

Dr SSG Wickremesinghe

Quality Report

Grantham Practice
Beckett House
Grantham Road
London
SW9 9DL

Tel: 020 7733 6191

Website: www.granthamcentrepractice.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 31 March 2016

Date of publication: 02/08/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Outstanding	
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

Detailed findings from this inspection

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

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr SSG Wickremesinghe's practice (the Grantham Practice) on 31 March 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

We saw three areas of outstanding practice:

- The practice's patient satisfaction survey findings were significantly better than the national or local averages in several areas. Most notably patients

Summary of findings

found access to the practice to be significantly better, and both the appointments system and the helpfulness of reception staff were rated highly by patients.

- The practice had highlighted that 10% of the population were from Ghana, with a large number from Kumasi, and many patients travelled back to the country on a frequent basis. They had worked to develop a co-operative service with a doctor in Kumasi who had travelled to the practice to develop shared care for these patients. In particular, the practice had developed shared care diabetic protocols with the practice. This allowed patients continuity of care when out of the country.
- The practice had delivered a number of services for the benefit of its Portuguese population, who form 30% of the practice's patient list. The practice had

invited two Portuguese GPs from Lisbon to the surgery. With patient consent, they sat in on appointments with patients and fed back on some of the challenges they saw. The practice reported that they gave "invaluable insight in patients' conditions that had not been picked up despite use of translators." In partnership with the local Portuguese Community Centre the practice ran a 'NHS' day at the centre. This involved talks on how to access appropriate health care and focus groups. The practice reported that they had ensured that all leaflets in the practice were translated into Portuguese with the assistance of a local community group and had made the leaflets available to any other practices in the local area who wanted to use them.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients 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 in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as outstanding for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.
- The practice had highlighted that 10% of the population were from Ghana, with a large number from Kumasi, and many patients travelled back to the country on a frequent basis. They had worked to develop a co-operative service with a doctor in Kumasi who had travelled to the practice to develop shared care for these patients. In particular, the practice had developed shared care diabetic protocols. This allowed patients to receive co-ordinated care when out of the country. The practice had developed a shared care protocol for patients wishing to use this service.
- The practice had delivered a number of services for the benefits of its significant Portuguese population. The practice had invited two Portuguese GPs from Lisbon. With patient consent, they sat in on appointments with patients and fed back on some of the challenges they saw. The practice reported that they gave "invaluable insight in patients' conditions that had not been picked up despite use of translators." In partnership with the local Portuguese Community Centre the practice ran a 'NHS' day at the centre. This involved talks on how to access appropriate health care and focus groups. The practice had designed a welcome pack in Portuguese.

Outstanding



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.

Good



Summary of findings

- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice provided named GPs for older patients.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. Total QOF achievement for diabetic indicators was 84%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.
- The practice had highlighted that 10% of the population were from Ghana, with a large number from Kumasi, and many patients travelled back to the country on a frequent basis. They had worked to develop a co-operative service with a doctor in Kumasi who had travelled to the practice to develop shared care for these patients. In particular, the practice had developed shared care diabetic protocols with the practice. This allowed patients continuity of care when out of the country.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 77 %, which was comparable to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 74%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

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.

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Good



Summary of findings

- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

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).

- 78% 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.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. Total QOF achievement for mental health related indicators was 84%. The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 90%, similar to the national average of 88%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results for 2015/6 showed the practice was performing better than local and national averages. Four hundred and ten survey forms were distributed and 89 were returned. This represented 1.4% of the practice's patient list.

- 93% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 93% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 94% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%).

- 92% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 27 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. In particular, patients stated that it was easy to make an appointment, and that they were treated with dignity and respect by staff.

We spoke with eight patients during the inspection. All eight patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. In particular, patients told us that the care provided by doctors was of high quality.

Dr SSG Wickremesinghe

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 and two further CQC inspectors.

