

Newton's Practice

Quality Report

The Health Centre
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 3BB

Tel: 01444412280

Website: www.newtonspractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 30 August 2016

Date of publication: 16/01/2017

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

Requires improvement



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?

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Newtons Practice	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14
Action we have told the provider to take	24

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Newtons Practice on 30 August 2016. Overall the practice is rated as requires improvement.

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

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were not always assessed and well managed.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said 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 sought feedback from staff and patients; however it was not always acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.
- Medicine management practices did not always keep patients safe.

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

Summary of findings

- The provider must ensure that medicines fridges are kept secure at all times.
- The provider must ensure that healthcare assistants who carry out vaccines and immunisations do so under a clear authorisation which is maintained on record.
- The provider must ensure a record of cleaning clinical areas and equipment is maintained to support infection control audits.
- The provider must ensure that the feedback from patients and other stakeholders is managed and responded to.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- The provider should review and continue to take action to identify carers who are patients at their practice.
- The provider should keep minutes of the regular nurse meetings to assist with future training, development and any quality assurance audits.
- The provider should review the records maintained for staff training to ensure they are up to date.

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 with GP colleagues to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. However these were not consistently documented to demonstrate the approach to learning and dissemination of information.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were not always assessed and well managed. For example the security of medicines was not satisfactory.
- Infection control systems did not ensure the practice mitigated the risk of infection.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



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

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.

Summary of findings

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

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

Good



Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as requires improvement for being well-led.

- The practice had a vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- 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.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients; however it had not always acted on this information. For example the friends and family data had not been analysed and submitted and feedback from the Patient Participation Group following the last survey had not been responded to.
- The patient participation group was active and spoke positively about the practice team and their support.

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 provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 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.
- The practice had regular meetings with the Proactive Care Team to help avoid admissions. The practice provides an enhanced service for unplanned admissions – a register of the most vulnerable patients - with care plans and reviews following any unplanned hospital admissions.

Requires improvement



People with long term conditions

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the national average in some areas and higher in others. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 82% compared to the CCG and national average of 78%. The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 94 % compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 88%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

- 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.

Families, children and young people

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 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.
- 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.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 88%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 84%, the same as the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.

Requires improvement



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 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.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

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

Requires improvement



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The provider was rated as requires improvement for safe and well-led and good for effective, caring and responsive. The issues identified as requiring improvement overall affected all patients including this population group. There were, however, examples of good practice.

- 85% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was similar to the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the clinical commissioning group (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 92% compared to the CCG average of 94% and national average of 90%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

- 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.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing below or similar to the local and national averages. 245 survey forms were distributed and 114 were returned. This represented 0.8% of the practice's patient list.

- 72% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 67% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 79% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%).

- 72% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 32 comment cards, all contained positive comments about the standard of care received. Patients commented on a caring, professional and helpful practice team. Patients felt listened to and treated with kindness.

We spoke with two patients during the inspection. All patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were friendly, helpful and caring.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

- The provider must ensure that medicines fridges are kept secure at all times.
- The provider must ensure that healthcare assistants who carry out vaccines and immunisations do so under a clear authorisation which is maintained on record.
- The provider must ensure a record of cleaning clinical areas and equipment is maintained to support infection control audits.

- The provider must ensure that the feedback from patients and other stakeholders is managed and responded to.

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- The provider should review and continue to take action to identify carers who are patients at their practice.
- The provider should keep minutes of the regular nurse meetings to assist with future training, development and any quality assurance audits.
- The provider should review the records maintained for staff training to ensure they are up to date.

Newtons Practice

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 and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Newtons Practice

Newtons Practice is practice offering general medical services to the population of Haywards Heath in West Sussex. There are approximately 13,835 registered patients.

The practice population has a slightly higher number of patients between 30 and 44 years of age and a significantly higher number of patients over 85 years of age than the national and local clinical commissioning group (CCG) average. There are a lower number of patients with a longstanding health condition of 40% compared to the CCG average of 52% and national average of 54%. The percentage of registered patients suffering deprivation (affecting both adults and children) is lower than the average for both the CCG area and England.

