

Streatham Park Surgery

Quality Report

91 Mitcham Lane

Streatham

London

SW16 6LY

Tel: 020 8835 0077

Website: www.streathamparksurgery.com

Date of inspection visit: 2 February 2016

Date of publication: 18/04/2016

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	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Streatham Park Surgery	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12
Action we have told the provider to take	21

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Streatham Park Practice on 2 February 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed with the exception of storage of vaccines.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.

The area where the provider must make improvement is:

- The practice must ensure that adequate cold chain processes are in place and must ensure that actions are immediately taken if refrigeration temperatures are outside of the safe range.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

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

Requires improvement



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- The practice's refrigerators were temperature checked every day. However, in many cases temperatures were out of the safe range and no actions had been taken.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



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

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the National GP Patient Survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Summary of findings

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example the practice had been involved with the local PACT service to provide developed care for high risk or vulnerable patients.
- 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.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.

Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits 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.
- Indicators for the management of long term conditions such as diabetes or hypertension were similar to or better than national averages.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.
- The practice participated with the local Planning All Care Together (PACT) initiative that provided comprehensive care to patients with multiple long term conditions.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- 79% of all patients with asthma had received a review in the previous twelve months.

Good



Summary of findings

- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- 78% of eligible patients had received a cervical smear test in the last five years. This is similar to national averages.
- 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, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- The practice was open on Saturday morning for those patients who could not access appointments during normal working hours.

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 multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



Summary of findings

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- 84% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average/ worse than the national average.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results for 2014/15 showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and nine survey forms were distributed and 90 were returned. This represented a completion rate of 29%, and a total of two per cent of the practice's patient list.

- 75% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 79% and a national average of 73%.
- 82% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 85%, national average 85%).
- 82% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 86%, national average 85%).

- 69% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 82%, national average 78%).

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. In particular patients stated that staff at the practice were courteous and that they were treated with dignity and respect.

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

Streatham Park Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Streatham Park Surgery

Streatham Park Surgery is based in two sites in the London Boroughs of Wandsworth and Southwark. The practice has two partners (one male and one female) who work a combined 14 clinical sessions per week manage both sites. The main site is based in a converted shop. The address of this site is 91 Mitcham Lane, Streatham, London, SW16 6LY. The branch site is also based in a converted shop. The address for this site is 139 Franciscan Road, Tooting, London, SW17 8DS.

The practice is based in an area with a mixed demographic. There is a high level of ethnic diversity among the practice population and there are a significant number of patients for whom English is not their first language. Both partners speak Urdu and Punjabi and will on occasion consult in that language.

The practice has approximately 4,430 patients on its list. The practice employs salaried GP and a nurse practitioner who both work full time in the practice. There is also a further practice nurse and a health care assistant who work three days per week. Both partners are also trainers and they also teach undergraduates from St George's Hospital. However, at the time of the inspection there were no GP trainees attached to the practice.

The practice is contracted to provide Personal Medical Services (PMS) and is registered with the CQC for the following regulated activities: treatment of disease, disorder or injury, maternity and midwifery services, surgical procedures, and diagnostic and screening procedures at two locations.

The practice is open between 8:00am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are from 9:00am to 1:00pm every morning and 4:00pm to 6:00pm daily with the exception of Tuesday and Wednesday afternoons at Franciscan Road when the practice is closed. Extended surgery hours are offered on Saturdays from 10:00am to 12:00pm at Mitcham Lane (every week) and from 9:00am to 10:30am at Franciscan Road (on alternate weeks).

The practice had not been inspected prior to this inspection.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive inspection programme.

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

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before 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 2 February 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (including both partners, the practice manager, the nurse practitioner and three receptionists/administrative staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

- Is it safe?

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.
- Serious event reporting could be accessed by all staff on the computer system.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, in the case of a patient who had been wrongly identified and a letter had been sent to a patient with the same name, the practice had implemented a system whereby middle names and dates of birth were checked before letters were issued and the letter contained the patients middle name.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had some 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 that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection level 3, and nurses to a minimum level 3.

- 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 check (DBS check). (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable Health Care Assistants to administer vaccinations after specific training when a doctor or nurse were on the premises.
- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.
- There were 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.

