

Newbury Group Practice

Quality Report

Newbury Park Health Centre,
40 Perrymans Farm Road,
Ilford,
Essex IG2 7LE
Tel: 020 8554 1094
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 4 September 2017
Date of publication: 06/11/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Requires improvement 

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	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Newbury Group Practice	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Newbury Group Practice on 10 March 2016. The practice was rated good for safe, effective and caring. However, they were rated requires improvement for responsive and well-led and therefore their overall rating for the practice was requires improvement. The full comprehensive report can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Newbury Group Practice on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

We carried out this announced follow up comprehensive inspection on 4 September 2017.

The practice is rated as requires improvement for responsive, however overall the practice is now rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients we spoke with said they found it easy to make an appointment and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. Examples we reviewed showed the practice complied with these requirements.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

Summary of findings

- Review the patient feedback including the results of the national GP patient survey with a view to improving the service.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Good



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

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were comparable to the national average in most cases.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.
- End of life care was coordinated with other services involved.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice lower than others for several aspects of care.
- The practice had identified less than 1% of their patients as carers
- Survey information we reviewed showed that patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Summary of findings

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

- The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population.
- Patients we spoke with said that the appointment system had improved significantly since our last inspection and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and evidence from four examples reviewed showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff.
- 56% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 68% and the national average of 81%.
- 49% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 58% and the national average of 73%.

Requires improvement



Are services well-led?

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

- 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 policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- A governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received inductions, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on. The practice engaged with the patient participation group.

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified at an early stage older patients who may need palliative care as they were approaching the end of life. It involved older patients in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in long-term disease management of patients with long term conditions.
- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 78%, which was 1.3% below the CCG average and 12.2% below national averages

Families, children and young people

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

Good



- Systems were 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 accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Immunisation rates were comparable to the CCG rates for childhood immunisations.

Summary of findings

- Patients told us, on the day of inspection, that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice worked with midwives, health visitors and school nurses to support this population group. For example, in the provision of ante-natal, post-natal and child health surveillance clinics.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of these populations had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care, for example, extended opening hours.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people and those with a learning disability.
- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice had information available for vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed knew how to recognise signs of abuse in children, young people and adults whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. They were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



Summary of findings

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- 86% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting.
- The practice had a register of patients experiencing poor mental health. These patients were invited to attend annual physical health checks and 82 out of 100 had been reviewed in the last 12 months.
- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 76%, which was 15.6% below the CCG and 16.7% below national averages.

Requires improvement



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2017. The results showed the practice was performing below the local and national averages. There were 333 survey forms distributed and 110 were returned. This represented 33% response rate and 0.8% of the practice's patient list.

- 68% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 85%.
- 49% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 58% and the national average of 73%.

- 63% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 66% national average of 77%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 17 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients felt the staff were understanding and helpful.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

Review the patient feedback including the results of the national GP patient survey with a view to improving the service

Newbury Group Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector who was accompanied by a GP specialist advisor

Background to Newbury Group Practice

Newbury Group Practice provides GP primary care services to approximately 14300 people living in Ilford. The local area is a mixed community, however the practice population are from relatively deprived parts of the borough.

There are two partners and four salaried GPs. There is two males GP and four females GPs who work a combination of full and part time hours totalling 44 sessions. The practice is a training practice and employs one trainee GP. Other staff included a nurse practitioner, a nurse, a health care assistant, a practice manager and 15 reception and administrative staff. The practice holds a General Medical Services (GMS) contract and was commissioned by NHSE London. The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures, treatment of disease, disorder and injury, surgical procedures, family planning and maternity and midwifery services.

The practice was open from 8am to 6.30pm Mondays to Friday. They offered extended hours appointments on Saturdays between 8am and 1.30pm. The telephones were staffed throughout working hours. Appointment slots were available throughout the opening hours. The out of hours services are provided by an alternative provider. The details of the 'out of hours' service were communicated in a

recorded message accessed by calling the practice when closed and details can also be found on the practice website. Longer appointments were available for patients who needed them and those with long-term conditions. This also included appointments with a named GP or the nurse. Pre-bookable appointments could be booked up to two weeks in advance; urgent appointments were available for people that needed them.

The practice provides a wide range of services for child health care and smoking cessation. The practice also provides health promotion services including a flu vaccination programme, travel vaccinations and cervical screening.

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. When we inspected this practice on 10 March 2016 the practice was rated as requires improvement overall. We served a requirement notice for regulation 17 (Good Governance) HSCA 2008. The full comprehensive report can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Newbury Group Practice on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

We undertook this inspection on 4 September 2017 to check that action had been taken to comply with legal requirements

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nurse and reception staff. We also 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 a system for reporting and recording significant events.

