

Edgwick Medical Centre

Quality Report

2 Queen Mary's Road, Coventry, CV6 5LL

Tel: 024 7668 5918

Website: www.edgwickmedical.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 22 November 2016

Date of publication: 31/01/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Good



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

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	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Edgwick Medical Centre	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 Edgwick Medical Centre on 22 November 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There were clearly defined processes and procedures to ensure patients were safe and an effective system was for reporting and recording significant events.
- Patients said they were treated with dignity, respect and compassion. Patients were involved with decisions about their care and treatment.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Patients' needs were assessed and care delivered in line with current guidelines. Staff had the appropriate skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

- Urgent same day patient appointments were available when needed. The majority of patients we spoke with and those who completed comment cards before our inspection said they were always able to obtain same day appointments, although a small number said it could be difficult to get an appointment at times.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said GPs gave them enough time and treated them with dignity and respect.

The area where the provider should make improvements are:

- Continue work already in progress to identify more patients who were carers.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There were appropriate systems for reporting and recording significant events. They were regularly reviewed in practice meetings.
- Risks were assessed and well managed.
- Procedures were in place to ensure patients were kept safe and safeguarded from abuse. All staff had received appropriate safeguarding training at the required level for their role.
- Safety alerts for medicines were reviewed and actioned. Details of reviews and actions were recorded.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received support, an explanation and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again and incidents were reviewed to ensure they were not repeated.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data available from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) 2015/16 demonstrated that patient outcomes were mostly similar to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average and national average. The practice scored 95% with an exception rate of 9%. This was similar to the CCG average of 94% with the same exception rate.
- The practice used clinical audits to identify areas of improvement and acted upon their results.
- Care was delivered by staff according to current evidence based guidance.
- Care plans had been prepared for the most vulnerable patients, for example those most at risk of unplanned hospital admission.
- Practice staff had the necessary skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- We saw that staff worked with other health care professionals to provide 'joined up' care which met the range and complexity of patients' needs.

All staff received appraisals and had personal development plans.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



Summary of findings

- The results of the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2016 showed patients rated the practice highly for aspects of care.
- Patients were treated with kindness and respect. Patient confidentiality was maintained.
- Patients we spoke with and patients who completed comment cards before our inspection were completely positive about all aspects of care and treatment they received at the practice.
- Easy to understand and accessible information about services was available for patients.

The practice had implemented additional ways to identify patients who were carers as only 1% had been identified. For example, by including this on the registration form for new patients.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Most patients told us they were always able to obtain a same day appointment when needed. Appointments were available on the day of our inspection.
- Children and elderly patients were prioritised for same day appointments.
- The practice building had good facilities and was equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- At the time of our inspection, due to a problem, patient appointments could not be booked on-line, although the technology was in place. The practice management had discussed this with the CCG to ensure they were aware of the problem. As a result, the practice manager was due to attend appropriate training on the day after our inspection.

Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- There were appropriate processes to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The management structure was clearly defined and staff knew who to raise concerns with. The practice had policies and procedures which outlined how it should operate and held regular governance meetings.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice had a clearly defined vision which explained how it delivered care and treatment to patients. Staff understood this vision and how it related to their work. This was linked to a five year development plan for the practice.
- The practice sought feedback from patients and staff. The Patient Participation Group (PPG) was newly formed. A PPG is a group of patients registered with a practice who worked with the practice team to improve services and the quality of care.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

Good



- Care plans were in place with the most vulnerable older patients (2%) and used with multi-disciplinary teams to reduce unplanned hospital admissions. These patients had an alert placed on their patient records to ensure clinical staff were aware.
- Older patients were given personalised care which reflected their needs.
- Over the last 12 months all patients aged 75 and over had been invited for a health check. This included blood tests, fracture assessment, frailty assessment, and checks for depression and dementia. From those checks, the practice identified patients who needed further investigation and referred them appropriately. Over the last 12 months, 53% of patients over the age of 75 had responded to the invitation for a health check.
- Home visits were offered to patients who could not reach the practice.

Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients were good for conditions commonly found in older people.

People with long term conditions

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

Good



- The practice had a register of patients with long term conditions to enable their health to be effectively monitored and managed.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- Patients had a named GP and a review every 12 months to monitor their condition and ensure they received correct medicines. This also included carers if the patient had one. The frequency of the review depended on the severity of the patient's condition. Due to the high prevalence of diabetes in the local area, patients with this condition were reviewed every nine months.
- All patients who had been prescribed eight or more medicines had a medicines' review within the last 12 months.

Summary of findings

- The practice achieved a 98% influenza vaccination record for diabetic patients during 2015/16. This was above the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 94%.