Newtons Practice is run by eight partner GPs (four male and four female). The practice is also supported by two salaried GPs (female), one advanced nurse practitioner, three practice nurses, two healthcare assistants and three paramedic practitioners. There is a team of administrative and reception staff, and a deputy practice manager.

The practice runs a number of services for its patients including asthma clinics, diabetes clinics, coronary heart disease clinics, minor surgery, child immunisation clinics, new patient checks and travel vaccines and advice.

Services are provided from one location:

Newtons Practice

The Health Centre

Haywards Heath

West Sussex

RH16 3BB

Opening hours are Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm
Monday to Friday.

During the times when the practice is closed arrangements are in place for patients to access care from IC24 which is an Out of Hours provider.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 30 August 2016. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nurses, the practice manager and administration 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 system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events. We saw practice records that documented discussions and investigations of incidents and significant events at regular meetings. These records did not always demonstrate how information was shared with the practice team and how they learned from the events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw that action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, when a delivery of vaccines had not been stored correctly the practice took action to investigate the incident. The information was shared with reception staff and guidelines introduced to reduce the risk of such an error reoccurring.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead

member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and nurses were trained to child safeguarding level three.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. We found that staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and they 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 had risk assessed this activity and they had a policy and guidelines on using DBS.
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. A nurse practitioner 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. The latest infection control audit took place in May 2016. We found that the practice did not keep a record of the cleaning of clinical areas by staff at the end of their sessions nor did they keep a record of the cleaning of clinical equipment. .
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice did not always keep patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. We observed that the room where medicine fridges were located was unlocked on examination so were the fridges. Staff told us that the room was never locked at they did not have a key. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to

Are services safe?

administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber. However these PSDs were only in place for organised clinics and the practice could not demonstrate that opportunistic and individual patient vaccines had been appropriately authorised.

- The practice did not hold stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse).
- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment including satisfactory evidence of conduct in previous employment. For example, proof of identification, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service were in place. At the time of the inspection not all records for clinical staff contained evidence of professional indemnity insurance. For example these were not available for two of the GPs and all of the nursing team. Following the inspection the practice sent evidence to the commission to demonstrate that this insurance was in place for all clinical staff.

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. However on the day of the inspection the practice had no record available to demonstrate that a fire drill had been undertaken as this was held by the NHS trust who shared the building. Following our inspection the practice provided evidence to demonstrate that a fire drill and practice had taken

place in February 2016. 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. The practice had undertaken a legionella risk assessment. (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings). Regular testing of the water supply was carried out by the landlord's contractor.

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 99.6% of the total number of points available.

This practice was not an outlier for one QOF clinical target. Data from 2014/2015 showed:

Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to or higher than the CCG and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 82% compared to the CCG and national average of 78%. The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 93 % compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 88%.

Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the CCG and better than the 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 95% compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 88%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been six clinical audits completed in the last two years, four of these were completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result of an audit of a medicine used to treat gout and the testing of uric acid in the blood of patients with this diagnosis resulted in a significant increase in the annual testing of patients (23.5% to 75.2%) and a reduction in the levels of uric acid in patients tested. The number of patients with lowered levels of uric acid (within acceptable parameters) had increased from eight to 48.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions. We spoke with a member of staff who had the infection control lead and they had been supported with training and access to a network of healthcare professionals undertaking this role to provide peer support. The practice told us they provide staff with a weeks paid study leave each year to attend additional training and development courses.
- 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. On the day of the inspection we were unable to find evidence of recent staff appraisals. The practice told us that they had a single folder containing these and staff had confirmed recent appraisals. We were told the folder was on the premises but could not be located during the inspection. Following the inspection the practice sent information to confirm that the folder had been located and 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. We found training records were not always up to date and did not keep track of staff training updates.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 88%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 84%, and the national average was 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

For example the number of patients aged between 60 and 69 screened for bowel cancer in the last 30 months was 64% compared to a CCG average of 64% and a national average of 58%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 0.5% to 95% compared to CCG averages of 1.1% to 96% and five year olds from 69% to 92% compared to the CCG average of 86% to 96%.

