practice could evidence the number of children who were on a child protection plan.
- Staff had received training relevant to their role and could demonstrate their understanding of safeguarding.
- A notice was displayed in the waiting room, advising patients that a chaperone was available if required. A chaperone is a person who acts as a safeguard and witness for a patient and health care professional during a medical examination or procedure. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had a risk assessment in place. It was recorded in the patient's records when a chaperone had been in attendance by the clinician.
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. We saw up to date cleaning schedules in place. There was nominated infection prevention and control (IPC) lead and an IPC protocol in place. All staff were up to date with IPC training. We saw evidence that an IPC audit had taken place within the last 12 months and action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- Processes for handling repeat prescriptions had been updated. Regular medication audits were carried out with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams to

Are services safe?

ensure the practice was prescribing in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads and blank prescriptions were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGDs), in line with legislation, had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment).

- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment, in line with the practice recruitment policy, for example proof of identification, references and Disclosing and Barring Service (DBS) checks.

Monitoring risks to patients

The practice had procedures in place for assessing, monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. We saw evidence of:

- Risk assessments to monitor the safety of the premises, such as the control of substances hazardous to health and legionella (legionella is a bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings). There was also a health and safety policy which was accessible to staff.
- An up to date fire risk assessment which had been undertaken by a local provider.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was regularly tested and calibrated to ensure the equipment was safe to use and in good working order.

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had arrangements in place to respond to emergencies and major incidents. We saw:

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff were up to date with fire and basic life support training.
- There was a fire evacuation plan in place which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the building. Regular fire drills were carried out and staff were aware of their responsibilities.
- There was emergency equipment available, which included a defibrillator and oxygen, with pads and masks suitable for children and adults.
- Emergency medicines were stored in a secure area which was easily accessible for staff.
- The practice had an effective accident/incident recording and reporting system in place.
- 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 and was available on the practice intranet and in hard copy. The plan also included a shared arrangement with a nearby practice to ensure that services could still be delivered should there be a catastrophic failure of the building.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met peoples' needs. Updates were also discussed at GP and nursing team meetings.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.
- GPs attended CCG meetings with other practices, to look at the joint strategic needs assessment of the local area and through this better plan the delivery of services to meet local demand.

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). We saw minutes from meetings which could evidence QOF was discussed within the practice and any areas for action were identified.

The most recent published results (2015/16) showed the practice as IG Medical had achieved 100% of the total number of points available (CCG average 97% and national average 95%), with 13% exception reporting; CCG average 12% and 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). Data showed:

- Performance for some diabetes related indicators was better or similar to the CCG and national averages. For example, 90% of patients on the diabetes register had a recorded foot examination completed in the preceding 12 months; CCG average 84% and England averages of 88%.

- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. For example, 87% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had an agreed care plan documented in the preceding 12 months; CCG average 94%, England average 89%.

The practice used clinical audit, peer review, local and national benchmarking to improve quality. We reviewed two audits which had been completed in the preceding 12 months, these identified compliance against recognised guidelines and performance identified areas for improvement. Through this process the practice was able to demonstrate where improvements had been made. For example:

- An audit on the prescription of anticoagulant drugs to patients with Atrial Fibrillation (a heart condition) demonstrated a reduction in the number of patients untreated.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment. Evidence we reviewed showed:

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff had received mandatory training that included safeguarding, fire procedures, infection prevention and control, basic life support and information governance awareness. The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed staff which also covered those topics. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training. They were also supported to attend role specific training and updates.
- 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 online resources and discussions with other clinicians
- All GPs were up to date with their revalidation and appraisals.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Since the merger with Ilkley and Wharfedale Medical Practice the staffing structure was revised and modified.
- During the merger process the practice had held a number of engagement days explaining the merger and ensuring staff worked to standard policies and procedure and were fully engaged in the process to maintain standards of patient care.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

The practice had timely access to information needed, such as medical records, investigation and test results, to plan and deliver care and treatment for patients. They could evidence how they followed up patients who had an unplanned hospital admission or had attended accident and emergency (A&E).

Staff worked with other health and social care services to understand and meet the complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. Information was shared between services, with the patient's consent. We saw evidence that multidisciplinary team meetings, to discuss patients and clinical issues, took place on a monthly basis.

Personalised care plans were in place for those patients who had complex needs, and were at a high risk of an unplanned hospital admission or had palliative care needs. These were reviewed and updated as needed. Information regarding end of life care was shared with out-of-hours services, to minimise any distress to the patient and their family.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice had a policy regarding consent and staff we spoke with were aware of it and had a good understanding of the principles of consent.