Families, children and young people

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

- A total of 86% of eligible patients had received cervical screening in the last 12 months. This was above the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 81%.
- There were appointments outside of school hours and the practice building was suitable for children and babies.
- Outcomes for areas such as child vaccinations were in line with the average for the CCG.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and the local health visitor. Midwife appointments were available at the practice every week.
- A monthly multi-disciplinary team meeting was held with the midwife and health visitor. The child protection register and non-attendance for immunisations and checks were reviewed at this meeting.

A full range of family planning and sexual health services were available within the practice building.

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 practice ensured it provided services to meet the needs of the working age population, For example, extended hours appointments were available on Mondays from 6.30pm to 7.45pm.
- Telephone consultations were available for patients who were unable to reach the practice during the day.
- Regular reviews of the appointment system were held to ensure patients could access the service when they needed to. This had recently resulted in additional telephone appointments being made available.

A full range of services appropriate to this age group was offered, including travel vaccinations and smoking cessation.

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 had a register of patients who were vulnerable to enable their health to be effectively monitored and managed. This included patients with a learning disability.
- The practice participated in the learning disability enhanced service and offered comprehensive reviews by clinical staff who had undertaken relevant training.
- The practice supported vulnerable patients to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Longer appointments were available for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice worked with other health care professionals to provide care to vulnerable patients, for example, the district nursing team and community matron. Vulnerable and complex patients were discussed at the monthly multi-disciplinary team meeting.

Staff could recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities to share appropriate information, record 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 had a register of patients with poor mental health to enable their health to be effectively monitored and managed.
- The practice worked with multi-disciplinary teams to provide appropriate care for patients with poor mental health. This included patients with dementia.
- Patients were signposted to appropriate local and national support groups.
- Staff demonstrated a good working knowledge 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. The results showed the practice was largely performing in line with local and national averages for care, although some areas regarding patient access to the practice were below average and the practice was working to improve these. 364 survey forms were distributed and 101 were returned, which represented a 28% completion rate. This represented xx% of the practice's patient list.

- 50% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by telephone compared to the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 73%.
- 73% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 85%.
- 70% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.

- 57% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 19 comment cards, all of which made positive comments about all aspects of care received at the practice. All patients were positive about all aspects of care received at the practice, although one patient told us it could be difficult to get through on the telephone at times.

We spoke with seven patients during the inspection. Two patients were members of the Patient Participation Group (PPG). A PPG is a group of patients registered with the practice who worked with the practice team to improve services and the quality of care. All the patients we spoke with said they were satisfied with the care they received and had no difficulty obtaining appointments when they needed one.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Continue work already in progress to identify more patients who were carers.

Edgwick Medical Centre

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 advisor.

Background to Edgwick Medical Centre

Edgwick Medical Centre is located in the Foleshill district of Coventry. The practice is a group practice and had 4478 patients registered at the time of our inspection. Foleshill is an urban area and the practice has a significant number of patients from ethnic minority groups – 80%, with Asian and eastern European being the most common. As a result, most patients do not speak English as a first language. There is also considerable deprivation as Foleshill is the 13th most deprived local authority ward in England. A large number of patients have long term medical conditions, for example, 10% of patients registered at the practice have diabetes – double the national average.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract with NHS England. The GMS contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities. The practice is part of a local GP federation known as the GP Alliance. A federation is formed of a group of practices who work together to share best practice and maximize opportunities to improve patient outcomes.

Edgwick Medical Centre has two partner GPs (one male and one female), along with one locum GP (male) who is usually based at the practice. There are also two practice

nurses and at the time of our inspection the practice was part way through the recruitment process to employ a healthcare assistant. They are supported by a practice manager and administrative and reception staff.

The practice is open from 8am to 6.30pm during the week. Appointments are available throughout those times. Extended hours appointments are available on Mondays from 6.30pm to 7.45pm.

When the practice is closed, patients can access out of hours care provided by Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Partnership Trust located in the City of Coventry Healthcare Centre through NHS 111. The practice has a recorded message on its telephone system to advise patients. This information is also available on the practice's website.

Home visits are available for patients who are unable to attend the practice for appointments. There is also an online service which allows patients to order repeat prescriptions and book new appointments without having to telephone the practice. Telephone appointments are available for patients who are unable to reach the practice during normal working hours.

The practice treats patients of all ages and provides a range of medical services. This includes minor surgery and disease management such as asthma, diabetes and heart disease. The practice also cares for 35 patients at a nearby nursing home, all of whom have dementia.

