

Dr Pritpal Bath

Quality Report

49 Ashcroft Road

Luton

LU2 9AU

Tel: 01582 391831

Website: www.ashcroftpractice.gpsurgery.net

Date of inspection visit: 18 May 2016

Date of publication: 22/12/2016

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	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Dr Pritpal Bath	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Pritpal Bath on 18 May 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.
- 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.
- Outcomes from national patient surveys showed the practice was consistently performing higher than both local and national averages in a number of areas.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice sought feedback from staff and patients, 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:

- Legionella testing (undertaken by accredited persons) to be included in the risk assessment portfolio.

Summary of findings

- Continue to develop a system and deliver annual appraisals for all staff.
- Development work on the functionality of the practice website should continue.
- Seek to increase membership and activity of the Patient Participation Group.

- Continue work to identify and support those patients who are carers.

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.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons learnt were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, appropriate 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.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were generally at or above average compared to the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and national averages.
- 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 staff. However the practice were continuing to complete appraisals for all staff
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey published January and July 2016 showed patients consistently rated the practice higher than others for many aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Good



Summary of findings

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

Good



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

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were aware of the vision and their role in relation to it.
- There was a leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held appropriate business and governance meetings.
- There was an understanding of the governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for 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 was active.

Summary of findings

- The practice was keen to embrace a continuous learning and improvement ethos at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice had 384 patients aged over 75; all these patients had a named GP.
- Health checks had been completed for 162 of these patients in the last 12 months.
- Systems were in place to conduct post falls assessment, with support and referral to social services available.

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 chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 92%, which was higher than the local CCG average of 87% and national average of 88%.
- 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.
- Effective re-call procedures were in place for monitoring and to ensure attendance at reviews.
- Care plans were agreed for COPD (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) patients and rescue packs were available.

Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances.
- There was a clinical safeguarding lead and all staff were trained appropriate to their role.
- Immunisation rates were higher than local and national averages for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The percentage of women aged 25 - 64 years of age whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding five years was 82%, which was slightly higher than the local CCG average of 80% and the same as the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- Telephone consultations and extended hours offered evening appointments.
- Early morning and late evening appointments with nurses for phlebotomy and other clinics.
- On-line services introduced including appointment booking and ordering prescriptions.
- There was a named member of staff responsible for follow-up for the national bowel cancer screening programme.

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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 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.
- Bereavement support was in place where needed with visits to recently bereaved patients.
- The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 64 patients as carers, which equated to approximately 1% of the practice list.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- 64% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015), which was lower than the local average of 81% and the national average of 84%.
- 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 support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended A&E 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.
- All non-clinical staff had received dementia awareness training and were 'Dementia Friends'.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The results of the national GP patient survey published in January and July 2016 showed the practice was consistently performing well above local and national averages.

The most recent results, from July 2016, were based on 257 survey forms distributed with 110 returned. This represented a 43% response rate and 2% of the practice's patient list.

- 97% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the local CCG average of 67% and the national average of 73%.
- 99% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the local CCG average of 79% and the national average of 85%.
- 94% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the local CCG average of 79% and the national average of 85%.
- 93% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the local CCG average of 70% and the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 52 completed comment cards from a variety

of patients; some were from families with young children and others from older age ranges. A number of patients identified they had been with the practice for almost 30 years, whilst others were recently registered patients.

Overall, the feedback from the comment cards was overwhelmingly, consistently and strongly positive. The caring and thoughtful attitude of staff being highlighted by almost all of the respondents. On some cards named staff members had been identified as providing exceptional and outstanding care.

All of the cards contained positive descriptions of the service delivered. However, one card also mentioned that a female GP would be welcomed, whilst another mentioned that, more recently, as the surgery was busier, sometimes access to appointments could be more difficult. We saw that the practice had sought to address any problems regarding access to appointments by the introduction of the on-line booking system, which had helped in planning and accessing appointments.

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

The Friends and Families test results for the practice showed a 100% satisfaction outcome from six responses.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Legionella testing (undertaken by accredited persons) to be included in the risk assessment portfolio.
- Continue to develop a system and deliver annual appraisals for all staff.
- Development work on the functionality of the practice website should continue.
- Seek to increase membership and activity of the Patient Participation Group.
- Continue work to identify and support those patients who are carers.

Dr Pritpal Bath

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team comprised of a GP specialist adviser and was led by a CQC Inspector.

Background to Dr Pritpal Bath

Dr Pritpal Bath, is also known as The Ashcroft Surgery, is part of the NHS England and Luton Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

All services are provided from one registered location;

- 49 Ashcroft Road, Luton, LU2 9AU.

The practice provides services under the auspices of a General Medical Services (GMS) contract (a GMS contract agreed nationally between NHS England and a GP practice).

