

Maghull Family Surgery

Quality Report

Maghull Health Centre, Westway
Maghull
Liverpool
L31 0DJ

Tel: 01515202487

Website: www.maghullfamilysurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 29 June 2017

Date of publication: 21/08/2017

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?	Requires improvement	
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 Maghull Family Surgery	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13
Action we have told the provider to take	23

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Maghull Family Surgery on 29 June 2017. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- The practice had systems to minimise risks to patient safety but some aspects of medicines management required improvement.
- 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.
- Patients said they were treated with care, compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns. This included informal complaints made to the practice.
- Patients we spoke with said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- Staff worked well together as a team, knew their patients well and all felt supported to carry out their roles.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. Examples we reviewed showed the practice complied with these requirements.

Summary of findings

However, there were areas where the provider needed to make improvements.

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- Systems and processes must be in place to ensure that risks associated with high risk medicines are implemented to ensure patient safety.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- The practice should develop an agreed and documented approach to the management of test results that every member of the practice team is familiar with. This should include having a system in place to track and reconcile tests requested against results received. This should be undertaken regularly to ensure there are no delays dealing with results that require prompt action.

- The system to cascade information for patient safety alerts should be reviewed to ensure all relevant alerts are reviewed and acted upon.
- Measures should be put in place to maintain the security of blank prescription forms used in printers when the printer is left unattended such as overnight or when the surgery/consulting room is not in use.
- The provider should ensure an appropriate risk assessment has been carried out to identify a list of medicines, in line with best practice, that should be in place for use in an emergency situation, both in the practice and for the purpose of home visits.
- An action plan should be implemented to address the poor results of the national GP patient survey.
- A system should be put in place to monitor patient referrals to hospital, particularly under the two week waiting times.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as requires improvement for providing safe services.

- Although risks to patients were assessed, the systems and processes to address these risks were not always implemented well enough to ensure patients' safety. For example, we found that some patients who were prescribed high risk medicines had not had their treatment reviewed as required and that improvements were needed to ensure that risks were well managed.
- The provider did not ensure that an appropriate risk assessment was in place to identify a list of medicines that were needed in an emergency.
- We found that the security of blank prescription forms used in printers was left unattended such as overnight or when the surgery/consulting room is not in use.
- 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 that they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- The practice had adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice similar to or lower than others for several aspects of care. For example, 79% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85% and 81% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- Survey information we reviewed showed that patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was accessible.
- During our inspection we observed that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect. We saw staff treated patients with kindness and maintained patient and information confidentiality.
- All of the 42 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting conditions, including patients with a condition other than cancer and patients living with dementia.
- Patients we spoke with said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and evidence from three examples reviewed showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as good for providing well led services.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a leadership structure which covered a number of the providers other practices, staff told us they felt supported by management. The practice had policies and procedures to govern activity.
- An overarching governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received an induction, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour.
- The provider encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents, for sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on. The practice had an active Patient Participation Group (PPG).
- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels. Staff training was a priority and was built into staff rotas.
- GPs who were skilled in specialist areas used their expertise to offer additional services to patients.

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.

- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits, extended appointments 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. Older patients were involved in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs.
- Older patients were provided with health promotional advice and support to help them to maintain their health and independence for as long as possible. For example, carrying out over 75's health checks, fall prevention assessments and Flu vaccinations for the elderly.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- The practice held information about the prevalence of specific long term conditions within its patient population. This included conditions such as diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), cardio vascular disease and hypertension. The information was used to target service provision, for example to ensure patients who required immunisations received these.
- Practice nurses held dedicated lead roles for chronic disease management. As part of this they provided regular, structured reviews of patients' health.
- Patients with several long term conditions were offered a single, longer appointment to avoid multiple visits to the surgery.
- All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for a structured annual review to check their

Good



Summary of findings

health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found there were systems to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- 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.
- The practice engaged with the younger people and teenage population and had worked to improve outcomes in areas such as teenage sexual health, smoking cessation for young people and increase vaccination and immunisation uptake.

Good



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 and Saturday appointments.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs of 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.

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.
- 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.

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).

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and dementia.
- The practice had a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving medicines for mental health needs.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.
- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016 for the period of March 2015 – January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages for some but not all questions, 279 survey forms were distributed and 103 were returned. This represented approximately 2% of the practice's patient list. Some of the results showed that:

- 71% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 85%.
- 83% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 69% and the national average of 73%.

- 66% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 76%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 43 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patient said the practice was always clean, they found it easy to get an appointment and they felt staff were respectful and treated them with dignity.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

- Systems and processes must be in place to ensure that risks associated with high risk medicines are implemented to ensure patient safety.