Edgwick Medical Centre is an approved training practice for doctors who wish to become GPs. A GP trainee is a qualified doctor who is training to become a GP through a period of working and training in a practice. Only approved training practices can employ GP trainees and the practice must have at least one approved GP trainer. However, at the time of our inspection, the practice was not operating as a training practice due to constraints on GP's time.

Detailed findings

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 our inspection, 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 inspection on 22 November 2016. During our inspection we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, nursing staff, the practice manager and administrative staff) 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 shared their views and experiences of the service.

- We reviewed policies, procedures and other information the practice provided before the inspection.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

Edgwick Medical Centre had an effective system for reporting and recording significant events.

- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of significant events and we examined three that had occurred within the last 12 months recorded, investigated and discussed fully with staff in the next available staff meeting. Lessons to be learnt had been identified and implemented.
- Staff we spoke with described the incident reporting procedure and we saw the recording form. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment.
- We saw how when things went wrong during care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, were given an explanation, 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 these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, when a patient referral had not been made, the practice acted quickly to correct the error, amended the referral process as a result and gave relevant reminders to staff.

Overview of safety systems and processes

We were satisfied the practice had appropriate systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse, which included:

- Systems were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These were based on relevant legislation and local requirements issued by Coventry City Council's safeguarding team. Staff told us how they could access these policies and we saw evidence of this. They 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 who had been trained to level three in

child safeguarding. All clinical staff had also been trained to this level. All non-clinical staff had received training on safeguarding children to level 2 and on vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs, nursing and administrative staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities.

- There were appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene within the practice. We observed the premises to be visibly clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who had received appropriate training and kept up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and the latest had been carried out in September 2016. This had not identified any areas of concern, but the practice nurse explained the action that would be taken if anything was identified.
- A regular multi-disciplinary team meeting was held. This included the midwife and health visitor. Regular agenda items were a review of the child protection register and non-attendance for immunisations and baby checks.
- There were Patient Group Directions (PGDs) in place to allow the practice nurse to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- There were suitable arrangements in place for managing medicines within the practice. This included emergency medicines and vaccines which were kept in the practice. Processes were in place for the handling of repeat prescriptions. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use.
- The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of Coventry and Rugby Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) pharmacy team and a local pharmacy, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. A monthly meeting was held with a CCG pharmacist.
- Systems were in place for monitoring the prescribing of high-risk medicines, for example warfarin, a medicine to increase the time blood takes to clot.
- We reviewed personnel files and found appropriate and we saw processes were in place to carry out recruitment checks prior to employment. For example, proof of

Are services safe?

identity, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). 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.

- There was a notice in the waiting room to inform patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a DBS check.

Patient safety alerts were well managed.

- The practice safety alerts protocol clearly described the process staff were to follow in responding to alerts.
- Alerts were received by email from external agencies such as Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE).
- These were coordinated by the practice manager (with a nominated person identified for when the practice manager was not available) who ensured actions taken had been recorded.
- Searches were made to identify any patients affected by alerts.
- All actioned alerts were discussed in clinical meetings.
- GPs and nurses described examples of alerts where appropriate changes had been made as a result. For example, a recent alert for a medicine prescribed for patients diagnosed with diabetes had been acted upon, with medicine reviews completed for those patients affected.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patient and staff safety were monitored in an appropriate way.

- All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use (last checked September 2016) and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. This had last been checked in November 2016.
- There were systems in place to ensure the practice was safely staffed to enable patient needs to be met. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty. Staff were able to cover for each other when absent. Regular locum GPs were used when a GP was absent and appropriate checks were carried out prior to employing the locum.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

Edgwick Medical Centre had adequate arrangements in place to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available, securely stored and staff knew how to access these.
- The practice had a defibrillator (which provides an electric shock to stabilise a life threatening heart rhythm) available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- There were emergency medicines securely kept on the premises which were easily accessible to staff. Checks were regularly made on these medicines to ensure they were within date and therefore suitable for use.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. Arrangements were in place to use facilities owned by a nearby practice if the practice building was unavailable. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff. Copies were kept by key staff at home so they could access them if the practice building became unusable.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

We were shown how Edgwick Medical Centre 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. NICE is the organisation responsible for promoting clinical excellence and cost-effectiveness and for producing and issuing clinical guidelines to ensure that every NHS patient gets fair access to quality treatment.

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice. The most recent published results (2015/16) showed that the practice scored 95% with an exception rate of 9% (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients were unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines could not be prescribed because of side effects). This was similar to the CCG average of 94% with the same exception rate.

