

The Lakeside Practice

Quality Report

White Wings Centre
Spa Pool Rd
Askern
Doncaster
South Yorkshire
DN6 0HZ
Tel: 01302 820494
Website: www.lakesidepractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 26 January 2016 Date of publication: 03/03/2016

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	

Contents

Summary of this inspection	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9
Detailed findings from this inspection	
Our inspection team	10
Background to The Lakeside Practice	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Lakeside Practice on 26 January 2015. 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 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.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.

- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure all staff complete relevant safeguarding training for children as recommended in the Safeguarding Children and Young people: roles and competences for health care staff Intercollegiate document (Third edition: March 2014).
- The number of repeat prescription issues should be reviewed so they are in line with annual reviews.
- Written complaint responses should refer to the Parliamentary Health Service Ombudsman for people to refer to if they were not satisfied with their response.
- The training passport should detail the frequency of update training staff needed to attend.

Professor Steve Field CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP

Chief Inspector of General Practice

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 were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and 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.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

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

Good







Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice was working with the other GPs in their locality group to offer Saturday morning GP appointments to patients who contacted the out-of-hours service and needed to be seen. This negated the need to travel to the out-of-hours centre in Doncaster.
- Most 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 clinical service advisors offered all patients varied appointment length times dependent on their reason for being seen.
- 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.

- 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 this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care.
 This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- 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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.

Good





- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active. A member of staff from the local care home also attended the meetings on behalf of the patients at the home.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

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.

- 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.
- GPs performed a weekly ward round at the two local care homes with patients registered at the practice. They also held a weekly meeting with the care home manager.

People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 0.4% above the CCG and 7% above the national average.
- 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.

Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.

Good



Good

- - - -



- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 88%, which was above 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.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients who needed them.
- The practice regularly worked with multidisciplinary teams in the case management of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- The practice informed patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in 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.
- GPs performed a weekly ward round at the two local care homes with patients registered at the practice. They also held a weekly meeting with the care home manager.

Good





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 living with dementia).

- 82% of patients diagnosed as living with dementia who had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is above the national average.
- 95% with poor mental health had an agreed comprehensive care plan in place. This is above the national average of 88%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with living with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and living with dementia. Practice staff were dementia friends trained.



What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 2 July 2015. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. 323 survey forms were distributed and 102 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 83% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 70% and a national average of 73%.
- 85% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 84%, national average 85%).
- 89% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 82%, national average 85%).

• 85% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 75%, national average 77%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 44 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients described the practice as providing a caring service which was responsive to their individual needs.

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



The Lakeside Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector, a GP specialist adviser, a practice manager specialist adviser and an expert by experience.

Background to The Lakeside Practice

The Lakeside Practice is located in Askern on the outskirts of Doncaster. The practice provides services for 7,424 patients under the terms of the NHS Personal Medical Services contract. The practice catchment area is classed as within the group of the fourth more deprived areas in England. The age profile of the practice population is similiar to other GP practices in the Doncaster Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) area.

The practice has four GP partners, three female and one male. They are supported a regular female GP locum, two advanced nurse practitioners, two practice nurses, a healthcare assistant, a phlebotomist, and a team of management and clinical service advisors.

The practice is open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments with GPs and the practice nursing team are available from 8am to 12 noon every morning and 1pm to 5.30pm daily. Extended surgery hours are offered on Thursday evenings until 8pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that can be booked up to three weeks in advance, urgent appointments are also available for people who need them. Practice nurses offer a telephone triage service for all patients who request a same day appointment.

When the practice is closed calls were answered by the out-of-hours service which is accessed via the surgery telephone number or by calling the NHS 111 service.

Prior to our inspection, we noted the partners at the practice did not reflect the partners registered with the Care Quality Commission. The registered manager, told us as part of the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009: Regulation 15 they would apply to add the two partners.

The Lakeside Practice is registered to provide maternity and midwifery services; treatment of disease, disorder or injury; family planning and diagnostic and screening procedures from The White Wings Centre, Spa Pool Rd, Askern, Doncaster, South Yorkshire, DN6 0HZ.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive inspection programme.

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 registered 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.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 26 January 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, advanced nurse practitioners', practice nurses, healthcare assistants, managers and clinical service advisors') and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions
- Families, children and young people
- Working age people (including those recently retired and students)
- People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable
- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with 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 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 practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, we were told how the process of referring to other healthcare professionals was reviewed following an incident. The incident record contained the investigations undertaken and reported how to avoid the situation happening again. We were told this was discussed at the monthly clinical meeting and shared with staff who attended. We were told staff who did not attend the meetings would be briefed accordingly following the meeting.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

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 adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities. Not all practice nurses had completed level two safeguarding training for children as recommended in the Safeguarding Children

- and Young people: roles and competences for health care staff Intercollegiate document (Third edition: March 2014). The registered manager told us this would be reviewed with immediate effect. The lead GP was trained to Safeguarding level three.
- 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 check (DBS check). (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. An advanced nurse practitioner had just taken on the role of the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead. They had plans to liaise with the local IPC teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol in place and staff had received training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. We noted the issue number for repeat prescriptions on the patient record system was very high. We reported this to a GP partner who told us it would be reviewed. Two of the advanced nurse practitioners had qualified as Independent Prescribers and could therefore prescribe medicines.. They received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. We noted the person who approved the PGDs now worked at the practice on a locum basis and suggested this be reviewed. The practice had a system

12



Are services safe?

for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable healthcare assistants to administer vaccinations after specific training when a doctor or nurse were on the premises.