The arrangements for managing medicines, specifically vaccinations and other medications that required refrigeration, were not consistent. The practice had implemented a cold chain policy and had trained

Are services safe?

administrative staff to check the temperatures at both sites. However, in the two months prior to the inspection the temperature of the refrigerators at Merton Road had been recorded above eight degrees centigrade for part of the day 18 times (12 of which were above ten degrees centigrade) and below two degrees centigrade for part of the day every day. At Franciscan Road over the same period, on all but two days the temperature was above eight degrees for part of the day and on all but five days the temperature was below two degrees centigrade for part of the day. On the day of the visit the refrigerators that we checked appeared to be working correctly. Given the very large variations in temperature recorded, it was unclear whether the machines were faulty, or if the staff reading the temperatures were not clear how to do so. However, in none of the incidences of temperatures being measured outside of normal levels had action been taken. The practice indicated following the inspection that they had purchased new thermometers and had trained staff in how to measure temperatures.

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 that 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 at one site, but one was not available at Franciscan Road on the day of the inspection, although following the inspection the practice have put one in place. Oxygen was in place at both sites 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 fit for use.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 99% of the total number of points available, with 11% 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). The level of exception reporting is higher than the national average. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from QOF and other information provided by the practice showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the CCG and national average. The practice had scored 100% of QOF points for diabetes for 324 patients on the diabetes register. The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol was 5mmol/l or less was 91%, compared to a national average of 81%.
- The practice scored 100% on QOF for hypertension indicators for 827 patients. The percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months was 150/90mmHg or less was 87%, compared to a national average of 84%.

- The practice scored 96% for mental health indicators for 110 patients. One of the practice partners told us that the practice was in the top centile for poor mental health. Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the CCG and national average. For example, 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 97%, compared to a national average of 89%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been seven clinical audits completed in the last two years, three of these were completed two cycle audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. We saw that audit findings were discussed in meetings and that action points were in place. During a review of Tramadol prescribing there was clear detail in each patients record as to whether Tramadol was the most effective medication, and we saw that changes had been made where required.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.

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. It covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff for example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions. Staff administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- 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 services 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. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated. We saw that care plans were individualised and patients were provided with advice as to how they might better manage their own health.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.

- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 78%, which was comparable to the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 77% to 95 % and five year olds from 77% to 92%.

Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s (73%) and at risk groups (55%) were comparable to CCG and national averages.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. 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 two members of the patient participation group. They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 91% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 89%.
- 87% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 88%, national average 87%).
- 95% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%).
- 84% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 85%, national average 85%).

- 80% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 87%, national average 91%).
- 85% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 87%, national average 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 on 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, although results were slightly lower than local and national averages. For example:

- 76% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 86%.
- 74% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 81%, national average 82%).
- 79% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 82%, national average 85%).

Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language, and doctors in the practice could consult in two other languages. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 1.4% of the practice list as carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Are services caring?

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 had developed a thorough system for following up patients with poor mental health, who represented a higher than average proportion of the practice population.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on Saturday mornings from 9:00am to 12pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability, up to three times the normal appointment length of 10 minutes.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- The practice took part in the local Planning All Care Together (PACT) initiative for developed management of high risk and vulnerable patients.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately/were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8:00am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 9:00am to 12:00pm every morning and 4:00pm to 6:00pm daily. Extended surgery hours were offered every Saturday from

10:00am- to 12:00pm at Mitcham Lane and from 9:00am to 10:30am on alternate weekends at Franciscan Road. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to two weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 71% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 79% and national average of 75%.
- 75% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 79%, national average 73%).
- 43% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 57%, national average 59%).

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

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 including notices in the practice, in the practice leaflet and on the website.

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained through audit and review of systems. The practice also held a full range of practice and team meetings at which relevant issues were discussed and shared with staff.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

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

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

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

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

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients, the public and staff. It proactively sought patients' feedback and engaged patients in the delivery of the service.

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through regular team meetings. Staff told us they would not

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

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

Continuous improvement

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	Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment
Maternity and midwifery services	Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.: Safe care and treatment
Surgical procedures	
Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	How the regulation was not being met: The practice did not store vaccines in line with cold chain best practice guidance. This was in breach of regulation 12(2)(b)(e)(f) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.