

Dr Abbas Awad, Dr Bose Mohan, Dr Fazal Omer

Quality Report

West View Road
Hartlepool
Cleveland
TS24 9LJ

Tel: 01429890400

Website: www.westviewmillenniumsurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 24 May 2017

Date of publication: 07/07/2017

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Dr Abbas Awad, Dr Bose Mohan, Dr Fazal Omer	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at West View Millennium Surgery on 24 May 2017. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and a system in place for reporting and recording significant events. All opportunities for learning from internal and external incidents were maximised.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

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

The provider was aware of 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). Examples we reviewed showed the practice complied with these requirements.

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



- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed, we found there was an effective system for reporting and recording significant events; lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. When things went wrong patients were informed as soon as practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again. These were also discussed at the practice meetings and staff signed to confirm they had read and understood the minutes of the meetings.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff demonstrated that they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- The practice had adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

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 compared to the local and national average.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement. The practice had a proactive approach to audit to improve patient safety and well-being.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.
- End of life care was coordinated with other services involved.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



Summary of findings

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Survey information we reviewed showed that patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was 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



- The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population. The life expectancy in the practice is nine years lower for men and seven years for women in the most deprived areas. They have introduced a number of initiatives to address issues relating to death by smoking, reducing smoking in pregnancy and alcohol related hospital admissions. The practice provided a range of services and linked with other services. Examples of these were smoking cessation, same day access to appointments in the practice and hosting a public health trainer who providing a twelve week programme in the practice to improve health and well-being.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting conditions, including patients with a condition other than cancer and patients living with dementia.
- Patients we spoke with 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 evidence from two examples reviewed showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.

Summary of findings

- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- An overarching governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received inductions, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. In two examples we reviewed we saw evidence the practice complied with these requirements.
- The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents and sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on. The practice engaged with the patient participation group.
- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels. Staff training was a priority and was built into staff rotas.

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

Good



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

- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs. The practice kept a register of house bound patients who were regularly reviewed and visited.
- The practice identified at an early stage older patients who may need palliative care as they were approaching the end of life. It involved older patients in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs. The practice have established a register of patients identified as at risk of admission. Following discharge from hospital, the practice reviews the patients' needs and links with multidisciplinary teams, ensuring appropriate care planning and community services are in place to prevent further hospital admissions
- Where older patients had complex needs, the practice shared summary care records with local care services. Examples of these were working with other members of the primary healthcare team, including monthly meetings to discuss case management, including district nurses, Macmillan nurses and community matrons.
- All patients have a named GP, enabling the practice to focus on giving elderly people the care they need and prevent unnecessary admissions to hospital. All patients who are identified as being frail have a code in their medical records which prompts the clinicians during review. A register of these patients is kept including the severity of frailty.
- All clinicians have done an e-learning programme on Dementia and every patient over 75 years at review has an enquiry regarding memory and if concerns are identified referred for memory assessment.

The practice have identified and recorded carers details, ensuring they have consent where required to share information with the patient's carer.

Summary of findings

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 long-term disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Nationally reported data for 2015/2016 showed that outcomes for patients with long term conditions were similar to the local CCG and national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5mmol/l or less was 82% compared to the national average of 80% and the CCG average of 83%.
- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- There were emergency processes for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.

All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for 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

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found there were systems 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 accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Immunisation rates were relatively low for all standard childhood immunisations. The practice is in a high deprivation area, they introduced a number of initiatives to improve uptake. The practice has a designated member of the administration team who leads on the call and recall of children who were due childhood immunisation. All children who are overdue immunisation have an alert posted on the front page of their medical records to alert staff if they contact or attend the practice.
- Patients told us, on the day of inspection, that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.

Good



Summary of findings

- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice worked with midwives, health visitors and school nurses to support this population group. For example, in the provision of ante-natal, post-natal and child health surveillance clinics and safeguarding meetings.
- The practice had emergency processes for acutely ill children and young people and for acute pregnancy complications.

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 these populations 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.

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, and those with a learning disability.
- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice had information available for vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed 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.

Good



Summary of findings

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good



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

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- < >
The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and dementia. People with a diagnosis of Dementia are invited for an annual review and signposted to appropriate services in the community and local support groups.
- The practice had a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving medicines for mental health needs.
- Nationally reported data from 2015/2016 showed the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months was 96%. This was comparable to the local CCG average of 93% and above the national average of 89%.
- Children with Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) receiving medicines were offered 6 monthly reviews.
- Patients with drug and alcohol abuse problems were offered health assessments and referral for support if required to help with reducing their reliance on drugs and alcohol, the practice uses the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) tool to help identify people at risk.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.
- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published on 7 July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above local and national averages. 215 survey forms were distributed and 115 were returned. This represented 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 85%.
- 82% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 73%.
- 85% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to CCG average of 77% the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection.

We received 27 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients described the service they received from all staff at the practice as good, caring, friendly, professional, and polite and said the staff treated them with dignity and respect.

We distributed 11 patient questionnaires during the inspection. All 11 patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring.

