

Kumar Medical Centre

Quality Report

59 Grasmere Avenue
Slough
Berkshire
SL2 5JE

Tel: 01753 579803

Website: www.kumarmedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 31 October 2016

Date of publication: 09/12/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

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	11

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	12
Background to Kumar Medical Centre	12
Why we carried out this inspection	12
How we carried out this inspection	12
Detailed findings	14

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Kumar Medical Centre on 31 October 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

Specifically, we found the practice good for providing safe, effective, caring, responsive and well led services.

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 we spoke to on the day of inspection informed us they were able to make an appointment with a named GP, 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 an area of outstanding practice:

- The practice had responded to the needs of ethnic minority diabetic patients and developed 'The South Asian Lifestyle Intervention Programme' in collaboration with other practices in the local clinical commissioning group (CCG). The project was aimed at improving the outcomes for diabetic patients. In addition, the practice was offering other health

Summary of findings

promotion activities, such as, group discussions and yoga classes at the premises. The practice informed us they were one of the best performing practices in managing diabetes in Slough CCG. We noted the positive impact on prescribing rates. For example, the practice had over all lowest prescribing rates (-11%) compared to other practices in the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) and reduced the prescribing of antibiotics by 40%.

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Ensure all staff are aware that a translation service is available and information about a translation service is displayed in the reception areas.
- Review and monitor the system in place to continue with improvements and encourage the uptake for the bowel screening programme.

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.

Good



- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were learnt from significant events and staff we spoke with informed us that significant events were discussed during the practice team meetings. We saw evidence that lessons were communicated widely to support improvement including sharing with other local practices.
- 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.
- Fridge temperatures were recorded daily.
- There was an infection control protocol in place and infection control audits were undertaken regularly.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good



- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were above average compared to the national average. For example, performance for mental health related indicators was better than the CCG and national average. The practice had achieved 100% of the total number of points available, compared to 98% locally and 93% nationally.
- 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.
- The practice's uptake of the bowel screening programme was below national average. However, the practice had taken steps to encourage the uptake and recent data demonstrated improvement and the practice's uptake for the bowel screening programme had increased from 36% to 41%.

Summary of findings

- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



- Data showed that patient outcomes were varied in comparison to others in locality for several aspects of care. For example, 85% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 89%.
- 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. The practice was offering a translation service. However, some reception staff we spoke with were not aware if a translation service was offered and we did not see notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- 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.

Good



- 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, a new clinical pharmacist was employed (starting in January 2017) jointly by five practices in the partnership with South Bucks NHS trust to carry out medicines reviews for complex cases.
- The practice had responded to the needs of ethnic minority diabetic patients by developing 'The South Asian Lifestyle Intervention Programme' in collaboration with other local practices.
- The practice had improved prevalence of stroke from 3.07% in 2014 to 1.13% in 2016.
- Data collected via the national GP patient survey reported patients had good access to appointments at the practice. For example, 84% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 50% and national average of 73%.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP, with urgent appointments available the same day.

Summary of findings

- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to 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 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 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 patients.

Good



- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- It was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- There was a register to effectively support patients requiring end of life care.
- There were good working relationships with external services such as district nurses.
- The premises was accessible to those with limited mobility. However, the practice did not have a low level desk at the front reception.

People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as outstanding for the care of patients with long-term conditions.

Outstanding



- There were clinical leads for chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All patients with long term conditions had a named GP and the practice carried out a structured annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met.
- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed the practice had achieved excellent outcomes for the care of patients with long-term conditions. For example, performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the CCG and national average. The practice had achieved 100% of the total number of points available, compared to 90% locally and 90% nationally.
- The practice had responded to the needs of ethnic minority diabetic patients by taking part in developing a 'The South Asian Lifestyle Intervention Programme' in collaboration with other local practices and data showed that patient outcomes had improved.
- We also noted the positive impact on prescribing rates because patients were self managing their long term conditions better due to improved lifestyles.