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- The practice should develop an agreed and documented approach to the management of test results that every member of the practice team is familiar with. This should include having a system in place to track and reconcile tests requested against results received. This should be undertaken regularly to ensure there are no delays dealing with results that require prompt action.
- The system to cascade information for patient safety alerts should be reviewed to ensure all relevant alerts are reviewed and acted upon.

- Measures should be put in place to maintain the security of blank prescription forms used in printers when the printer is left unattended such as overnight or when the surgery/consulting room is not in use.
- The provider should ensure an appropriate risk assessment has been carried out to identify a list of medicines, in line with best practice, that should be in place for use in an emergency situation, both in the practice and for the purpose of home visits.
- An action plan should be implemented to address the poor results of the national GP patient survey.
- A system should be put in place to monitor patient referrals to hospital, particularly under the two week waiting times.

Maghull Family Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Maghull Family Surgery

Maghull Family Surgery is located in Maghull, Merseyside and falls within South Sefton Clinical Commissioning Group. The practice has two contracts in place, firstly a Personal Medical Services (PMS) and a GMS (General Medical Services) contract. Under both contracts the practice serves a local population of approximately 4800 patients.

The practice clinical team consists of two GP partners (male) and one non-clinical partner, supported by two long term locum GPs, (one male and one female). A further (male) locum GP is available on an ad hoc basis for additional cover as and when required. The service has a practice nurse who works four days per week. The clinical team is supported by a practice manager, a practice administrator and seven administrative and reception staff.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are from 9am to 11.30am every morning and from 3.30pm to 6pm daily. Extended surgery hours are offered at the practice on Tuesday of each week, from 6.30pm to 8pm.

The practice is in a facility shared with Maghull Community Health Centre. Community midwives, health visitors and nurses are based in this building. The practice has a slightly higher than average population of older patients, with

22.6% of patients being aged 65 and over, compared to the England average of 16.7%, and the practice had 10.6% of patients over age 75 years, compared to the England average of 7.6%. There is a small amount of car parking available outside the practice.

The practice does not provide out of hours services. When the surgery is closed patients are directed to the GP out of hours service provider (NHS 111).

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 29 June 2017.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area and talked with carers and/or family members

Detailed findings

- Reviewed a sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.
- Visited all practice locations
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver care and treatment plans.

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

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

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

- older people
- people with long-term conditions
- families, children and young people
- working age people (including those recently retired and students)
- people whose circumstances may make them vulnerable
- people experiencing poor mental health (including people living with dementia).

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was a system for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- From the sample of three documented examples we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed. The practice carried out an analysis of the significant events.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- There was a system to cascade information for some patient safety alerts but on the day of inspection we found that an alert we knew required review had not been picked up by the practice.
- The practice also monitored trends in significant events and evaluated any action taken.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- 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. Staff we spoke with had a good understanding of safeguarding matters

arising. There were lead members of staff for safeguarding, both for adults and children. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and 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. All clinicians were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS

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.
- One of the GP partners was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.

The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice minimised risks to patient safety, however some improvements were needed.

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions and repeat prescriptions were signed before being dispensed to patients. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. However, the practice did not have robust arrangements in place for monitoring those patients on high risk drugs. We found that GPs had prescribed high risk medicines without checking whether the patient had received the correct monitoring and blood tests. Blank prescription forms and pads were mostly securely stored, but we found some were left in printers in clinical rooms overnight. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow

Are services safe?

nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health care assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines and patient specific prescriptions or directions from a prescriber were produced appropriately.

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 patient and staff safety.

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The premises were not owned by the provider but contracts arrangements were in place for the maintenance and health and safety aspects related to ensuring the building was fit for purpose. During the inspection there was limited evidence and documentation available to demonstrate this, but these were sent to us shortly after the visit. The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.
- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments to monitor safety of the premises such as control of

substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

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

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 and kept in a secure area of the practice, all staff were aware of their location. All the medicines were checked but we found that some of these had expired and some emergency medicines such as antibiotics and adrenaline for children were not available.
- 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 practice monitored its performance against QOF indicators continuously in order to improve and achieve better outcomes. The practice also worked towards meeting local targets.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit. There was a structured approach to the management of quality improvement and the practice proactively identified audits in response to:

- Local and national priorities
- Change in guidelines
- Significant events
- Following educational meetings

Audits included, for example, a diabetes audit, hypertension audit, cancer diagnosis, and medicines management audits.

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- From the sample of 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Information was shared between services, with patients' consent, using a shared care record. Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs. However, there was no system in place to monitor the patient referrals to hospital, particularly under the two week waiting times initiative.

- 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 in need of extra support. These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, patients with conditions such as heart failure, hypertension, epilepsy, depression, kidney disease and diabetes. Patients with these conditions or at risk of developing them were referred to (or signposted to) services for lifestyle advice such as dietary advice or smoking cessation.