The practice has approximately 5,085 registered patients. The age range of patients at the practice broadly follows the national demographic. For example, approximately 16% of the practice population is over 65 years of age, compared to 17% nationally and 22% of patients are under the age of 18 years, compared to national figure of 21%.

According to national data the area falls in the 'fifth least deprived decile' and is one of average deprivation. Average life expectancy for people living in the area is higher than local CCG and matches national averages. Male life expectancy at 79 years compared to CCG average of 78 years and national average 79 years. Female life expectancy for the area was 84 years, which was higher than both the local CCG average of 82 and national average of 83 years.

The building has good facilities for patients, including access arrangements, with graduated walking ramp and easy access toilets for the less mobile and baby changing facilities.

The ground floor reception and waiting area is bright and equipped with an electronic patient arrival registration screen. All consultation and treatments rooms are located on the ground floor. The administration staff occupy the first floor.

The practice is located in a Luton suburb and is provided with public transport linking the practice to surrounding housing and major roads to the town centre. Car parking is available on site and in adjacent roads.

The practice has one male full time GP Partner, uses locum GPs as required, and two female practice nurses. Administration and management is provided by the practice manager, deputy manager and a team of administrators and reception staff.

The practice offers appointments and services to meet the requirements of its patients as follows;

- The practice is open daily from 8am to 7pm everyday Monday to Friday.

The practice has patients who work away from the area, with many commuting to and from London. Early and later appointments are offered for patients who may not be able to attend during conventional opening times. Urgent and emergency appointments are available on the same day and patients are advised consultations may be with a duty doctor rather than their preferred, or usual, GP.

When the practice is closed, out-of-hours services are provided by the 111 service. Advice on how to access the

Detailed findings

out-of-hours service is clearly displayed on noticeboards throughout the public spaces in the waiting and reception area, on the practice website and telephone message when the surgery is closed.

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 18 May 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff, including the GP, nurse, practice manager, deputy manager and administration 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 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, MHRA (Medicine and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency) alerts, 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, we saw that the practice had responded to a recent alert relating to defibrillators and the securing of loose cords for window blinds. In each case the practice manager had alerted the relevant people within the practice, had taken appropriate checks to ensure the practice was operating safely and that any actions taken had been accurately recorded in a centrally held record of activity.

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 GP 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. The GP was trained to the appropriate level to manage child protection or child safeguarding (level 3) and other staff were trained as appropriate to their role.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. Clinical 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). Non-clinical staff who acted as chaperones, and who had not been subject to a DBS check, had up-to-date risk assessments in place and had been appropriately trained about the function and role of acting as a chaperone.
- 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.
- However, on the day of inspection we found that a staff washroom was also being used as a store room for equipment and other cleaning materials. When this was raised with the practice we saw that immediate steps were taken to remove the equipment. The cleaning materials were appropriately stored in a closed cupboard.
- 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 CCG medicines

Are services safe?

management team, 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 had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed two 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. In addition, for GPs and clinical staff, including locums, the practice had systems to ensure up-to-date professional registration was in place.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives.
- The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly.
- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control. We saw evidence that the practice had made arrangements for an external, accredited organisation to undertake an appropriate legionella assessment and

this was scheduled to be completed shortly after our inspection. (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 skill 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 to safely meet patients' needs.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

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

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 showed the practice achieved 94% of the total number of points available. This was above the local CCG average of 91% and comparable to the national average of 95%.

Overall, the practice had an exception reporting level of 12%, where local and national rates were 9%. We saw that the clinical domains for rheumatoid arthritis and COPD (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) were noticeably higher than local and national averages. However, we also saw that for osteoporosis and dementia the practice had recorded 0% exceptions which compared very favourably against local and national results.

(Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

The practice had a system for recalling patients on the QOF disease register and the lead GP was responsible for QOF. Discussions with the practice demonstrated that the procedures in place for exception reporting followed the QOF guidance.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/2015 showed:

Performance for diabetes related indicators was higher than the national average.

- For example, 93% of patients on the diabetes register had a foot examination and risk clarification within the preceding 12 months, compared to the local CCG average of 89% and national average of 88%. Exception reporting rate was 15% compared to CCG average of 7% and a national average of 8%.

Performance for mental health related indicators was broadly similar to local and national average.

- For example 85% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive agreed care plan, compared to the local CCG average of 87% and the national average of 88%. Exception reporting rate was 19%, compared to CCG average of 10% and national average of 13%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been two clinical audits completed in the last two years, where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. These had not been repeated, full-cycle, audits and the practice and plan to repeat these audits in the coming year.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included in response to a situation where the practice had recorded a medication issuing error. The practice liaised with the CCG medication management team and after investigation had amended local procedures to ensure that all patients had their medication review implemented and records were updated to identify 'contra indicators' and system was flagged to alert clinicians accordingly. (A contraindication is a specific situation in which a drug, procedure, or surgery should not be used because it may be harmful to the person.)