Summary of findings

- A clinical pharmacist was employed to carry out medicines reviews for complex cases patients with long term conditions.
- The practice had a dedicated member of staff to place reminders on the practice's computer system to ensure all reviews were done in a timely manner.
- The practice was organising monthly 'health and well-being social club', weekly yoga classes and offered group discussions to patients with long term conditions at the premises.
- For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Families, children and young people

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

- 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 patients who had a high number of A&E attendances.
- Immunisation rates were high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young patients were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was same as the national average of 82%.
- The practice offered weekly smoking cessation clinic at the premises.
- 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.
- We noticed that a GP partner was working as a primary care strategy lead in Slough CCG. A GP partner had led a project at CCG level designed to educate young children early about health promotion messages with the added effect of cascading these influencing messages to parents and extended family members.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 offered extended hours appointments Monday to Friday from 6.30pm to 7pm at the premises. In addition, the practice offered extended hours appointments Monday to Friday from 6.30pm to 8.30pm and every Saturday and Sunday from 9am to 1pm at Crosby House practice (funded by Prime Minister's Access Fund).
- 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.
- We noted the practice was offering telephone consultations.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The practice is rated as good for the care of patients 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.
- It offered annual health checks for patients with learning disabilities. Health checks and care plans were completed for 28 out of 35 patients on the learning disability register.
- 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



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- Data from 2015-16 showed, performance for dementia face to face reviews was above the CCG and national average. The practice had achieved 88% of the total number of points available, compared to 85% locally and 84% nationally.

Good



Summary of findings

- 85% of patients experiencing poor mental health were involved in developing their care plan and health checks.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Systems were in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency, when experiencing mental health difficulties.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 7 July 2016 showed the practice was performing better than the local and below the national averages for most of its satisfaction scores. Three hundred and sixty-five survey forms were distributed and 97 were returned (a response rate of 27%). This represented 2.08% of the practice's patient list.

- 81% of patients said they were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 80% and national average of 85%.
- 73% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with a CCG average of 73% and a national average of 85%.
- 66% of patients said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared with a CCG average of 64% and a national average of 78%.

- 84% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 50% and national average of 73%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. All of the 46 patient CQC comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. We spoke with five patients and eight patient participation group (PPG) members during the inspection. Patients we spoke with were positive about the care and treatment offered by the GPs and nurses at the practice, which met their needs. They said staff treated them with dignity and their privacy was respected. They also said they always had enough time to discuss their medical concerns.

We saw the NHS friends and family test (FFT) results for last six months and 94% patients were likely or extremely likely recommending this practice.

Kumar Medical Centre

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist advisor.

Background to Kumar Medical Centre

Kumar Medical Centre is situated in Slough within a converted premises. All patient services are offered on the ground and first floors. The practice comprises of three consulting rooms, one treatment room, a patient waiting area, a reception area, administrative and management office.

The practice has core opening hours from 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. The practice offers a range of scheduled appointments to patients every weekday from 9am to 6.10pm including open access appointments with a duty GP throughout the day. The practice offers extended hours appointments Monday to Friday from 6.30pm to 7pm at the premises. In addition, the practice offers extended hours appointments Monday to Friday from 6.30pm to 8.30pm and every Saturday and Sunday from 9am to 1pm at Crosby House practice (funded by Prime Minister's Access Fund).

The practice has a patient population of approximately 4,670 registered patients. The practice population of patients aged between 0 to 9 and 15 to 39 years old is higher than the national average and there are a lower number of patients over 40 years old compared to national average.

Ethnicity based on demographics collected in the 2011 census shows the patient population is predominantly Asian and 64% of the population is composed of patients with an Asian, Black or mixed background. The practice is located in a part of Berkshire with the average levels of income deprivation in the area.

There are two GP partners, and two salaried GPs at the practice. Three GPs are male and one female. The practice employs a practice nurse and a clinical pharmacist. The practice manager is supported by an assistant practice manager, a team of administrative and reception staff. Services are provided via a General Medical Services (GMS) contract (GMS contracts are negotiated nationally between GP representatives and the NHS).

Services are provided from following location:

59 Grasmere Avenue

Slough

Berkshire

SL2 5JE

The practice has opted out of providing out of hours services to their patients. There are arrangements in place for services to be provided when the practice is closed and these are displayed at the practice, in the practice information leaflet and on the patient website. Out of hours services are provided during protected learning time by East Berkshire out of hours service or after 6:30pm, weekends and bank holidays by calling NHS 111.

