

Dormers Wells Medical Centre

Quality Report

143 Burns Avenue,
Southall, Ealing,
UB1 2LU

Tel: 0208 571 0078

Website: www.dormerswellsmedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 4 May 2017

Date of publication: 25/05/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

Good



Are services caring?

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good



Are services well-led?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Dormers Wells Medical Centre	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13
Action we have told the provider to take	23

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dormers Wells Medical Centre on 15 March 2016. The practice was rated as good for providing effective, caring and responsive services, and requires improvement for providing safe and well-led services. The overall rating for the practice was requires improvement. We issued two requirement notices to the provider in respect of safe care and treatment and fit and proper persons employed.

The full comprehensive report on the March 2016 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Dormers Wells Medical Centre on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

This inspection was an announced comprehensive follow up inspection on 4 May 2017 to check that action had been taken to comply with legal requirements and assess what improvements had been made. We found improvements had been made however further improvement was necessary in relation to providing safe services. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems to minimise risks to patient safety. However, we found shortfalls with high risk medicine monitoring and acting on national patient safety alerts.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.

Summary of findings

- Patients we spoke with said they found they could make an appointment with a named GP in a reasonable time and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. Examples we reviewed showed the practice complied with these requirements.

The areas where the provider must make improvement are:

- Implement an effective system to monitor patients on high risk medicines.

In addition the provider should:

- Implement a process to act on patient safety alerts when relevant to general practice patients.
- Continue to monitor and improve patient satisfaction with access to the service.
- Identify and support more patients who are also carers.
- Develop a detailed strategy to deliver the practice vision.
- Implement a program of quality improvement to include clinical audit to improve patient outcomes.
- Consider ways to improve QOF exception reporting to bring in line with local and national figures.

Professor Steve Field CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

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

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

Requires improvement



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



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 comparable to others for most aspects of care.

Good



Summary of findings

- Survey information we reviewed showed that patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

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

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it. However, the strategy was not detailed, and it had not been formalised.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- An overarching governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received inductions, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. In two examples we reviewed we saw evidence the practice complied with these requirements.

Good



Summary of findings

- The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents and sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on. The practice engaged with the patient participation group.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified at an early stage older patients who may need palliative care as they were approaching the end of life. It involved older patients in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs.
- Older patients were provided with health promotional advice and support to help them to maintain their health and independence for as long as possible.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff worked with the GPs in long-term disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80mmHg or less is 88% compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 78%.
- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- There were emergency processes in place for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.
- All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for a structured annual review to check their

Good



Summary of findings

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

Families, children and young people

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

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found there were systems to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Immunisation rates were comparable to others for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us, on the day of inspection, that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- The practice provided support for premature babies and their families following discharge from hospital.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice worked with health visitors and school nurses to support this population group. For example, in the provision of ante-natal, post-natal and child health surveillance clinics.
- The practice had emergency processes for acutely ill children and young people and for acute pregnancy complications.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

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

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

Good



Summary of findings

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

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- 86% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 89%.
- The practice had a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving medicines for mental health needs.
- The percentage of patients with physical and/or mental health conditions whose notes record smoking status in the preceding 12 months is 98% compared to the national average of 95%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.
- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. Three hundred and fifty two survey forms were distributed and 100 were returned. This represented 1.4% of the practice's patient list. The results of the survey were in line with or below local and national averages:

- 73% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 85%.
- 52% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 67% and the national average of 73%.

- 64% 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 72% and the national average of 80%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 36 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **MUST** take to improve

- Implement an effective system to monitor patients on high risk medicines.

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Implement a process to act on patient safety alerts when relevant to general practice patients.
- Continue to monitor and improve patient satisfaction with access to the service.

- Identify and support more patients who are also carers.
- Develop a detailed strategy to deliver the practice vision.
- Implement a program of quality improvement to include clinical audit to continuously improve patient outcomes.
- Consider ways to improve QOF exception reporting to bring in line with local and national figures.

Dormers Wells 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 adviser.

Background to Dormers Wells Medical Centre

Dormers Wells Medical Centre is situated at 143 Burns Avenue, Southall, Ealing, UB1 2LU. The practice provides NHS primary care services through a General Medical Services (GMS) contract to approximately 7,000 people living in the London Borough of Ealing. The practice is part of the NHS Ealing Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The practice population is ethnically diverse with a higher than average number of children of all ages and adults 44 years and below. The practice has a much lower than average number of older patients. The practice area is rated in the third most deprived decile of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). People living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services.

The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures; treatment of disease, disorder or injury; maternity and midwifery services; surgical procedures and family planning.