Effective staffing

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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 staff reviewing patients with long-term conditions and, for non-clinical staff, specific training had been implemented to enable administration staff to cover different roles across the reception, administration and other support roles.
- 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 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. The practice had not provided formal annual appraisal for all staff within the last 12 months. However, we saw that this had been discussed at a recent staff meeting and steps were in place to ensure appraisal systems were put in place.
- 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 using Protected Learning Time (PLT) as appropriate.

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 people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation and patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- The practice had worked with a registered dietician and had supported patients with referrals to local agencies and hospital dieticians where appropriate.
- The practice had identified 1,308 patients as smokers, of these 1001 had received a review and referral. Within the preceding 24 months, 768 had been offered formal intervention and support. A total of 574 patients had been recorded as having stopped smoking as a result of the practice intervention and support.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 80% and national average of 82%. The practice had a lower exception rate of 2%, compared to a CCG average of 9% and a national average of 6%.

There was a clear policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. There were systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

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

- 60% of patients age between 60 and 69 years had been screened for bowel cancer in the last 30 months, which was noticeably higher than the CCG average of 51% and similar to the national average of 58%.

- 74% of female patients age between 50 and 70 years had been screened for breast cancer in the last 30 months, which was broadly similar to the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 72%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were higher than both the local CCG and the national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 98% to 100% and five year olds from 93% to 100%.

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

The practice began providing these checks in 2010. With 1,408 patients eligible for a health check the practice had delivered a total of 984 checks and, of these, 209 had been delivered within the last 12 months. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

All of the 52 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. 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 consistently rated above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example, data from July 2016 indicated the following outcomes:

- 93% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 85% and the national average of 89%.
- 90% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 87%.
- 100% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 95%.
- 92% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 85%.

- 92% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 89% to the national average of 91%.
- 95% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 84% and the 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. We also saw that care plans were personalised.

Results from the national GP patient survey published 2016 showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were consistently and noticeably higher than local and national averages. For example:

- 93% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 86%.
- 87% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 76% and to the national average of 82%.
- 91% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG 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. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- Staff had undertaken customer care and awareness training.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Are services caring?

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 64 patients as carers, which equated to approximately 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 suffered bereavement, the GP would contact them and where a follow up consultation was required, this would be at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs. Advice and information about local support groups was freely available.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- The practice offered appointments until 7pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and for those who required additional support.
- 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 vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities and translation services available.
- All consultation and treatment rooms were on the ground floor. Where required door frames and corridors had been widened to facilitate easy access for baby transporters, wheelchairs and mobility aids.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am to 7pm Monday to Friday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to twelve weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 92% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the local average of 74% and the national average of 76%.
- 97% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the local average of 67% and the national average of 73%.

The patients we spoke with on the day of the inspection told us they were able to get appointments when they needed them and the CQC comment cards supported these findings.

The practice had taken positive steps to ensure performance in the patient facing services was maintained at a high level. Staff had been provided with customer service training, on-line appointment booking facilities had been introduced and all available staff would respond to telephone enquires at peak call times.

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. 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.

- The complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- The practice manager was the designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system, with information and leaflets available within the waiting room area and details now available on the practice website.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found that the practice had followed the process outlined in its policy. Concerns were investigated thoroughly and information was shared with the patients in a timely and accessible way. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. Action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care.

For example, the practice regularly reviewed patient feedback and had introduced changes to the appointments system in response to concerns about gaining access to the practice by telephone. Staff had been

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

provided with customer service training, additional telephone lines had been made available and the introduction of on-line appointment booking had all sought to improve the patient experienced.

GP patient survey outcomes in July 2016 demonstrated that 97% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good. This was significantly higher than local or national averages at 66% and 73% respectively.

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 strategy and plans which reflected the vision and values and were reviewed appropriately.

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 clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the GP and senior managers 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 GP and managers were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with

patients about notifiable safety incidents. The practice encouraged a culture of openness and honesty, with 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.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported by the GP and managers in the practice.
- Staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, staff were encouraged 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 was working to develop and increase numbers of patients involved in its patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received.
- Following feedback from patients we saw that the practice had made improvements, for example to the telephone software system to allow more calls to be answered at peak call times.
- The practice gathered feedback from staff through meetings, personal discussions and team events.
- Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

There was a positive and clear desire to maintain high levels of patient satisfaction. There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice.

The practice team was highly experienced and had demonstrated positive examples of forward thinking and a willingness to embrace innovative ideas and new technologies in order to improve outcomes for patients.

For example:

- Training had been provided to support staff to become Dementia Friends.
- The practice had participated in a pilot scheme dealing with the electronic data transfer of information from hospitals.
- The practice had discussed plans to install Wi-Fi and to make it available to patients whilst at the surgery.