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

Detailed findings

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

Prior to the inspection we contacted the Slough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), NHS England area team and local Healthwatch to seek their feedback about the service provided by Kumar Medical Centre. We also spent time reviewing information that we hold about this practice including the data provided by the practice in advance of the inspection.

The inspection team carried out an announced visit on 31 October 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with 10 staff (included three GPs, a practice nurse, a practice manager and five administration staff), five patients and eight patient participation group (PPG) members who used the service.
- Collected written feedback from three staff.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed 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 are provided for specific groups of patients and what good care looks 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 learnt from significant events and communicated widely to support improvement including sharing with other local practices. For example, following a significant event the practice had reviewed their referral protocol, discussed positive outcome and advised all staff to carry out thorough investigation and do not ignore vague symptoms for heart related conditions.

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 relevant to their role. For example, GPs were trained to Safeguarding Children level three, nurses were trained to Safeguarding Children level two and both GPs and nurses had completed adult safeguarding training.

- 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 and a GP were 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 had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- 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

Are services safe?

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 premises. The practice had up to date fire risk management protocol in place 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 and regular checks 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).
- Staff told us there were usually enough staff to maintain the smooth running of the practice and there were always enough staff on duty to keep patients safe. The practice manager showed us records to demonstrate that actual staffing levels and skill mix met planned staffing requirements.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and 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.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality 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). In 2015-16, the practice had achieved 96% of the total number of points available, compared to 97% locally and 97% nationally, with 2% exception reporting. The level of exception reporting was below the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average (8%) and the national average (10%). Exception reporting is the percentage of patients who would normally be monitored but had been exempted from the measures. These patients are excluded from the QOF percentages as they have either declined to participate in a review, or there are specific clinical reasons why they cannot be included.

Data from 2015-16 showed;

- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the CCG and national average. The practice had achieved 100% of the total number of points available, compared to 98% locally and 93% nationally.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the CCG and national average. The practice had achieved 100% of the total number of points available, compared to 90% locally and 90% nationally.

- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was better than the CCG and national average. The practice had achieved 84% of the total number of points available, compared to 83% locally and 83% nationally.

Clinical audits were carried out to demonstrate quality improvement and all relevant staff were involved in improving care and treatment and patient outcomes.

- The practice had carried out number of repeated clinical audits cycles. We checked 19 clinical audits completed in the last two years, eight of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in applicable local audits, national benchmarking and accreditation.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, we saw evidence of repeated audit cycle of patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) (AF was a heart condition that caused an irregular and often abnormally fast heartbeat that could lead to blood clots, stroke, heart failure and other heart-related complications) not receiving anti-coagulation treatment (anticoagulants medicines were used to reduce the body's ability to form clots in the blood and prevent stroke).
- The aim of the audit was to identify and offer treatment to the patients with AF who required anti-coagulation treatment. The audit in June 2015 demonstrated that 69% of patients with AF were receiving anti-coagulation treatment. The practice reviewed their protocol and invited patients for medicine reviews. We saw evidence that the practice had carried out follow up audit in January 2016 which demonstrated improvements in patient outcomes and found 94% AF patients were receiving anti-coagulation treatment.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Staff told us they could access role-specific training and updates when required and that there was a programme of training. Nurses were also supported to undertake specific training to enable them to specialise in areas such as respiratory and diabetes care.
- 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. The practice had identified 19 patients who were deemed at risk of admissions and 95% of these patients had care plans been created to reduce the risk of these patients

needing admission to hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

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

Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice.

- These included patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet and wishing to stop smoking. Patients were signposted to the relevant external services where necessary such as local carer support group.
- The practice was offering opportunistic smoking cessation advice and patients were signposted to a local support group. For example, information from Public Health England showed 95% of patients (15+ years old) who were recorded as current smokers had been offered smoking cessation support and treatment in last 24 months. This was higher than the CCG average (86%) and to the national average (86%).

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone and text message 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. In total 36% of patients eligible had undertaken bowel cancer screening and 70% of patients eligible had been screened for breast cancer, compared to the national averages of 58% and 72% respectively. 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.

The practice was aware of poor bowel screening results and explained that this was due to known documented challenges within the South Asian practice population and vast numbers of patients not willing to participate in the screening process. The practice informed that the testing kit was not supplied with the translation in South Asian languages, which would have explained the importance of completing the test. This had an impact on screening programme.