Background to Dr SSG Wickremesinghe

The practice of Dr SSG Wickremesinghe, also known as the Grantham Medical Practice, is based in the London Borough of Lambeth. The practice is run by three partners (all male), two of whom are full time and one of whom works four sessions per week. The practice is in a purpose built premises which is shared with another practice, although the two practices were distinct and did not share other resources such as staff. The address of the practice is Grantham Practice, Beckett House, Grantham Road, London, SW9 9DL

The practice is in an area with a mixed demographic. It is in the third most deprived decile of practices in the UK. However, the partners told us that in recent years the population had changed as the area “had become gentrified”. The practice population includes a very high number of Portuguese patients who formed 30% of the practice’s list. There are also a large number of patients from West Africa, particularly Ghana, who in total form around 10% off the practices list. The practice has a large number of patients who either do not speak English or for whom it is not their first language

The practice has a list size of approximately 6,000. Further to the three GPs who run the practice, there are three salaried GPs (two female and one male) who combine for a

total of 14 sessions per week. In total there are 34 GP sessions per week. There is also a practice nurse, a healthcare assistant, a practice manager, two administrators, a secretary and four receptionists.

The practice is contracted to provide Personal Medical Services (PMS) and is registered with the CQC for the following regulated activities: treatment of disease, disorder or injury, maternity and midwifery services, surgical procedures, and diagnostic and screening procedures at one location.

The practice is open between 8:00am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. The practice also had extended hours on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday from 6:30pm until 7:00pm where appointments with a GP, nurse or healthcare assistant are all available. Scheduled appointments are available throughout the day, and a duty doctor is on call daily to manage emergencies and home visits.

The practice had not previously been inspected by the CQC.

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.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 31 March 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (including GP partners, salaried GPs, the practice manager, the practice nurse and receptionists/administrative staff) and with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

- Is it safe?

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events. All significant events were discussed in a dedicated monthly meeting attended by all clinical staff.

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, in a case where a case of hypothyroidism had been missed in a child, the practice had implemented a follow up system for overdue blood results as these had not been received following the patient's initial presentation.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse, which included:

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended

safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3. The practice nurse was trained to level 2. All other staff were trained to a minimum of level 1.

- 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 manager told us that all staff in the practice were routinely DBS checked on appointment.
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG 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 in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) 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

Are services safe?

presentation for treatment). The Health Care Assistant was trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction (PSD) from a prescriber. (PSDs are written instructions from a qualified registered prescriber for a medicine including the dose, route and frequency or appliance to be supplied or administered to a named patient after the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis).

- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure

enough staff were on duty. One of the practice partners and the practice manager told us that they were actively looking to recruit further practice nurse and reception resource, but that the practice had experienced difficulty in attracting suitable candidates. Staff in the practice that we spoke to said that there were currently not enough staff in the reception team, but that in the short term the shortfall had been accommodated by changes to rotas and overtime.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator on the premises which it shared with the other practice based in the building. The working status of the defibrillator was checked by the other practice on a regular basis. There was also oxygen available 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 in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.
- The practice used care plans for patients on the palliative care register. There were also care plans for patients with learning disabilities, those with long term conditions, those who had an unplanned admission and those with poor mental health. The care plans that we saw were comprehensive and individualised. The practice had procedures in place to ensure that patients with high need or those at high risk were discussed at multi-disciplinary team meetings.

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 (year end March 2015) were 95.6% of the total number of points available. Overall exception reporting at the practice was 3.8%, which is below the national average. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

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

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. Total QOF achievement for diabetic indicators was 84%. The percentage of patients

with diabetes on the register who had well controlled diabetes was 71%, similar to the national average of 77%. The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 92%, similar to the national average of 94%.

- Performance for hypertension related indicators was similar to the national average. The total QOF achievement for these indicators was 100%. The percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months was 150/90mmHg or less was 81%, similar to the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. Total QOF achievement for mental health related indicators was 84%. The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 90%, similar to the national average of 88%

The practice had specific leads for QOF and a system of recall for those patients with long term conditions who required review. We saw that those patients with more complex conditions were discussed at clinical meetings, with fully documented actions.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- The practice provided copies of three clinical audits completed in the last two years, each of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. We saw an audit of Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) testing of patients on goserelin. (Prostate-specific antigen, or PSA, is a protein produced by cells of the prostate gland. The PSA test measures the level of PSA in a man's blood. The blood level of PSA is often elevated in men with prostate cancer). The first cycle audit showed that five patients had not had the required yearly follow up. The practice introduced a new templated system of follow up following the audit, and on reauditing a year later, all patients had been tested as required.
- The practice participated in local audits (included those instigated by the CCG), national benchmarking, accreditation and peer review.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. 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, the practice's healthcare assistant had been provided mentoring support by the practice nurse, which was formalised and documented. Study leave was available for all clinical staff in the practice to attend relevant training and updates.
- 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. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.