For example:

- Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD – a collection of lung diseases). The practice achieved 100% with an exception rate of 0%. The overall score was above the CCG average of 95% with an exception rate of 8%.
- Hypertension (high blood pressure). The practice achieved 84% with an exception rate of 4%. This was similar to the CCG average of 83% with an exception rate of 3%.

- Dementia. The practice achieved 100% with an exception rate of 4%. This was above the CCG average of 95% with an exception rate of 6%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- A programme of clinical audit was in place and findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, an audit on patients referred to secondary health care (for example, hospital consultants), reduced the number of rejected referrals by ensuring information on routine and less regular referrals was aligned with the CCG referral guidelines. The practice has continued to monitor this.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation and peer review.

Effective staffing

Practice staff at Edgwick Medical Centre had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

- An induction programme was in place for newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and confidentiality. New staff received a period of mentoring with an established member of staff. This included locum GPs and the practice had a locum induction pack.
- There was a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of developmental needs in place. Staff received training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. We saw evidence of ongoing support and coaching. All staff we spoke had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- A staff handbook was produced and regularly updated to provide staff with all necessary information about the practice and procedures.
- Staff who administered vaccines and took samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training. This included an assessment of competence.
- Practice staff had received training that included safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Training was regularly updated.
- For planned and long term GP absence, Edgwick Medical Centre used locum GPs known to the practice.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

All information needed by staff to enable them to plan and deliver patient care was easily available to them:

- Information included care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Patients at risk of unplanned hospital admissions (2% of the patient list) had care plans in place.
- Information was shared with other services appropriately, for example when referring patients to other services, such as for secondary health care appointments.

Practice staff worked with other health and social care professionals to meet patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This resulted in a 'joined up' package of care with other providers. For example, when referring patients for family planning or sexual health matters.

Consent to care and treatment

We were told how practice staff obtained patients' consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

Patients in need of additional support were actively identified by the practice. For example:

- Smoking cessation advice was available from the practice. Over the last 12 months, 285 patients received smoking cessation advice, 33% of the total number of patients who smoked.
- Patients who received palliative (end of life) care and carers.
- Patients with a long term condition.
- Patients who need additional support, such as dietary advice.
- The practice offered additional support for diabetic patients.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 86%, which was above the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 82%. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel cancer (32% of patients screened). This was similar to the national average of 58% and breast cancer (59% of patients screened). This was below the national average of 72%. We discussed this with GP partners and the younger age range of patients was a contributory factor.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds were 100% which was above to the CCG range of 96% to 99% and five year olds from 94% to 99% which was comparable to the CCG range of 91% to 99%.

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 of Edgwick Medical Centre we saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect at all times.

- We received 19 comment cards from patients, all of which made positive comments about the standard of care received.
- Reception staff told us when patients needed privacy to discuss sensitive issues they were offered a private room.
- There were curtains in consultation rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.

We spoke with two members of the Patient Participation Group (PPG). A PPG is a group of patients registered with the practice who worked with the practice to improve services and the quality of care. They also told us they felt the practice provided an excellent service in a demanding area. Comment cards highlighted that staff were caring and respected patients.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2016 showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was largely in-line for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 83% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 89% and the national average of 89%.
- 82% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%.
- 90% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.
- 84% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 85% national average of 85%.
- 91% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 90% national average of 91%.

- 80% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients we spoke with told us they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment. They told us clinical staff listened to them. Every patient we spoke with told us they were given enough time by GPs. Comments made by patients on the comment cards completed before our inspection supported this.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2016 showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were largely in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 81% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 86%.
- 86% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%.
- 85% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 85%.

We saw how the practice provided assistance to enable patients to be involved in decisions about their care:

- The practice was able to translate for most patients within its own staff. If this was not possible, largely with some eastern European languages, there was a translation service available. Notices were displayed in the reception area about this. The service was regularly used.
- Information was displayed in other languages and additional information could be provided in other languages on request.
- A wide range of information about health awareness and locally available support groups was displayed in the waiting room.

Are services caring?

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Literature was available in the waiting room to publicise local and national support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 1% of the practice list as carers. We discussed this with GPs and the practice manager, who were aware this was low. We were told how the practice has worked to identify 'hidden carers', a known difficulty within the cultures found within the patient list. For example, the practice had included this on the registration form for new patients and had started working with Coventry Carer's Association.

Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. This included Coventry Carers Association and networking. Patients could also be referred to, or refer themselves to appointments with an Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) counsellor. All carers were also offered a carer's assessment.