- We reviewed four recruitment files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. The practice did not routinely check registration updates with the appropriate professional bodies. The registered manager checked all practice nursing staff registration with the Nursing Midwifery Council during our visit and scheduled further checks for when registrations were due to be renewed.
- There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

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 and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty. They also had standby rotas to use when clinical service advisors were off. Staff told us they had all agreed the rotas and knew when they would be working to cover leave and other eventualities.

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



Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 95.9% of the total number of points available, with 5.8% exception reporting. (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). Data from 2014/15 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 0.4% above the CCG and 7% above the national average.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 1% above the CCG and 2% above the national average.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 4% above the CCG and 7% above the national average.
- Performance for living with dementia related indicators was 2% above the CCG average and 5% above the national average.
- The practice had a low number of patients with a long term condition admitted to hospital as an emergency 16% compared to the national average of 19%.

Staff at the practice had developed and used care plans to coordinate the care of patients with long term medical

conditions and learning disabilities. Five percent of the practice population had a care plan in place. Of those patients with a long term condition, 57% had a medication review performed for the current year (2015/16).

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been four clinical audits completed in the last two years, three of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services.
 For example, recent action taken as a result included reviewing patients taking blood thinning medices to ensure they were regularly reviewed.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. It covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how it ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff for example, for those reviewing patients with long term conditions. Staff administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations 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 during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had training modules and



Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

in-house training. More recently staff had access to and made use of e-learning modules. We noted the training passport did not detail how often some training needed to be updated. For example, it did not recommend how often staff should attend safeguarding children updates.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
 Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- 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 services 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. We saw evidence that multidisciplinary team meetings took place on a quarterly basis and care plans were routinely reviewed and updated. The community nursing team were based in the same building and staff told us they frequently visited the practice to discuss patient's care 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 records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

 These included patients with palliative care needs, carers, those at risk of developing a long term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 88%, which was above the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how it encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to two year olds ranged from 93% to 97% and five year olds from 91% to 99%.

Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 80%, and at risk groups 55%. These were also above CCG and national averages.

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 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 44 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 two members of the patient participation group. They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 90% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 89%.
- 88% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 86%, national average 87%).
- 95% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG and national average 97%).
- 90% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 84%, national average 85%).
- 89% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 91%, national average 90%).

• 87% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 86%, national average 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 on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

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

- 86% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 86%.
- 85% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 79%, national average 81%).
- 85% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 87%, national average 85%).

Staff told us interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. Deaf, blind and lip speaking interpreters could be also booked for those patients who required them and the patient would be given a longer appointment. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients these services were available.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us if families experienced bereavement, the practice would send a bereavement card. Their usual GP may contact them and this call was either followed by a



Are services caring?

meeting 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. Other staff involved with the care of the patient would also be informed.



Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice was working with the other GPs in its locality group to offer Saturday morning GP appointments to patients who contacted the out-of-hours service and needed to be seen. This negated the need to travel to the out-of-hours contact centre in Doncaster.

- The practice offered evening appointments with the GP and practice nursing staff until 8pm on Thursdays for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- The clinical service advisors offered all patients varied appointment length times dependent on their reason for being seen.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and interpretation services available.
- Practice staff were dementia trained and sensitive to the needs of patients living with dementia.
- GPs performed a weekly ward round at the two local care homes with patients registered at the practice.
 They also held a weekly meeting with the care home manager.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments with GP and practice nursing team were available from 8am to 12 noon every morning and 1pm to 5.30pm daily. Extended surgery hours were offered on Thursday evenings until 8pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to three weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them. Practice nurses offered a telephone triage service for all patients who requested a same day appointment.

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.

- 83% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 74% and national average of 75%.
- 83% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 70%, national average 73%).
- 68% said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 54%, national average 60%).

Most people told us on the day of the inspection that they were were able to get appointments when they needed them. Two comment cards referred to difficulty obtaining appointments. The practice had signed up 12% of the patient population for the online appointment booking and prescription service.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England. However, written complaint responses did not refer to the Parliamentary Health Service Ombudsman for people to refer to if they were not satisfied with their response.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw a notice was available in the waiting area to refer to patients to member of staff if they wanted to complain.

We looked at eight complaints received in the last 12 months and found they were handled satisfactorily in a timely way and there was openness and transparency dealing with the compliant. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, the practice reviewed its appointment system following a complaint from a patient which resulted in 70% of appointments were now pre-bookable rather than booked on the day.



Are services well-led?

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- Staff were committed to continuous quality improvement. We noted the practice was not capturing all of the activity which would have contributed to this programme. For example, practice nursing staff were regularly reviewing patient medications when new guidelines were issued recommending a medicine of choice.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions

Leadership and culture

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

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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology.
- They 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 in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met regularly and were actively recruiting more members. It submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. A member of staff from the local care home also attended the PPG on behalf of the patients at the home.

 The practice had also gathered feedback from staff through through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give

Are services well-led?

Good



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

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.