- A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.
- The practice offered national screening programmes, vaccination programmes and long term condition reviews. The practice monitored how it performed in relation to health promotion. It used the information from the QOF and other sources to identify where improvements were needed and to take action.
- Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups on the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.
- Information and advice was available about how patients could access a range of support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80%, which was comparable with 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.
- Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme.
- The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer. There were 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.
- 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 42 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 one member of the patient participation group (PPG). They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comments highlighted that staff responded compassionately when patients needed help and provided support when required. However, results from the national GP patient survey showed the practice was mostly below average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 80% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 87% and the national average of 89%.
- 73% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the national average of 95%.
- 79% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.

- 81% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 92% and the national average of 91%.
- 78% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 92%.
- 86% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 97%.
- 81% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 90% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

The practice was aware of the below average results for the national GP surgery and they had taken actions to address the issues but a formal action plan had not been drawn up.

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.

Patients we spoke with answered positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. However, results from the GP patient survey showed the practice was below local and national averages. For example:

- 79% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 86%.
- 76% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 82%.
- 76% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 90%.

Are services caring?

- 69% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time for their first outpatient appointment in a hospital).

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 76 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). Carers could be offered longer appointments if required. They were also offered Flu immunisations and health checks. 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 or sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. We saw many examples of this and amongst others the practice had:

- Offered extended hours on a Tuesday evening until 8.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- Longer appointments were available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions. There were early and ongoing conversations with these patients about their end of life care as part of their wider treatment and care planning.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- There were accessible facilities, which included a hearing loop, and interpretation services available.

Access to the service

The appointment system was well managed and sufficiently flexible to respond to peoples' needs. People told us on the day that they were able to get appointments when they needed them. The practice was open between 8am to 6.30 Monday to Friday. Extended hours appointments were offered on a Tuesday evening to 8pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 74% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 75% and the national average of 76%.

- 82% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 83% 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 81% and the national average of 85%.
- 94% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 92%.
- 82% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 83%.
- 48% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 58% and the national average of 58%.

The practice was aware of the poorer results from the national GP surgery so they undertook their own practice survey in June 2016. All the patients coming into the surgery were given questionnaires regarding their experience with the nurse and the doctor. The questionnaires were given to patients for one month with a total of 50 questionnaires being completed. Results showed to us as part of this inspection indicated patients had been happy with the GP and nurse consultations. We were told that nurses at this period had been running late with appointments and patients requesting to see a particular GP could not get access an appointment. We saw that an action plan had been put into place. This included patients being notified that a GP was running late should this arise, the time given for the nurse was reviewed and increased for complex patients amongst other actions.

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

The practice had a system to assess:

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

In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

The practice had a system for handling complaints and concerns. Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England. We looked at a sample of complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these had been investigated and responded to in a timely manner and patients had been provided with a thorough

explanation and an apology when this was appropriate. Patients had been provided with contact details for referring complaints on to the Parliamentary and Health Services Ombudsman (PHSO) if they were not satisfied with the outcome of their complaint. We found that complaints were regularly discussed at staff meetings and lessons were learned from individual concerns and complaints.

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 in a friendly and approachable environment.

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs and nurses had lead roles in key areas, for example safeguarding and infection control.
- 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. For example in the way that significant events were managed.
- 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 provider 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 senior partner was 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 management team encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. From the sample of four documented examples we reviewed we found that the practice had systems to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment, the practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology.

The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence. There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management.

- The practice held and minuted a range of multi-disciplinary meetings including meetings with district nurses and social workers to monitor vulnerable patients. GPs, where required, met with health visitors to monitor vulnerable families and safeguarding concerns.
- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so. Minutes were comprehensive and were available for practice staff to view.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

(PPG) but prior to the inspection the work with this group had lapsed. It was part of the practice development to work with this group and to hold regular meetings to gain their views.

The practice had a support structure in place for supervision which included informal one to one sessions with staff. We were informed the practice nurses had informal supervision from the lead GP and they regularly attended local neighbourhood meetings for peer support and supervision. The development of staff was supported through a regular system of appraisal that promoted their professional development and this reflected any regulatory or professional requirements. 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. Monthly training was undertaken by the GPs and nurses with protective learning sessions. Patient views were monitored for the NHS Friends and Family test, complaints and compliments received.

Continuous improvement

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

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

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

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment</p> <p>How the regulation was not being met:</p> <p>The registered person did not do all that was reasonably practicable to monitor and manage risks to the health and safety of service users. Reviews of patients who were prescribed high risk medicines had not been carried out at the required level of frequency for all patients.</p> <p>This was in breach of regulation 12(1) (2) (a) and (b) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.</p>