The practice team consists of a male GP partner, a female GP partner, two regular locum GPs (3.5 whole time equivalents in total), a full time practice nurse, a health care assistant, a practice manager, a practice secretary and five reception staff.

The practice is open between 8.30am and 8pm Mondays and Thursdays, 8.30am and 7pm Fridays and 8.30am and 1pm Wednesdays. Appointments are available from 9am to 12pm every morning, 3pm to 6pm Monday, Tuesday and Friday and 2pm to 6pm Thursday. Extended appointments are available 6.30pm to 8pm Monday and Thursday, and 7.30am to 8am Tuesday. Patients can access out of hours care through the NHS 111 service.

The practice provides a range of services including child health and immunisations, joint injections, anticoagulation, long-term condition management, smoking cessation advice, cervical screening, spirometry, electrocardiogram, phlebotomy, wound care and pre-diabetic assessments.

Why we carried out this inspection

We undertook a comprehensive inspection of Dormers Wells Medical Centre on 15 March 2016 under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The practice was rated as good for providing effective, caring and responsive services and requires improvement for providing safe and well-led services. It was rated overall as requires improvement.

We also issued two requirement notices to the provider in respect of safe care and treatment and fit and proper

Detailed findings

persons employed. We undertook this follow up inspection on 4 May 2017 to check that action had been taken to comply with legal requirements and assess what improvements had been made.

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 4 May 2017. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (two GPs, practice nurse, practice manager, non-clinical staff) and spoke with three patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed a sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver care and treatment plans.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 15 March 2016, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing safe services as the arrangements in respect of mandatory training, recruitment, medicine management and fire safety needed improving.

We issued two requirement notices in respect of these issues and found arrangements had improved when we undertook a follow up inspection of the service on 4 May 2017. However, arrangements in respect of acting on national patient safety alerts and the monitoring of high risk medicines needed improving and therefore the practice remains rated as requires improvement for being safe.

Safe track record and learning

There was a system for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- From the sample of six documented examples we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed. The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, one significant event involved a verbally abusive patient. The police were called and the patient was dealt with appropriately. The patient was deregistered from the practice following advice from NHS England. Learning was shared which was that the police should be called immediately with similar incidents to minimise the risks to patients and staff.
- The practice had a process in place for the dissemination and review of patient safety alerts however there was no evidence that relevant ones had been acted on. There were no examples of where

searches had been done on the clinical system to check for affected patients. Immediately after our inspection the provider wrote to us with a detailed action plan to address the shortfalls identified. The improvements made can be assessed at our next inspection of the service.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements for safeguarding reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. From one documented example we reviewed we found that the GPs had attended safeguarding meetings when possible or provided reports where necessary for other agencies.
- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs, the nurse and healthcare assistant were trained to child protection or child 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 (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).

The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene.

- We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- The practice nurse was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. Annual IPC audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.

Are services safe?

The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice minimised risks to patient safety (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal).

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions. Repeat prescriptions were signed before being dispensed to patients and there was a reliable process to ensure this occurred. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment). Health care assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines and patient specific prescriptions or directions from a prescriber were produced appropriately.
- There was not an effective system in place to check patients on high risk medicines such as methotrexate and lithium had received regular blood tests. We checked the notes of patients on three high risk medicines and found seven examples of where patients had not received their blood tests at the appropriate intervals. Staff explained that blood tests were done by the hospital, however there was no process to confirm this, and patients were continuing to receive their medicines on the assumption that the blood tests had been done. Immediately after our inspection the provider wrote to us with a detailed action plan to address the shortfalls identified. The improvements made can be assessed at our next inspection of the service.

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

Monitoring risks to patients

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

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.
- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system to ensure enough staff were on duty to meet the needs of patients.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 15 March 2016, we rated the practice as good for providing effective services.

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 97% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 96% and national average of 95%. Overall exception reporting was 9% compared to the CCG average of 6% and the national average of 6%.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015/16 showed:

- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80mmHg or less is 88% compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 78%.
- 86% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 89%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90mmHg or less is 85% compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 83%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- There had been three clinical audits commenced in the last year, one of these was a completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. The audit was aimed at better diagnosis and treatment of atrial fibrillation (abnormal heart rhythm which can cause stroke). The second cycle of the audit showed improved detection rate with 31 patients on anticoagulation therapy compared to the initial cycle of the audit where 24 patients were on anticoagulation therapy.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs and nurses. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- Evidence showed that the practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation.
- The practice nurse and the healthcare assistant were qualified to provide smoking and alcohol cessation and dietary advice. Patients were referred to relevant services when required.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80%, which was comparable with the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 81%.