GPs contacted families following bereavement. Patients were also signposted to relevant support services.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- Extended hours appointments were available on Monday evenings and the practice had recently made additional telephone appointments available.
- Same day appointments were available for all patients when required. Appointments were available on the day of our inspection.
- Practice staff were able to translate for most patients who did not speak English as a first language and a translation service was also available.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and their carers were also invited.
- The practice also offered telephone consultations for patients who could not attend the practice during normal working hours.
- Clinical staff made home visits to patients who were unable to reach the practice.
- Travel vaccinations were available.
- Appropriate staff training was carried out. For example, staff had recently received carer awareness training.
- Due to the high prevalence of diabetes within the local community, more than double the national average, the practice had formed a partnership with George Eliot Hospital in Nuneaton to review patients where treatment was more difficult to manage.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8. am to 6.30pm during the week. Appointments were available throughout those times. Extended hours appointments were available on Mondays from 6.30pm to 7.45pm. When the practice was closed, patients could access out of hours care provided by Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Partnership Trust located in the City of Coventry Healthcare Centre through NHS 111. The practice had a recorded message on its telephone system to advise patients. This information was also available on the practice's website.

Results from the National GP Patient Survey published in July 2016 showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was broadly in-line with or in some areas below the local and national averages, apart from satisfaction with the practice's opening hours.

- 73% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 76%.
- 50% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by telephone compared to the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 73%.

One patient who completed a comment card before our inspection told us they had difficulty getting through on the telephone at times.

We discussed telephone access with practice management. The practice had made more staff available to answer telephones at busy times and had tried to encourage patients with non-urgent needs to telephone at quieter times. At the time of our inspection, the practice had explored options for a new telephone system with an increased call capacity and was shortly to enter into a contract with a provider for this.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

There was a clear and effective system in place for handling complaints and concerns.

- The practice complaints procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- The practice had designated the practice manager to handle all complaints received.
- Information about how to complain was clearly displayed in the waiting room and in the practice patient leaflet.
- An annual complaints summary was prepared and discussed to review progress and any potential trends.

Nine complaints had been received within the last 12 months and we reviewed two of these. Patients received an appropriate explanation and apology. Complaints were reviewed annually to ensure lessons had been learnt and any errors made had not been repeated. The practice acted on concerns raised by patient complaints; for example, by revising the procedure for issuing repeat prescriptions.

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

Edgwick Medical Centre had a clearly defined direction and vision 'to provide an excellent primary care service for all patients without prejudice.' This was displayed on the practice website and on notices displayed within the practice.

Governance arrangements

The practice had a governance framework in place which facilitated the delivery of care and reflected the practice values. This ensured that:

- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained and changes were made when concerns were identified. For example, with patient concerns about being able to get through on the telephone.
- Policies and procedures were tailored to the practice and were available to all staff. They were reviewed annually and staff were informed of any changes.
- There were clear arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks. All concerns were raised and fully discussed in staff meetings.

Leadership and culture

We saw how the lead GP and management team had the necessary experience and skills to run the practice and provide appropriate high quality care to patients. Staff we spoke with told us the partners were fully approachable and listened to staff ideas and concerns. Staff also told us how open the lead GP and management were and they felt they could easily raise any concerns they had.

There were systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment. The partners encouraged a culture of openness, approachability and honesty. Staff we spoke with confirmed this. There were appropriate systems in place at the practice to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

- Patients affected were supported, given an explanation and a verbal and written apology.
- There was a clearly defined management structure in place and staff were supported. Staff told us there was a culture of openness within the practice.
- Staff we spoke with told us they felt valued and supported. All staff were involved in discussions at meetings and in appraisals and were invited to identify opportunities to improve the service offered by the practice.
- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings and we saw minutes of meetings to confirm this. Staff told us they could raise any issues at team meetings.

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 an active Patient Participation Group (PPG). A PPG is a group of patients registered with a practice who worked with the practice to improve services and the quality of care. The PPG met quarterly, carried out patient surveys and discussed developments within the practice.
- The practice gathered and used feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion.
- Results from the NHS Friends and Family Test during the last nine months showed that 64% of patients who responded were either likely or highly likely to recommend the practice to friends and family.

Continuous improvement

The practice is part of a local GP federation known as the GP Alliance. A federation is formed of a group of practices who work together to share best practice and maximize opportunities to improve patient outcomes.

Edgwick Medical Centre is an approved training practice for doctors who wish to become GPs. A GP trainee is a qualified doctor who is training to become a GP through a period of working and training in a practice. Only approved training practices can employ GP trainees and the practice must have at least one approved GP trainer. However, at the time of our inspection, the practice was not operating as a training practice due to constraints on GP's time.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Due to the high prevalence of diabetes within the local community, more than double the national average, the practice had formed a partnership with George Eliot Hospital in Nuneaton to review patients where treatment was more difficult to manage.