Results from the Friends and Family test (FFT) from February 2017 showed 19 responses. Thirteen were extremely likely and five were likely to recommend the practice. One patient did not respond.

Feedback on the comments cards, the questionnaires and from the FFT reflected the results of the National Patient Survey.

Dr Abbas Awad, Dr Bose Mohan, Dr Fazal Omer

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Dr Abbas Awad, Dr Bose Mohan, Dr Fazal Omer

The West View Millennium Surgery, West View Road Hartlepool Cleveland, TS24 9LJ is situated to the north of Hartlepool town in an area of high deprivation. The practice provides services under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract with NHS England, North East Area Team. The practice list size of 6557 is predominantly white British background with a small number of patients from ethnic minorities.

The practice has three male GP partners and one salaried GP female. There are three practice nurses and one nurse practitioner. There is a practice manager and a team of secretarial, administration and reception staff.

The practice is open between 8.30am to 6pm Monday to Friday with the exception of Thursday when the practice opens between 8.30 and 5.30. The practice closes for lunch each day between 12- 1.30pm. There is a GP available to deal with any emergencies. Following patient feedback the practice will start to provide appointments from 8am on a Thursday from June 2017.

The practice score one on the deprivation measurement scale, which is the most deprived, the deprivation scale goes from one to ten, with one being the most deprived. People living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. The overall practice deprivation score is worse than the England average.

The practice, along with all other practices in the Hartlepool and Stockton CCG area have a contractual agreement for NHS 111 service to provide Out of Hours (OOHs) services from 6:30pm to 8am. The following organisations collectively provide urgent care services in the area North Tees and Hartlepool Foundation Trust, North East Ambulance Service and Hartlepool and Stockton Health (Federation) agreed with the NHS England area team. When the practice is closed, patients use the NHS 111 service to contact the OOHs provider. Information for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is available in the waiting area, in the practice information leaflet and on the practice website and telephone answering machine.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 24 May 2017.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, nurse practitioner, practice nurse, practice manager, deputy practice manager, secretary and administration staff) and spoke with the chair of the Patient Participation Group (PPG).
- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area.
- Reviewed a 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.
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver 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 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 living with dementia).

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was a system for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- From the sample of two documented examples we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed. The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, following an incident when the answer machine (providing patients with information on what to do when the practice was closed) had not been activated. The practice devised a double checklist and systems to ensure this did not occur in the future. Another example identified that a diabetic patient attending a one stop shop outside of the practice had been identified as having a high blood pressure but had not been told to contact their GP. The practice worked with the other organisations to improve the process and ensure that all concerns were addressed and patients were advised to visit their GPs.
- The practice also monitored trends in significant events and evaluated any action taken.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to minimise risks to patient safety.

- Arrangements for safeguarding reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding.
- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three.
- A notice in the waiting room and consulting rooms advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).

The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene.

- We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- The practice practitioner was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. However disposable hand towels used in the practice were not in a dispenser or wall mounted.

The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice minimised risks to patient safety (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal).

Are services safe?

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. However the practice had not signed up to shared care for some medicines. However they regularly checked that patients receiving these high risk medicines were monitored. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems to monitor their use. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for clinical conditions within their expertise. They received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.

We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, evidence of satisfactory conduct in previous employments in the form of references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the DBS.

Monitoring risks to patients

There were procedures for assessing, monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety.

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.
- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments 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).
- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system to ensure enough staff were on duty to meet the needs of patients. Staff provided cover for sickness and holidays and regular locums were engaged when required.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely. However we noted that the defibrillator, oxygen and emergency medicines were stored in three different places. The practice were going to risk assess the storage of their emergency equipment.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan 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

Clinicians were aware of relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published QOF results were 98% of the total number of points available which is 1% above the CCG average and 3% above the National average. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 95% which was comparable to the local CCG average of 87% and the national average of 90%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100% which was comparable to the local CCG average of 96% and above the national average of 93%.
- The percentage of patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) who had had a review, undertaken by a healthcare professional, including an assessment of breathlessness in the preceding 12 months was 98%. This was above the local CCG average of 92% and the national average of 90%.
- The percentage of patients with asthma who had had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months was 95%, which was above the local CCG average of 80% and the national average of 76%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- There had been five completed two cycle clinical audits completed in the last two years were the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice had also completed five mini audits covering topics such as emergency admissions, antibiotic and lithium prescribing. Although second cycles had not been completed for these audits to date we saw evidence that they had been shared and discussed with the clinical team and improvements implemented.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, improving the management of patients taking novel oral anticoagulants NOACs a blood thinning medicine. The second cycle demonstrates that that all patients now had the recommended monitoring, alert cards, and bleeding risk scores in place as per the guidelines. Other examples were improving paracetamol prescribing and improving the coding and identification of patients with Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD). Also monitoring patients prescribed drugs by the mental health team under shared care agreements according to National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines June 2015 ensuring patients safety.