There was a policy to offer text or written reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by ensuring a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

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

Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given averaged 89% for under two year olds compared to the 90% national standard and in line with national averages for five year olds.

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

At our previous inspection on 15 March 2016, we rated the practice as good for providing caring services.

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 36 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 three patients including one member of the patient participation group (PPG). They told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comments highlighted that staff responded compassionately when 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 generally below average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses although the difference from the average was not significant. For example:

- 77% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 85% and the national average of 89%.
- 76% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 87%.
- 89% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 92%

- 77% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 85%.
- 84% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 84% and the national average of 91%.
- 83% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 92%.
- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 97%.
- 83% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 91%.
- 81% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 87%.

The views of external stakeholders were positive and in line with our findings. For example, the manager of a local care home where some of the practice's patients lived praised the care provided by the practice.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 82% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 86%.
- 69% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 82%.

Are services caring?

- 80% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 90%.
- 82% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access

a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website. Support for isolated or house-bound patients included signposting to relevant support and volunteer services.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 17 patients as carers (0.2% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

A member of staff acted as a carers' champion to help ensure that the various services supporting carers were coordinated and effective.

Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 15 March 2016, we rated the practice as good for providing responsive services.

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- The practice offered extended hours on a Monday and Thursday evening until 8pm and on a Tuesday from 7.30am to 8am for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability, patients experiencing poor mental health and those whose first language was not English.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions. There were early and ongoing conversations with these patients about their end of life care as part of their wider treatment and care planning.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were accessible facilities, which included a hearing loop, and interpretation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am and 8pm Mondays and Thursdays, 8.30am and 7pm Fridays and 8.30am and 1pm Wednesdays. Appointments were available from 9am to 12pm every morning, 3pm to 6pm Monday, Tuesday and Friday and 2pm to 6pm Thursday. Extended appointments were available 6.30pm to 8pm Monday and Thursday, and 7.30am to 8am Tuesday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to one month in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 68% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 72% and the national average of 76%.
- 49% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 69% and the national average of 73%.
- 57% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the CCG average of 69% and the national average of 76%.
- 77% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 92%.
- 52% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 67% and the national average of 73%.
- 21% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 44% and the national average of 58%.

Prior to our inspection the practice had drawn up an action plan to improve patient satisfaction with access. Measures included the more active promotion through posters and leaflets of online services for booking appointments and encourage patients to contact the practice at less busy times for test results and general enquiries to ease the demand for telephone access. Other actions included trailing changes to the appointment system such as allowing patients to book appointments more than one month in advance. The practice were also engaging with the patient participation group to improve access and looking at ways of reducing the number of patients not attending appointments.

The practice had a system to assess:

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

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

The practice had a system for handling complaints and concerns.

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. For example, information in the patient leaflet and the complaints procedure displayed in the patient waiting area.

We looked at four complaints received in the last two years and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learned from individual concerns and complaints and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, one complaint we reviewed involved a misunderstanding between a patient and a locum GP. The complaint was discussed in a staff meeting and learning shared to minimise the likelihood of similar situations happening again.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 15 March 2016, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing well-led services as although there was a vision or for the practice, there was no strategy to deliver the vision, policies and procedures were not in all cases up to date or reviewed and the systems and processes in place to effectively demonstrate good governance required improvement.

We found arrangements had improved when we undertook a follow up inspection of the service on 4 May 2017. The practice is rated as good for being well-led.

Vision and strategy

- The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients and there was a strategy to deliver the vision. Staff understood their responsibilities in relation to it. However the strategy was not detailed, it had not been formalised, and there were no supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values that were regularly monitored.
- The practice had a mission statement which was available on the patient website.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs and nurses had lead roles in key areas.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. These were updated and reviewed regularly.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained. Practice meetings were held monthly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.
- Clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements although there was no program of quality improvement including clinical audit in place.

- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.
- We saw evidence from minutes of a meetings structure that allowed for lessons to be learned and shared following significant events and complaints.

Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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

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

- patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, as a result of feedback the practice had introduced extended opening hours.
- the national GP survey, complaints and compliments received.
- staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

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

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Family planning services Maternity and midwifery services Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	Regulation 12 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment How the regulation was not being met: The registered person did not do all that was reasonably practicable to assess, monitor, manage and mitigate risks to the health and safety of patients who use services. They had failed to ensure an effective system was in place to monitor patients on high risk medicines. This was in breach of regulation 12(1) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.