We saw a comprehensive mental capacity policy in place which included an assessment of capacity, principles of best interest, advance directives, referrals and advocacy. Staff could demonstrate their understanding of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. We were informed that a patients' consent to care and treatment was sought in line with these. Where a patient's mental capacity to provide consent was unclear, an assessment was undertaken and the outcome recorded in the patient's record.

There was a policy in place regarding the use of Gillick competency and Fraser guidelines (these are used in medical law to decide whether a child aged 16 years or

younger is able to consent to his or her own medical treatment, without the need for parental permission or knowledge.) Staff could demonstrate their understanding and appropriate use of these.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support and signposted those to relevant services. These included patients:

- who were in the last 12 months of their lives
- required healthy lifestyle advice, such as weight management, smoking cessation and alcohol consumption.
- who acted in the capacity of a carer and may have required additional support

We were informed (and saw evidence in some instances) that Grassington Medical Practice:

- Participated in Airedale, Wharfedale and Craven Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) initiatives to reduce the rate of acute admission to hospital, and attendance at accident and emergency department. A recognised tool was used to identify patients who were considered to be at risk of frailty. These patients were reviewed and health care provided as needed.
- Had good working relationships with local the neighbourhood team and health trainers, to support patients with any additional health or social needs.
- Encouraged patients to attend national screening programmes for cervical, bowel and breast cancer. Patients were contacted and reminders were sent out to those eligible for cervical screening. The uptake rate for cervical screening in the preceding five years was 81%, compared to the CCG average of 84% and England averages of 82%.
- Had failsafe 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. In addition there was a computer recall system in place to remind patients when their cervical smear test was due.
- Carried out immunisations in line with the childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates were comparable or better than CCG averages. For example, children aged up to 24 months ranged from 91% to 96% (CCG average 74% to 98%) and for five year olds they ranged from 92% to 100% (CCG average 72% to 93%)..

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Offered health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40 to 74. Where abnormalities or risk

factors were identified, appropriate follow-ups were undertaken. In addition, health checks were offered for all patients over the age of 75 who had not seen a clinician in the previous 12 months.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

During our inspection we observed that:

- Members of staff were courteous and helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.
- There was a private room should patients in the reception area wish to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed.
- Curtains were provided in consulting and treatment rooms to maintain the patient's dignity during examinations, investigations and treatment.
- Doors to consulting and treatment rooms were closed during patient consultations and that we could not hear any conversations that may have been taking place.
- Chaperones were available for those patients who requested one and it was recorded in the patient's record.

All of the 28 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. Many cited individual staff as being very supportive and kind.

During the inspection we spoke with four patients and members of the patient participation group, whose views and comments were also positive.

Data from the national GP patient survey showed respondents rated the practice similar to other practices for many questions regarding how they were treated compared to other local and national practices. For example:

- 88% of respondents said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at listening to them (CCG average 91%, national average 89%)
- 86% of respondents said the last GP they saw or spoke to was good at giving them enough time (CCG average 88%, national 87%)
- 97% of respondents said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at listening to them (CCG average 92%, national 91%)
- 100% of respondents said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at giving them enough time (CCG and national average 92%)

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

- The NHS e-Referral service (previously known as choose and book) was used with patients as appropriate.
- Longer appointments and additional support were available for those patients who may have had difficulty with understanding their options.
- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- Information leaflets were available in an easy to read format.
- The practice is participating in the Serious Illness Care Programme UK which is a programme of structured conversations between the patient and doctor to identify what matters most to the patient and set the goals and priorities as they look ahead to their treatment and care. There was insufficient data to evaluate the impact of this programme at the time of the inspection.

Patient comments we received on the day of the inspection were all positive regarding their involvement in decision making and choices regarding their care and treatment.

Data from the national GP patient survey showed respondents rated the practice comparable other local and national practices. For example:

- 87% of respondents said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments (CCG average 89%, national 86%)
- 87% of respondents said the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments (CCG and national average 90%)

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

The practice worked jointly with palliative care and district nursing teams to ensure patients who required palliative care, and their families, were supported as needed. We were informed that if a patient had experienced a recent bereavement, this was followed up with a telephone call to the next of kin by the person best known to the family if this was seen to be appropriate on an individual basis.