- 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. Multi-disciplinary team meetings took place with health visitors, district nurses, the palliative care team and the mental health team on a regular basis, and care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet and smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- Dietary, podiatry and counselling services were available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 77 %, which was comparable to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to

Are services effective? (for example, treatment is effective)

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

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 ranged from 89% to 96% and five year olds from 92% to 100%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 27 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 eight patients. They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 90% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 90% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 95%.
- 89% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.

- 85% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 86% and to the national average of 91%.
- 100% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Of particular note was that all of the patients in the survey, and those that we spoke to said that they found receptionists helpful. In particular, the practice had noted that 30% of the practice population were Portuguese speakers and ensured that there was a Portuguese speaker on reception.

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

- 89% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 86%.
- 77% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 80% and to the national average of 82%.
- 84% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 82% and to the national average of 85%.

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

Are services caring?

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format. Thirty percent of the patients at the practice were Portuguese speakers. The practice had ensured that all leaflets in the practice were translated into Portuguese with the assistance of a local community group. The practice had made the leaflets available to any other practices in the local area who wanted to use them.

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.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 112 patients as carers (1.9% of the practice list). The practice ensured that carers were provided with yearly health reviews and that they were signposted to support services. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

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



Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice had noted that the local practice population were relatively high users of mental health services. The practice had recently appointed a salaried GP doctor who the practice were supporting in becoming trained as a GP with a specialist interest (GPSE) in mental health to better provide care for these patients.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on a Monday, Wednesday and Thursday evening until 7:00pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability and for those with multiple complex conditions.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- Some of the consulting rooms were on the first floor and there was no lift access. However, the practice had systems in place to ensure that wheelchair users and patients with limited mobility could be seen on the ground floor by the clinician of their choice.
- The practice had noted that 10% of the population were from Ghana, with a large number from Kumasi. Many of these patients travelled back to Ghana on a frequent basis. The practice had worked to develop a co-operative service with a doctor in Kumasi who had travelled to the practice to develop shared care for patients who wanted continuity of care and wished to use this service. For example, the practice had

developed shared care diabetic protocols with the doctor in Kumasi and were considering developing further protocols. This allowed patients continuity of care for patients when they were out of the country.

- The practice had delivered a number of services for the benefits of its significant Portuguese population. The practice had invited two Portuguese GPs from Lisbon to the practice. With patient consent, they sat in on appointments with patients and fed back to the practice's doctors on some of the challenges they saw. The practice reported that they gave "invaluable insight in patients' conditions that had not been picked up despite use of translators." In partnership with the local Portuguese Community Centre the practice ran an 'NHS' day at the centre. This involved talks on how to access appropriate health care and focus groups. The focus group was attended by nine patients who were born in Portugal and had been used to find positive and negative experiences of care in the NHS. The practice was developing an action plan to improve services further for these patients, although at the time of the inspection this had not yet been implemented. The practice has designed a welcome pack in Portuguese and one of the practice receptionists spoke Portuguese.
- The practice was in the process of launching a gardening project where vegetables would be grown in the practice grounds. The practice were hoping that patients with poor mental health or learning disabilities may want to become involved in the project as part of their continuing care.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8:00am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were available throughout the day. Extended hours appointments were offered from 6:30pm until 7:00pm on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 85% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.



Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- 93% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%).

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.

- 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. Details were available on notices in the waiting room, in the practice leaflet and on the practice's website.

We looked at five complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, and the response to the patient was open and transparent. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

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 in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included

support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. The practice had also organised focus groups with its Portuguese and Ghanaian populations to develop services for these groups.
- 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.

Continuous improvement

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. The practice had delivered targeted services to patients of both Portuguese and Ghanaian background who between them

accounted for 40% of the practice population. These services included joint work with GPs in Ghana and Portugal in order to identify areas where improvements might be made. These relationships were well developed and offered benefits to these groups of patients.