- Since our last inspection the practice had introduced a new reporting system for incidents. All staff we spoke with told us they had received training on the new system and were fully aware of how to access the system and record any incidents they witnessed. The recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- From the sample of six documented examples we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed and found the practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, where a patient had not received the correct dose of a medication on a repeat prescription a new protocol was put in place to ensure all repeat prescriptions were checked to ensure dose was always clear.
- The practice also monitored trends in significant events and evaluated any action taken.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements for safeguarding reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who

to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. One GP was the lead and they attended safeguarding meetings when possible or provided reports where necessary for other agencies.

- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding. All staff had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3 and nurses to level 2.
- There were notices in the waiting room and in treatment rooms advising patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones was trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable.

The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene.

- We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- The practice nurse was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. The practice carried out an annual and quarterly check of premises. 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 minimised risks to patient safety (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal).

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. Checks of fridge temperatures were carried out daily and recorded.
- Repeat prescriptions were signed before being dispensed to patients and there was a reliable process to ensure this occurred. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for

Are services safe?

safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.

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

Monitoring risks to patients

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

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.
- The practice had a variety of risk assessments to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 87% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and national average of 95%.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from QOF showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 78%, which was 1.2% below the CCG average and 12.2% below national averages.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 76%, which was 15.6% below the CCG and 16.7% below national averages.

The practice was aware of their performance in the above areas. In relation to diabetes they had introduced new protocols for the HCA and nurse in order to improve the blood pressure control of patients. In relation to mental health an administrator had been given responsibility for inviting these patients for their reviews and following up when they did not attend.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- There had been four clinical audits commenced in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. The practice undertook an audit to understand if hypoglycaemic discussions were had with diabetic patients at their annual reviews. On first audit they found these discussions were only recorded in 5 out of 30 records. Discussions were held with the clinical team and it was decided that hypoglycaemic sheets would be available in every consulting room to prompt discussion and to give to patients. On re-audit a year later it was found that these discussions were recorded in 25 out of the 30 notes that were reviewed.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, 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 and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs and nurses. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- From the sample of three documented examples we reviewed we found that the practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 87%, which was above the CCG average of 79% and above the national average of 81%.

There was a policy to offer telephone or written reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer. There were failsafe systems to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given were above both the CCG and national averages. For example, rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 85% to 94% and five year olds from 85% to 92%.

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

During our inspection we observed that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.
- Patients could be treated by a clinician of the same sex.

All of the 17 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 five patients including two members of the patient participation group (PPG). They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice. Comments 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 were mixed for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses in most areas. For example:

- 88% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 89%.
- 78% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 86%.
- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 95%.
- 71% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 86%.

- 74% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 84% and the national average of 91%.
- 71% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 92%.
- 88% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 97%.
- 62% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 91%.
- 80% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 87%.

The practice was aware of their scores in relation to the nurses and had carried out their own internal survey where the results showed that patients were very happy with the nursing team. The practice had also increased their nursing team, provided additional training and reviewed the nurse appointment system.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

Children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and recognised as individuals. For example, the GPs told us they would see young people on their own and would assess whether they were competent to understand what the GP discussed with them.

However, results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responses were below average in relation 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:

- 81% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 86%.

Are services caring?

- 68% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average 78% and the national average of 82%.
- 69% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 90%.
- 61% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 85%

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

- Staff told us that interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 140 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had experienced 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

At our previous inspection on 10 March 2016, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing responsive services as patients said they found it difficult to book appointment by phone and that the system for getting urgent appointments on the same day was chaotic. Patients also told us they had to wait too long after appointment times. We issued a requirement notice in respect of these issues and we found at this inspection, although there has been some improvements they are not reflected in the results of the GP patient survey.

