

Dr Zulfikar Moghul

Quality Report

200-202 Chadwell Heath Lane,
Romford,
Redbridge
RM6 4YU
Tel: 0208 548 7520
Website: none

Date of inspection visit: 5 January 2017
Date of publication: 14/03/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Dr Zulfikar Moghul	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Zulfikar Moghul (Grove Surgery) on 5 January 2017. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- Some patients said they did not find it easy to make an appointment with a named GP, but urgent appointments were available the same day. The practice was working to improve access.
- The practice had identified less than one percent of its patients as carers.
- Results of the national GP patient survey showed that the practice was performing below local and national averages in a number of areas. The practice was aware of this, and had taken action to improve patient satisfaction.
- Performance for child immunisations was below national averages.
- 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.
- 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.

Summary of findings

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Review results from the national GP patient survey and continue to work to improve patient satisfaction, including in relation to phone access and waiting time to be seen after arrival for an appointment.
- Review how carers are identified and recorded on the patient record system to ensure information, advice and support is made available to all.
- Consider how to improve its child immunisation programme for the benefit of that patient group.
- Continue to monitor and ensure all medical alerts are brought to the attention of all relevant staff.

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 comparable 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.

- The practice had identified less than 1% of patients as carers.
- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice lower than others for several aspects of care. The practice was aware of this, and had taken action to improve patient satisfaction.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.

- Patients said they did not find it easy to make an appointment with a named GP, but urgent appointments were available the same day.
- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice worked with the local pharmacy team to review its prescribing.
- 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.

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.
- 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 a governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care.
- 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.

Good



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.
- Flu and pneumococcal immunisations were given at home to housebound and other patients with mobility issues.

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.
- 96% of patients on the diabetes register had received a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months which was above the national average of 88%.
- 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.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- Immunisation rates for the standard childhood immunisations were below the national average. For example, rates for five year olds ranged between 60% to 84% which was below the national average of 81% to 94%.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- 83% of women aged 25-64 had had a cervical screening test performed in the preceding 5 years which was comparable to the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- Extended hours appointments were offered on three evenings a week for the benefit of patients who could not attend during working hours.

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.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

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).

- 91% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months, which was above 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 were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing below local and national averages. Three hundred and sixty five survey forms were distributed and 89 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 41% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 53% and the national average of 73%.
- 65% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 64% and the national average of 76%.
- 72% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 85%.
- 60% 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 67% and 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 21 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. One card mentioned difficulty in contacting the practice by phone.

We spoke with two patients during the inspection. Both patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The practice participated in the NHS friends and family test (FFT) (FFT is an anonymised method of asking patients if they would recommend the practice to a friend or family member). Eighty-eight percent of eight patients responding to the FFT said they would recommend the practice.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Review results from the national GP patient survey and continue to work to improve patient satisfaction, including in relation to phone access and waiting time to be seen after arrival for an appointment.
- Review how carers are identified and recorded on the patient record system to ensure information, advice and support is made available to all.
- Consider how to improve its child immunisation programme for the benefit of that patient group.
- Continue to monitor and ensure all medical alerts are brought to the attention of all relevant staff.

Dr Zulfikar Moghul

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 Dr Zulfikar Moghul

Dr Zulfikar Moghul (Grove Surgery) provides primary medical services in Romford, Essex to approximately 8400 patients and is a member of NHS Redbridge Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The practice population is in the fifth most deprived decile in England. Twenty-three percent of children live in income deprived households compared to a local average of 19% and a national average of 20%. The average age of patients is the lowest in Redbridge, for example: 32% of patients were aged under 18, compared to a CCG average of 24% and a national average of 21%; with 6% of patients aged over 65 compared to a CCG average of 12% and a national average of 17%.

The practice had surveyed the ethnicity of the practice population and had determined that 27% of patients described themselves as white, 48% Asian, 21% black and 3% as having mixed or other ethnicity.

The practice operates from a converted residential property with most patient facilities on the ground and first floors that are wheelchair accessible. There are offices for administrative and management staff on the ground and first floor. All floors are accessed via a lift or stairs.

The practice operates under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract and provides a number of local and national

enhanced services (enhanced services require an increased level of service provision above that which is normally required under the core GP contract). The enhanced services it provides are: meningitis immunisation; alcohol brief intervention; childhood vaccination and immunisation scheme; extended hours access; facilitating timely diagnosis and support for people with dementia; influenza and pneumococcal immunisations; learning disabilities; patient participation; rotavirus and shingles immunisation; and unplanned admissions.

