

Drybrook Surgery

Quality Report

The Surgery
Drybrook
Gloucestershire
GL17 9JE

Tel: 01594 542239

Website: www.drybrooksurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 28 June 2016

Date of publication: 21/07/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Our inspection team | 12 |
| Background to Drybrook Surgery | 12 |
| Why we carried out this inspection | 12 |
| How we carried out this inspection | 12 |
| Detailed findings | 14 |

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Drybrook Surgery on 28 June 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. However on the day of our inspection we found several out of date controlled medicines from 2013 onwards which had not been disposed of.
- 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.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. 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 proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure there is a robust and consistent system in place for disposing of out of date controlled medicines.

Summary of findings

- Ensure fire drills are undertaken regularly in line with fire risk assessment guidance.

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



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When 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 assessed and well managed. However on the day of our inspection we found several out of date controlled medicines from 2013 onwards which had not been disposed of.
- The practice had up to date fire risk assessments, however we noted that they had not carried out a fire drill within the past 12 months.

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 aligned 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. Comprehensive advice and signposting to a number of organisations that provide patient support was displayed in the waiting room alongside a patient information screen which provided health promotion advice.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice participated in a CCG led initiative called choice plus which allowed additional emergency slots to be available for patients to be seen at either Lydney Hospital or the Dilke Hospital. The appointments were triaged at the practice and available under strict criteria, this resulted in greater emergency appointment availability for patients of the practice.
- The practice participated in a local social prescribing initiative whereby patients with non-medical issues, such as debt or loneliness could be referred by a GP to a single hub for assessment as to which alternative service might be of most benefit and could be seen at the practice.
- 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 on the practice website and from leaflets in the waiting room. This was easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- 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. However on the day of our inspection we found several out of date controlled medicines which had not been disposed of and that the practice had not undertaken a fire drill within the past 12 months.
- 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, which it acted on. The patient participation group and friends of Drybrook surgery group were active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

Good



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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population and had a range of enhanced services, for example in dispensing, dementia, influenza and pneumococcal immunisations.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified that they had a higher than average elderly population and in response employed an avoiding admissions administrator and nurse who worked collaboratively to identify patients who were at risk of hospital admission or socially isolated and arranged nurse reviews and liaised with other professionals to ensure older patients' health and social needs were being met.

People with long term conditions

Good



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

- The practice had specialist nurses for diabetes and respiratory disease who provided both chronic and acute management of these patients within their area of expertise. Support from a GP was available if needed, and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for overall diabetes related indicators in 2014/15 was 89% which was below the clinical commissioning group average of 95% and comparable to the national average of 89%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Summary of findings

Families, children and young people

Good



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

- 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 patients 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 patients were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years in 2014/15 was 81% which was comparable to both the clinical commissioning group average of 84% and 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, health visitors and school nurses. A midwife visited the on a weekly basis and attended monthly multidisciplinary meetings.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- Daily telephone consultations were available and one of the GPs is contactable via email for patients who cannot attend the practice due to work commitments.
- Clinics available included counselling, mother and baby clinics, minor surgery and NHS health checks.

Summary of findings

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice had easy read practice leaflets for patients with visual impairments and were in the process of approving easy read practice leaflets for patients with learning disabilities.
- The practice displayed information for carers in the waiting room, on their website, on the health education screen and offered carers health checks.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Good



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

- 82% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months (04/2014 to 03/2015), which was slightly below both the clinical commissioning group average (CCG) of 86% and the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 78% which was below both the CCG average of 97% and national average of 82%.

Summary of findings

- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice 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 above both local and national averages. Two hundred and fifty-three survey forms were distributed and 130 were returned, a completion rate of 51% (which represents 3% of the patient population).

- 100% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to a clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 83% and a national average of 73%.
- 93% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to a CCG average of 89% and a national average of 85%.
- 91% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to a CCG average of 89% and a national average of 85%.

- 89% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to a CCG average of 83% and a 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 two comment cards both of which were very positive about the standard of care received. Patients told us that they received excellent and professional care and that they were treated with dignity and respect.

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

We looked at practice reviews on NHS choices, all five reviews were positive about the practice commenting on a friendly service where staff and GPs knew their patients well.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure there is a robust and consistent system in place for disposing of out of date controlled medicines.
- Ensure fire drills are undertaken regularly in line with fire risk assessment guidance.

Drybrook Surgery

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 pharmacist specialist adviser.

Background to Drybrook Surgery

Drybrook Surgery is a long established family orientated GP practice located in Drybrook, Gloucestershire which is a rural area in the Forest of Dean. The practice is situated in a two storey purpose built health centre building and is wheelchair accessible.