.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in 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 32 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received contained positive comments about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff took time to offer guidance and support, were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. 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 average or above for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses with the exception of one result. For example:

- 92% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and the national average of 87%.
- 92% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% 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 95%.
- 88% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 83% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.

- 91% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 85% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 86%.
- 80% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 77% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

The practice told us that they were unaware of the lower than average figures for the responses for the nurses. We did see information from the patient participation group (PPG) who had responded to the practice regarding the results. They were very supportive of the nursing team. The feedback from patients we spoke with and the comment cards was positive on the nursing team.

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

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

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Are services caring?

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 150 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). Written information was

available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. The practice has an agreed protocol and guidelines on identifying carers at every opportunity when contact is made with the practice.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- The practice offered a 'extended access clinic' on a Monday and Wednesday evening until 8pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- The practice has an urgent care clinic each day which is run by paramedic practitioners.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm each day. Extended hours appointments were offered between 7am and 8am each morning and are pre-bookable and 6pm and 7.30pm on Wednesdays. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them as part of the urgent care clinic and a duty doctor.

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

- 66% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 78%.
- 72% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 78% national average of 73%).

The practice reviewed their appointment system and introduced the urgent care clinic to improve access for patients.

People told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them. The comment cards we received were in line with what we had observed and been told on the day of the inspection.

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

We looked at 25 complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, openness and transparency with dealing with the complaint. We noted that actions were taken by the practice following the outcome of complaints investigations. For example when a patient complained they were unhappy with the telephone manner of a urgent care team staff member the patient received a personal visit from team member to discuss the role of the team.. The patient received a full explanation and the concern was discussed at a team meeting reducing the risk of a reoccurrence.

Are services well-led?

Requires improvement 

(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 vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

- The practice had a mission statement 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
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. However there were areas identified at this inspection that required improving. For example, safe medicine management, infection control and cleaning systems, staff information and inconsistent quality assurance systems.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when

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

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings. We saw evidence of these for GPs however the nurses meeting were not minuted. All clinical staff attend a clinical meeting.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG were involved in sharing information with the patient group, had organised events and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. Recent actions included the attendance at Saturday Flu clinics to help organise the event, speak with patients and encourage the use of the blood pressure monitor for the waiting room. The PPG had also been consulted on changes to appointments following the patient survey and told us that the introduction of the urgent care clinic had had a positive response from patients.

Are services well-led?

Requires improvement 

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

They told us that they had successfully recruited two younger patients to the group to broaden the demographics of the group. The PPG members were very supportive of the practice and felt there was a good, positive relationship and staff were approachable.

- We noted that the last patient survey had shown lower than average results for patient satisfaction regarding nurses. We saw that the PPG had responded to the practice commenting on this and their support for the team. The practice had not taken any steps to review these areas. We also found that the practice had the friends and family test information and forms however they were not collating, analysing and sending this for including in the practices online FFT results. The staff found a pile of completed forms from patients however they could be sure if any action had been taken with this information.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff feedback, appraisals and discussions at staff meetings. 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 set up a change team made up of staff across the service to look at the future development of the practice and review ongoing projects and initiatives in the practice such as the urgent care clinic and the continuity of care review.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

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

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment The provider had not ensured that the infection control systems protected staff and patients. The provider had not ensured the safety and security of medicines. The provider had not ensured systems to authorise staff to administer medicines including vaccinations include patient specific directions for healthcare assistants. This was in breach of regulation 12 (1) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014
Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 17 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Good governance The provider had not ensured that systems to take account of the feedback from patients and other stakeholders were effective. This was in breach of regulation 17 (1) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014