There were 25 patients registered as receiving care and 23 patients registered with the practice as carers which

Are services caring?

represented less than 1% of the practice population known to be carers. These patients were offered personal health checks and signposted to a local carers organisation. The practice recognised that the number identified was low (comparable with other practices across the CCG). They were looking at ways of improving data quality and ensure that all patients who acted in the capacity of carer were identified.

We saw there were notices and leaflets in the patient waiting area, informing patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. There was also information available on the practice website.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice worked with NHS England and Airedale Wharfedale and Craven CCG to review the needs of its local population and to secure improvements to services where these were identified. These included:

- Home visits for patients who could not physically access the practice and were in need of medical attention
- Urgent access appointments for children and patients who were in need.
- Online booking of appointments and requests for repeat prescriptions.
- Telephone consultations
- Longer appointments as needed
- Extended hours access
- Travel vaccinations which were available on the NHS
- Disabled facilities, a hearing loop and interpretation services

Access to the service

The practice is open between Mondays to Friday 8.00am to 6.30pm. The practice offered a late night surgery until 7.30pm each Tuesday for those not able to attend in normal surgery. A range of appointments were available throughout the practice opening hours. When the practice is closed out-of-hours services, and telephone access from 6pm to 6.30pm are provided by Local Care Direct, which can be accessed via the surgery telephone number or by calling the NHS 111 service.

People on the day of the inspection told us 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 home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Data from the national GP patient survey showed respondents rated the practice comparable to other practices. For example:

- 92% of respondents said the last appointment they got was convenient (CCG and national average 92%)

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- The 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.
- The practice kept a record of all written and verbal complaints.
- All complaints and concerns were discussed at the practice meeting.
- There was information displayed in the waiting area to help patients understand the complaints system.

There had been five complaints received in the last 12 months. The complaints were wide ranging and no themes were identified. We found they had been satisfactorily handled. Lessons had been learned and action taken to improve the quality of care. For example concerns were raised by a patient with regard to the change of location for the breast screening service in the location. The practice raised the issue with NHS England who commissioned the service and a solution achieved whereby the patients could refer themselves to the original service location. The practice wrote to the complainant and discussed the situation at the Grassington patient talk in November 2016.

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.

- There was a statement of purpose submitted to the Care Quality Commission which identified the practice values. For example, to provide high quality services to patients and be committed to improvements.
- The practice had a strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.
- All staff knew and understood the vision and values of the practice.

There was a strong caring patient centred ethos amongst the practice staff and a desire to provide high quality care. This was reflected in their passion and enthusiasm when speaking to them about the practice, patients and delivery of care.

Governance arrangements

The practice had good governance processes in place which supported the delivery of good quality care and safety to patients. This ensured there was:

- A good understanding of staff roles and responsibilities. The GPs and nurses had lead key areas, such as mental health, safeguarding, long term conditions management and infection prevention and control.
- Practice specific policies were implemented, updated, regularly reviewed and available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of practice performance. Practice meetings were held weekly with the doctors, where practice performance, significant events and complaints were discussed.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which was used to monitor quality and drive improvements.
- Effective arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks.
- Business continuity and comprehensive succession planning in place. For example, the practice had clear plans in place in the event of catastrophic loss of services demonstrating plans for cross working with other practices in the area.

Leadership and culture

The practice 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 and had a comprehensive 'being open' culture in place. We were informed that when there were unexpected or unintended incidents regarding care and treatment, the patients affected were given reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology.

On the day of the inspection the GP partners and practice manager could demonstrate they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice.

- There was a clear leadership structure.
- We were informed that the GP partners and manager were visible, approachable and took the time to listen.
- Staff informed us they felt respected, valued and supported.
- We saw evidence of regular meetings being held within the practice, such as nursing and administration
- The practice minuted a range of multidisciplinary meetings they held with other health and social care professionals to discuss patient care and complex cases, such as palliative care and safeguarding concerns.

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

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients and staff. It proactively sought feedback from:

- Patients who were members of the patient participation group (PPG). The PPG met regularly, and felt confident in submitting proposals for improvements to the practice, such as, making improvements to the waiting area and door arrangements to benefit disabled access.
- The NHS Friend and Family Test, complaints and compliments received.
- Staff through meetings, discussions and the appraisal process. Staff told us they would not hesitate to raise any concerns and felt involved and engaged within the practice to improve service delivery and outcomes for patients.

Continuous improvement

There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

team was forward thinking and part of local and national schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example the practice worked closely with their partner practice in Ilkley to improve the health of the local

population by developing new models of care such as improved access to appointments at either site and shared policies and procedures available to all staff on the computer system.