The practice team at the surgery is made up of one full-time male principal GP. There is one full-time female salaried GP and four part-time female locum GPs. The doctors provide a total of 30 clinical sessions per week. The nursing team consists of one part-time female advanced nurse practitioner, two part-time female nurses and one part-time female physician's assistant. There are nine administrative, reception and clerical staff including a full part-time practice manager.

The practice is open:

Monday to Wednesday 8.00am and 8.00pm.

Thursday and Friday 8.00am and 6.30pm.

GP appointments are available:

9.00am to 3.00pm.

4.00pm to 6.30pm.

Nurse appointments are available:

9.00am to 12.00pm.

12.30pm to 2.30pm.

3.00pm to 6.30pm.

Extended surgery hours are offered from 6.30pm until 8.00pm Monday to Wednesday. The practice does not open

Detailed findings

on a weekend. The practice has opted out of providing out of hours (OOH) services to their own patients when it is closed and directs patients to the OOH provider for NHS Redbridge CCG.

Dr Zulfikar Moghul (Grove Surgery) is registered as a sole principal GP with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures; maternity and midwifery services; treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

This practice has not previously been inspected by 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.

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 5 January 2017. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GP, nurses, practice manager, administrative staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.

- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients 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.

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, a patient was called in too soon for a test. When the practice realised the mistake it apologised to the patient. It subsequently discussed the issue in a meeting and revised its procedures to double check when tests were due before offering appointments.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had 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, nurses were trained to level 2 and non-clinical staff 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 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. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for specific clinical conditions. They received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber. PGDs

Are services safe?

are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment.

- We reviewed three 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 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, in addition, staff worked to a fixed timetable and provided cover for each other during holiday and other busy times.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was a panic alarm 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 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. There was no failsafe system to ensure that updates were brought to the attention of all relevant staff. Following the inspection the practice introduced a system to ensure that all staff would be appropriately updated in future.

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, with overall clinical exception reporting of 9% (comparable to the national average of 9%). 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 2014-15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. For example:
 - 74% of patients with diabetes, on the register, had a last blood sugar reading within the preferred range which was comparable to the national average of 78%.
 - 79% of patients with diabetes had a last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) of 5 mmol/l or less, which was comparable to the national average of 81%.

- 96% of patients on the diabetes register had received a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months compared to a CCG average of 83% and a national average of 88%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average:
 - 91% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months, which was comparable to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 88%.
 - 93% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months, which was comparable to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 90%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been two clinical audits completed in the last two years, one of these was a completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, for example it had worked with the CCG on a COPD audit (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease).
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included the findings of an audit of patient waiting times. A clinician had recorded the average waiting time for patients beyond their appointment time for two consecutive weeks in three successive months. Following the first cycle the clinician found that the average waiting time was 18 minutes. The clinician held a meeting with staff to review the findings. The practice made the following changes to the appointment system: emergency appointments were moved to the end of the clinic rather than fitting them in between booked appointments; staff were given training in triaging the need for emergency appointments as well as appropriate use of the minor ailments scheme; posters were displayed in the waiting room reminding patients of the permitted length of consultations.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Following the second cycle, the average waiting time had been reduced to six minutes. The clinician also received positive feedback from patients about the reduced waiting time.

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, 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. All staff, employed for over a year, 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. 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.

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.

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, smoking and alcohol cessation and asthma. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- A dietician and smoking cessation advice were available from local support groups.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 83%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 below the CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 80% to 84% (the CCG average ranged from 91% to 92% and the national average was 73% to 93%) and five year olds from 60% to 84% (the CCG average ranged from 69% to 85% and the national average was 81% to 95%).

The practice told us that a number of patients refused childhood immunisations for cultural reasons, whilst others failed to respond to repeated attempts to arrange appointments. There were also a number of patients who did not have records of their children's immunisation status, but who declined immunisation. The practice made repeated efforts to arrange appointments for this patient group, including phoning patients parents, and, by making use of alerts on the computer system staff would speak to patients parents when they were attending the practice.

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 21 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. One card mentioned difficulty in getting through on the phone.

We spoke with two members of the patient participation group (PPG). 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 below average for its satisfaction scores for some 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 85% and the national average of 89%.
- 91% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 82% 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 93% and the national average of 95%.