The practice provides general medical services to approximately 4,400 patients. Services to patients are provided under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with NHS England. (A GMS contract is a contract between NHS England and general practices for delivering general medical services and is the commonest form of GP contract).

The Practice has three GP partners (one female and two male) which is equivalent to two and three quarters full time equivalent GPs. The clinical team includes three practice nurses and one healthcare assistant (all female). The practice manager is supported by an office manager and a team of five administrators / receptionists.

Drybrook Surgery is a dispensing practice with a team of three dispensers working in the dispensary on a rotational basis. The practice dispenses to approximately 34% of the registered patient base.

The practice population has a higher proportion of patients aged over 65 compared to local and national averages. For example, 24% of practice patients are aged over 65 compared to the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 20% and the national average of 17%.

The practice is located in an area with low social deprivation and is placed in the third least deprived decile by public health England. The prevalence of patients with a long standing health condition is 57% compared to the local CCG average of 55% and the national average of 54%. People living in more deprived areas and with long-standing health conditions tend to have greater need for health services.

The practice is open between 8.30am and 6pm on Monday to Friday. Between 8am - 8.30am and 6pm – 6.30pm every weekday telephone calls are picked up by the reception team and a duty doctor is on site to treat any medical emergencies. Appointments are available between 8.30am and 1pm every morning and 2.45pm to 6pm every afternoon.

Out of hours cover is provided by South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust and can be accessed via NHS 111.

The practice provided its services from the following address:

The Surgery

Drybrook

Gloucestershire

GL17 9JE

Detailed findings

This was the first inspection of Drybrook Surgery. We noted that the practice were not registered for family planning. The provider informed us that they did not realise they had to register for family planning. The provider advised that they would apply to CQC for this registration.

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 28 June 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including two GPs, the practice manager, one nurse, two dispensers, one health care assistant and two members of the administration team. In addition to this we spoke with three patients and three patient participation group members 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 2 comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The 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 reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, three patients smear results were sent to a local hospital in out of date pots. The hospital contacted the practice to advise that re-tests on these patients would need to be completed. The practice nurse contacted all three patients, apologised, advised them of their error and invited them back to the practice for a re-test at a time that was convenient for the patient. A new process was implemented which included storing the pots in a location where the health care assistant could take on the responsibility for checking the dates alongside other weekly checks to ensure this incident would not reoccur.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements.

Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. 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 protection or child safeguarding level three all other team members were trained to level one or two.

- Notices in the consultation rooms and treatment 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. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept 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 clinical commissioning group (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. Patient Group Directions (PGD) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of

Are services safe?

medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment. Health care assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction (PSD) from a prescriber. PSDs are written instructions, from a qualified and registered prescriber for a medicine including the dose, route and frequency or appliance to be supplied or administered to a named patient after the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis.

- There was a named GP responsible for the dispensary and all members of staff involved in dispensing medicines had received appropriate training and had opportunities for continuing learning and development. Any medicines incidents were recorded for learning and the practice had a system in place to monitor the quality of the dispensing process. Dispensary staff showed us standard procedures which covered all aspects of the dispensing process (these are written instructions about how to safely dispense medicines).
- The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse) and had procedures in place to manage them safely. There were also arrangements in place for the destruction of controlled drugs, however on the day of our inspection we found several out of date controlled medicines from 2013 onwards which had not been disposed of. On the day after our inspection we were informed that this had occurred due to the medicines being logged in an old controlled medicines register. The medicines had not been transferred to the new register and therefore in terms of the daily administrative procedures they had “ceased to exist” and were stored awaiting destruction in a locked cabinet. This resulted in them not being destroyed alongside other out of date medicines as they were not included in the new register. A new procedure has been implemented which ensures that the controlled medicines cabinet is also stock checked in the way that the medicines on the shelves get routinely checked. The practice have contacted the pharmacists at the CCG to arrange for the out of date controlled medicines to be destroyed.
- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of

identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

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 area which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments, however we noted that they had not carried out a fire drill within the past 12 months. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients’ needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children’s masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.

Are services safe?

- 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 comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results from 2014/15 were 90% of the total number of points available. We looked at the practice QOF figures for 2015/16 and saw that this had improved to 96%. Exception reporting for the practice was 5% which was below both the local average of 10% and the national average of 9%. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

This practice was an outlier for some QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 90% which was below the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 95% and above the national average of 89%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 83% which was comparable to both the CCG average of 85% and national average of 84%.

- Performance for mental health related indicators was 78% which was below both the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 93%. We looked at mental health performance indicators for 2015/16 and saw an improved result of 85%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been six clinical audits completed in the last two years, three of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research. The practice measured their performance against practices in the area with similar patient demographics and disease prevalence.

Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included monitoring patients who had received minor surgery and looking at excision (removal of affected skin by cutting out) rates. For example, the audit of minor operations showed a very high success rate in excisions within national guidelines and low complication rates.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as: employing a dedicated administrator and nurse to monitor and manage unplanned hospital admissions. This showed good outcomes for elderly patients, for example, the number of emergency admissions for 19 ambulatory care sensitive conditions (conditions where effective community care and case management can help prevent the need for hospital admission) per 1,000 population (04/2014 to 03/2015) was 11% which was lower than both the clinical commissioning group average of 12% and national average of 15%.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- 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 patients, 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.
- A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to both the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by ensuring a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. The practice's uptake for females aged between 50-70 years, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months was 76%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 77% and above the national average of 72%.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The practices uptake for patients aged between 60-69 years, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months was 65% which was above both the CCG average of 63% and the national average of 58%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were above both the CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to

under two year olds ranged from 89% to 100% compared to CCG averages of 72% to 96%. Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given to five year olds ranged from 85% to 98% compared to CCG averages of 90% to 95%.

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.

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

We spoke with three members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were pleased with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 92% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and national average of 89%.
- 92% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 87%.
- 99% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 97% and national average of 95%.

- 91% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 88% and national average of 85%.
- 95% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 90%.
- 94% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback from the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views mentioning that they were often given appointments before the clinic started. 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 above both local and national averages. For example:

- 94% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 86%.
- 90% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 82%.
- 89% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 85%.

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

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

Are services caring?

- The screen in the waiting room provided health promotion advice.
- The practice had purchased a hearing loop following PPG feedback.

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.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 44 patients as

carers (1% of the practice list). The practice new patient registration form asks whether patients were carers and whether they would like to be added to the carers register. The practice had a carers information in the waiting room and carers information displayed on the health education screen. Carers were offered annual health checks and longer appointments and could be referred to social prescribing. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them. 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. For example, the practice participated in a local social prescribing initiative whereby patients with non-medical issues, such as debt or loneliness could be referred by a GP to a single hub for assessment as to which alternative service might be of most benefit and could be seen at the practice.

- Bookable telephone appointments were available for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability. The practice had 23 patients on the learning disability register and 11 had received an annual health check.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- Weekly meetings took place that included discussions of hospital admissions, hospital discharges and palliative care patients.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Between 8am - 8.30am and 6pm - 6.30pm every weekday telephone calls were picked up by the reception team and a duty doctor was on site to treat any medical emergencies. Appointments were available between 8.30am and 1pm every morning and 2.45pm to 6pm every afternoon. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six 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 above both the local and national averages.

- 87% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and national average of 78%.
- 100% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 73%.

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 in place to assess:

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

In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made in accordance with a practice protocol. 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; there were detailed leaflets available in the waiting room and details on the practice website.

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found that all complaints were dealt with in a timely manner, with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a complaint was received from a patient who attended for an appointment requiring medication. The medication had failed to be ordered by the practice which resulted in a

Are services responsive to people's needs? (for example, to feedback?)

delay to the patient's treatment. The practice investigated the incident, apologised to the patient, implemented new processes to ensure this incident could not reoccur and this was discussed at practice level.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. However on the day of our inspection we found several out of date controlled medicines which had not been disposed of and that the practice had not undertaken a fire drill within the past 12 months.

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 and practice manager were very 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.
- 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 away days were held at least once a year.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners and practice manager 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 the friends of Drybrook Surgery through surveys and complaints received. The PPG and friends of Drybrook Surgery carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, through patient survey the PPG identified a need for a phlebotomy

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

(blood taking) chair in the health care assistant room.

The friends of Drybrook Surgery equipment fund supported the improvement. The PPG had feedback to the practice that patients would benefit from a hearing loop and also a new hand dryer in the toilet, both of these items were purchased and placed in the practice by the practice manager within one month of this feedback. Both the PPG and friends of Drybrook Surgery spoke highly of the GPs, staff and practice manager at the practice advising that they were very honest, caring and responsive to any feedback and suggestions given.

- The practice had gathered feedback from 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 for example, one reception team members working hours were changed upon request and another staff member was given protected management time away from the reception desk to carry out management tasks. All staff we spoke with 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. For example:

- The practice participated in a CCG led initiative called Choice Plus which allowed additional emergency slots to be available for patients to be seen at either Lydney Hospital or the Dilke Hospital. The appointments were triaged at the practice and available under strict criteria, this resulted in greater emergency appointment availability for patients of the practice.
- The practice participated in a local social prescribing initiative whereby patients with non-medical issues, such as debt or loneliness could be referred by a GP to a single hub for assessment as to which alternative service might be of most benefit and could be seen at the practice.