Effective staffing

Evidence reviewed showed that staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, those nurses reviewing patients with long-term conditions had undertaken relevant training and attended regular skill 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 on line resources and discussions at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs and nurses. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- From the sample of six documented examples we reviewed, we found that the practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services. We also saw that the practice had developed a checking system to continually monitor referrals and attendance.

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

The practice ensured that end of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of different patients, including those who may be vulnerable because of their circumstances.

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, alcohol cessation and drug misuse. The practice also hosted a public health trainer who offered a twelve week course to improve health and well-being.
- The practice signposted people who needed support for alcohol or drug problems to local counselling services.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 88%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 84% and above the national average of 81%.

Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given were below the CCG and national averages. For example, rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 72% to 90% and five year olds from 70% to 90%. However the practice was aware and had developed a number of strategies to address the low rates.

There was a policy to offer telephone or written reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74 years. The

practice had been commended by Hartlepool public health team for completing a high number of healthy heart and lung checks. 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

During our inspection we observed that 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.
- Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs. The practice had developed a list of needs at the reception desk where people could discreetly point to the list of services required. Examples of these were pregnancy test, cervical smear, and urine bottle and faeces container.
- Patients could be treated by a clinician of the same sex.

All of the 27 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.

Eleven patients completed questionnaires and we spoke with one member of the Patient Participation Group (PPG). They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comments highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required. We received one comment about what a patient felt was unnecessary questions by a member of the administration team.

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

- 92% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 89% and the national average of 89%.

- 92% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 85%.
- 96% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 94%.
- 92% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 85%.
- 97% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 94% and the national average of 91%.
- 99% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 92%.
- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 98% and the national average of 97%.
- 98% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 98% national average of 97%.
- 95% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 87%.

The percentage of patients in the GP patient survey that said the GP was poor or very poor at giving them enough time and listening to them was 2%; this was comparable to the local CCG average of 3% and national average of 4%. The percentage of patients in the GP patient survey that said the nurse was poor or very poor at giving them enough time and listening to them was 0%; this was comparable to the local CCG average of 1% and national average of 2%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

Are services caring?

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were similar to or above the local and national averages. For example

- 91% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 96%.
- 90% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 84% national average of 82%.
- 99% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 90%.
- 97% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff that might be able to support them.

- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital).

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website. Support for isolated or house-bound patients included signposting to relevant support and volunteer services.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 2% of the practice list as carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them and annual health checks.

Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent them a sympathy card and on some occasions attended funerals. The call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs 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 understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population:

- The practice currently does not offer extended hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions. There were early and ongoing conversations with these patients about their end of life care as part of their wider treatment and care planning.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice sent text message reminders of appointments and test results.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were accessible facilities for patients with disabilities and interpretation services available.
- Other reasonable adjustments were made and action was taken to remove barriers when patients find it hard to use or access services. For example the use of a fax machine to enable a deaf patient to communicate with the practice.
- The practice has considered and implemented the NHS England Accessible Information Standard to ensure that disabled patients receive information in formats that they can understand and receive appropriate support to help them to communicate.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am to 6pm Monday to Tuesday, Wednesday to Thursday 8.30am to 5.30 pm and Friday 8.30am to 6pm. Appointments were available between these times. The practice was closed 12pm to 1.30pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to two weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 79% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 77% and the national average of 76%.
- 97% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 70% and national average of 73%.
- 87% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.
- 91% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 92%.
- 82% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 73%.
- 81% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 65%.

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

The practice had a system to assess:

- whether a home visit was clinically necessary and
- the urgency of the need for medical attention.

When patients requested a home visit the details of their symptoms were recorded and an electronic task sent directly to the GP or nurse practitioner a paper copy was also printed. If necessary the GP or nurse would call the patient back to gather further information so an informed decision could be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

The practice had a system 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. This was available in reception and on the web site.

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way and with openness and transparency. Lessons

were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. An example of this was improving the communication regarding home visits to ensure requests are not missed. All requests are put on screen the same day, double checked with the screen diary and a paper copy printed to ensure no visit is missed if there is a computer problem.

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 clear 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 and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure and staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs and nurses had lead roles in key areas. Lead GPs and nurse had been identified for governance, safeguarding, and infection control and information governance.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. These were updated and reviewed regularly.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained. Practice meetings were held monthly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.
- We saw evidence from minutes of a meetings structure that allowed for lessons to be learned and shared following significant events and complaints.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care.

They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. From the sample of two documented examples we reviewed we found that the practice had systems to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

- The practice held and minuted a range of multi-disciplinary meetings including meetings with district nurses and social workers to monitor vulnerable patients. GPs, where required, met with health visitors to monitor vulnerable families and safeguarding concerns.
- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so. We noted team held regular team social and fundraising events for local charities and to promote team working.
- 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 and staff. It proactively sought feedback from

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, ensuring all non-clinical staff wore name badges and improving access to podiatry.
- the NHS Friends and Family test, complaints and compliments received
- staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. The practice had plans to extend the practice building to meet the growing needs of the practice population.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Enforcement actions

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.