The practice had taken steps to promote the benefits of bowel screening in order to increase patient uptake. We saw various posters and leaflets in the waiting area in different languages and information on the practice website encouraging patients to take part in the national

screening programme. The practice informed us when they received information from the national screening team then they routinely sent letters to non-responders to encourage them to participate in the national screening scheme. We saw evidence that these steps had demonstrated improvements in patient outcomes and the practice's uptake for the bowel screening programme had increased from 36% to 41%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were comparable to the CCG averages. For example:

- Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given in 2014/15 to under two year olds ranged from 85% to 97%, these were comparable to the CCG averages which ranged from 86% to 95%.
- Childhood immunisation rates for vaccines given in 2014/15 to five year olds ranged from 85% to 98%, these were comparable to the CCG averages which ranged from 80% to 95%.

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 46 patient CQC comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients providing positive feedback said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We also spoke with five patients and eight 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 results were comparable to the CCG average and the national average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 96% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 92% and national average of 95%.
- 80% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 78% and national average of 87%.
- 76% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 76% and national average of 85%.
- 85% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 89%.

- 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 83% and national average of 91%.
- 80% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 81% and national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 75% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 71% and national average of 82%.
- 83% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 77% and national average of 85%.
- 77% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 80% and national average of 86%.
- 89% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 84% and national average of 90%.

The practice provided facilities to help patients be involved in decisions about their care, however, improvements were required. For example:

- On the day of inspection some reception staff we spoke with were not aware if a translation service was available and offered by the practice. We did not see notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available. However, the practice manager informed us a translation service was available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Are services caring?

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. There was a practice register of 94 patients (2% of the practice patient population list size) who were carers and they were being supported, for example, by offering health checks and referral for social services support.

Written information was available for carers to ensure they understood the various avenues of support available to them. The practice website also offered additional services including counselling. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when patients needed help and provided support when required.

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

We found the practice was responsive to patient's needs and had systems in place to maintain the level of service provided. The demands of the practice population were understood and systems were in place to address identified needs in the way services were delivered. Many services were provided from the practice including diabetic clinics, mother and baby clinics and a family planning clinic. The practice worked closely with health visitors to ensure that patients with babies and young families had good access to care and support. Services were planned and delivered to take into account the needs of different patient groups and to provide flexibility, choice and continuity of care. For example;

- 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 vaccines.
- There were disabled facilities and a hearing loop available. However, the practice did not provide a low level desk at the front reception.
- The practice had installed a touch screen self check-in facility to reduce the queue at the reception desk. This self check-in could be used in multiple languages and was providing waiting time information at the time of check-in.
- The practice website was well designed, clear and simple to use featuring regularly updated information. The website also allowed registered patients to book online appointments and request repeat prescriptions.
- An electrocardiogram (ECG) service was offered onsite. An electrocardiogram (ECG) is a simple test that can be used to check heart's rhythm and electrical activity. Sensors attached to the skin are used to detect the electrical signals produced by heart each time it beats. A practice nurse was trained to collect monitoring data which was forwarded for further analysis.
- The practice had an in-house clinical pharmacist with dedicated time to carry out medicine reviews for

patients with complex needs and patients receiving anti-coagulation treatment. (Anti-coagulants are medicines that help prevent blood clots).

Anti-coagulation clinic was offered onsite, resulting in 22 patients who required this service not having to travel to local hospitals. A clinical pharmacist was awarded 'clinical pharmacist of the year' award in 2015, due to establishing pharmacist led 'direct oral anti-coagulants' (DOAC) service in the Slough CCG. This service had reduced workload on GPs and encouraged full patient involvement in decisions about their anti-coagulation treatment. In addition, a new clinical pharmacist was employed (starting in January 2017) jointly by five practices in the partnership with South Bucks NHS trust.