- 81% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 81% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 73% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 87%.

The practice told us that staff had received additional customer care training and support from the practice manager, that there had been an improvement as a result of shorter appointment waiting times, and with changes to the phone system, to make access easier. The practice offered online booking and was also trialling email and text booking for routine appointments.

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 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:

- 83% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 86%.
- 84% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 82%.
- 80% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 85%.

Are services caring?

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

- 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. Staff spoke a range of the local languages.
- 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.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 23 patients as carers (less than 1% of the practice list). Carers were offered annual flu vaccination, and were signposted to local support groups. 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 phoned or visited the family, to offer condolences and to signpost them to 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.

- The practice offered evening appointments on Monday to Wednesday evenings until 8.00pm for the benefit of patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice had a lift to enable ease of access to the upper floor.
- It was the only GP practice in Redbridge that opened all day on Thursdays.
- The practice was part of a local GP hub enabling patients to get appointments up to 10.00pm on weekday evenings and with weekend appointments also available.
- The practice was working with its vulnerable patients to trial mobile phone text (eight patients were participating in the trial) and email (fifty patients were participating) booking of non-urgent appointments.
- Flu and pneumococcal immunisations were given at home to housebound and other patients with mobility issues.

Access to the service

GP appointments were available:

9.00am to 3.00pm.

4.00pm to 6.30pm.

Nurse appointments were available:

9.00am to 12.00pm.

12.30pm to 2.30pm.

3.00pm to 6.30pm.

Extended surgery hours were offered from 6.30pm until 8.00pm Monday to Wednesday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to eight weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patients were less satisfied with how they could access care and treatment compared to national averages.

- 76% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 41% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 72% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 85%.
- 60% 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 67% and the national average of 79%. This contrasted with the findings of the practice's Friends and Family Test (FFT) where 88% of eight patients responding to the FFT said they would recommend the practice.
- The practice told us that it had been dissatisfied with its previous telecoms provider and, following a recommendation from other practices, had entered into a contract with another provider. This phone system was not as flexible as the practice had requested. It had taken significant steps to improve access including: 12% of patients were registered for online access; it was trialling email booking for routine appointments, with fifty patients participating; eight patients were part of another trial of the use of mobile phone texting for routine appointment booking; and it was the only practice in Redbridge that ran clinics on a Thursday afternoon. The practice was able to refer patients to a local walk-in centre, and was a member of a local GP hub that offered evening appointments up till 10.00pm on weekdays, with weekend appointments also

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

available. It was also investigating the option to increase its extended hours from three evenings a week, to every weekday evening, though no date had been set for this change.

The practice had recognised the issue of patients waiting too long to be seen for an appointment. The principal GP had carried out an audit of waiting times and as a result had made a number of changes, including: changing his consultation style to keep appointments better to time; educating patients not to expect to raise a number of issues unless they booked a longer appointment; moving emergency appointments to the end of clinics rather than simply fitting them in between booked appointments; and reception staff informed patients on arrival and apologised if appointments were running late.

People told us on the day of the inspection that they were able to get appointments when they needed them. This was also reflected in the CQC comment cards we received, with only one card mentioning difficulty in contacting the practice by phone.

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

This was achieved by a GP telephoning the patient or carer in advance to gather information to allow for an informed decision to be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. 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

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 including a leaflet available from reception.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way, with openness and transparency in dealing with the complaint. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. Action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a patient complained about the availability of on the day appointments. The practice apologised to the patient and carried out a review of its appointment system, which it discussed in a meeting. It then introduced the following changes in procedure: it introduced a revised appointment system; made changes to its phone system; and also added a receptionist at peak times to enable more calls to be answered.

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 vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

- The practice had a mission statement but it was not displayed. Following the inspection the practice displayed a copy of its mission statement in the waiting area.
- The practice had a strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

The practice had a 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 arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the principal GP 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 principal GP was 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 principal GP 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 an 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 principal GP. 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. For example, the PPG had asked the practice to run clinics on Thursday afternoons as a means of improving patient access. The practice considered this and started running Thursday afternoon clinics, making it the only GP practice in Redbridge that opened on Thursday afternoons.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through social events, and generally through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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

The practice had recently employed a newly qualified nurse practitioner, who was receiving mentoring and guidance from the principal GP. Three members of the non-clinical staff were studying for qualifications in team leadership, and business administration.