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population:

- Patients over 75 years had a named GP to co-ordinate their care. Longer appointments were available for these patients when required. The GPs carried out home visits when needed. We saw evidence to demonstrate that all attendances at A/E and admissions were reviewed with team to see if they could have been avoided and if any lessons could be learnt to improve. The practice worked closely with the integrated care management team.
- The practice held registers for patients in receipt of palliative care, had complex needs or had long term conditions. They were invited for an annual review and patients that did not attend were chased and encouraged to engage with their care. Patients in these groups had a care plan and would be allocated longer appointment times when needed. The practice was fully engaged with multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) in the management of these patients. The practice also started diabetic patients on insulin.
- Systems were in place for identifying and following-up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk. For example, they would refer families for additional support and had multidisciplinary meetings with health visitors where any safeguarding concerns would be discussed. The practice triaged all requests for appointments on the day for all children under two when their parent or carer requested the child be seen for urgent medical matters. The GPs demonstrated an understanding of Gillick competency and told us they promoted sexual health screening.
- The practice offered working age patients access to extended appointments two mornings, including Saturday's, a week. They also offered on-line services for repeat prescriptions, booking appointments and access to medical records. Daily phone consultations were also available.
- The GPs told us that patients whose circumstances may make them vulnerable such as those under safeguarding or people with learning disabilities were offered regular health checks and follow-up. They were coded on appropriate registers. Pop up alerts were placed on all computer notes to alert all members of staff to vulnerable patients. GPs told us this was to allow them to meet their specific additional needs such as double appointments. Patients with learning disabilities were invited annually for a specific review. We saw that there were 35 patients on the register all had been reviewed in the last 12 months.
- Patients experiencing poor mental health were invited to attend annual physical health checks and 82 out of 100 had been reviewed in the last 12 months. They worked closely with the local community mental health teams and made referrals to other services when such as IAPT.
- The practice had achieved 86% of the latest QOF points for patients with Dementia and although this was below both CCG and national averages, it had increased since our last inspection. All dementia patients had a care plan which both they and carers had been involved in drafting. Dementia friendly training had been given to all staff at the practice and they had a monthly drop in session for patients with dementia and their carers.
- The premises were accessible to patients with disabilities and there was a hearing loop installed. The waiting area was large enough to accommodate patients with wheelchairs and allowed for easy access. Accessible toilet facilities were available for all patients attending the practice.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8am to 6.30pm Mondays to Friday. They offered extended hours appointments on Saturdays between 8am and 1.30pm. The telephones were staffed throughout working hours. Appointment slots were available throughout the opening hours. The out of hours services are provided by an alternative provider. The details

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

of the 'out of hours' service were communicated in a recorded message accessed by calling the practice when closed and details can also be found on the practice website. Longer appointments were available for patients who needed them and those with long-term conditions. This also included appointments with a named GP or the nurse. Pre-bookable appointments could be booked up to two weeks in advance; urgent appointments were available for people that needed them.

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

- 59% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 70% and the national average of 76%.
- 47% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 51% and the national average of 71%.
- 73% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 84%.
- 56% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 68% and the national average of 81%.

- 49% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 58% and the national average of 73%.
- 41% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 43% and the national average of 58%.

The practice were aware of their performance in these areas and had increased its opening hours and added five clinical sessions per week and were therefore able to offer more appointments. They had also installed a new telephone system and were in the process of reviewing it.

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 posters were displayed in reception and, summary leaflet were available.

We looked at the two complaints received in the last 12 months and found they were all dealt with in a timely way, in line with the complaints policy. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 10 March 2016, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing well-led services as during our inspection carried out in October 2013 we fed back to the practice that patients were dissatisfied with the appointment booking and telephone systems and these issues had still not been appropriately addressed as patients were still dissatisfied. Also we noted the practice investigated all complaints, but patients did not always receive a written apology. We issued a requirement notice in respect of these issues and found these arrangements had improved when we undertook this inspection. The practice is now rated as good for providing well-led services.

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice vision and values was to deliver high quality medical care in a friendly patient centred and compassionate manner.
- The practice had a clear strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs and nurses had lead roles in key areas such as safeguarding and long term conditions.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. These were updated and reviewed regularly.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained. Practice meetings were held monthly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.

- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. We saw they carried out an environmental risk assessment on an annual basis.
- We saw evidence from minutes of a meetings structure that allowed for lessons to be learned and shared following significant events and complaints.

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

- The practice held and minuted a range of multi-disciplinary meetings including meetings with district nurses and social workers to monitor vulnerable patients. GPs, where required, met with health visitors to monitor vulnerable families and safeguarding concerns.
- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the management team in the practice. All

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG had met monthly. They analysed the results from patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, they had requested that the telephone system be updated and more appointments to be made available.
- There were high levels of staff satisfaction. The practice had gathered feedback from staff generally through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff were proud of

the organisation as a place to work and spoke highly of the culture. Staff at all levels were actively encouraged to raise concerns. All staff we spoke with told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. They said they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

We found the practice had a culture of learning and teaching, which was a core part of their work.

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. Since our last inspection they taken part in the “Productive General Practice” program which involved GPs being peer reviewed. They were also a training practice for both undergraduates and post graduates.