- The practice had improved prevalence of stroke from 3.07% in 2014 to 1.13% in 2016.
- The practice had worked in collaboration with other practices in Slough CCG and developed 'The South Asian Lifestyle Intervention Programme' in 2013. This programme was set up with the aim to encourage healthy eating habits and improve well-being of diabetic patients through education and support. This programme was offering combination of services to support patients which included: various exercise programmes, lifestyle improvements and behavioural changes workshops delivered by a nutritional advisor and a practice nurse, with support available in South Asian languages. These services were helping patients to live well with their diabetes by learning new ways of managing their lifestyles. Evaluation data showed patient outcomes were good and 89% patients with 'type two' diabetes saw reduction in their blood sugar levels with lifestyle changes control by diet.
- The practice had received the national award for the 'Best Diabetic Team of the Year' in 2014. The practice informed us this programme had been featured in the 'NHS Right Care' in February 2016. The practice informed us they were one of the best performing practices in managing diabetes in Slough CCG.
- The practice was organising monthly 'health and well-being social club' at the premises. The practice was discussing one health related topic during each group session and was empowering the patient to take control of their own health.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- The practice had offered group consultations to patients with asthma and encouraged the regular use of inhalers. The practice had organised three sessions which were attended by a GP, a practice nurse and a practice manager.
- The practice was offering weekly yoga classes at the premises which was usually attended by eight patients every week.
- The practice had reviewed their antibiotic prescribing protocol and reduced the prescribing of antibiotics by 40%. Data showed the practice was one of the lowest prescriber in the Slough CCG and spent 11% less on their prescribing budget.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. The practice was closed on bank and public holidays and patients were advised to call NHS111 for assistance during this time (this out of hours service was managed by East Berkshire out of hours). The practice offered range of scheduled appointments to patients every weekday from 9am to 6.10pm including open access appointments with a duty GP throughout the day. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, telephone consultations and urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them. The practice offered extended hours appointments Monday to Friday from 6.30pm to 7pm at the premises. In addition, the practice offered extended hours appointments Monday to Friday from 6.30pm to 8.30pm and every Saturday and Sunday from 9am to 1pm at Crosby House practice (funded by Prime Minister's Access Fund).

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

- 84% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 50% and national average of 73%.
- 64% of patients said they always or almost always see or speak to their preferred GP compared to the CCG average of 42% and national average of 59%.
- 75% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 72% and national average of 76%.
- 81% of patients said they were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 80% and national average of 85%.
- 72% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 58% and national average of 73%.

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

We checked the online appointment records of three GPs and noticed that the next pre-bookable appointments with named GPs were available within two weeks and a duty GP within one to two weeks. Urgent appointments with GPs or nurses were available the same day.

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.

The practice operated a triage system for urgent on the day appointments. Patients were offered an urgent appointment, telephone consultation or a home visit where appropriate. 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.

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. The complaints procedure was available from reception, detailed in the patient leaflet and on the patient website. Staff we spoke with were aware of their role in supporting patients to raise concerns. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint. None of the patients we spoke with had ever needed to make a complaint about the practice.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found that all written complaints had been addressed

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

in a timely manner. When an apology was required this had been issued to the patient and the practice had been open in offering complainants the opportunity to meet with either the manager or one of the GPs. We saw the practice had included necessary information of the complainant's right to escalate the complaint to the Ombudsman if dissatisfied with the response. The Ombudsman details were included in complaints policy, on the practice website and a practice leaflet.

Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, one complaint we reviewed highlighted dissatisfaction about the clinical care received at the practice. The practice investigated this complaint, discussed at the peer group and it was found that the patient had been referred appropriately according to the health needs and all necessary actions had been undertaken.

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 vision statement which included the delivery of effective and innovative patient-centred sustainable primary care to the patients.
- We found details of the aims and objectives were part of the practice's statement of purpose. The practice aims and objectives included providing highly effective and safe medical care by involving patients in decision making process about their treatment and care. This also included maintaining a highly motivated skilled workforce, in order to provide a consistently high standard of medical care.
- The practice had a good 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.
- Staff had a comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice.
- 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

The GPs in the practice prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. They were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always took time to listen to all members of staff. Staff told us there was an open and relaxed atmosphere in the practice and there

were opportunities for staff to meet for discussion or to seek support and advice from colleagues. Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the GPs and management in the practice.

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 GPs 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 including friends and family tests and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met on a regular basis and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

example, the practice had upgraded telephone system, installed multilingual check-in screen, reviewed appointment booking system and introduced telephone consultations following feedback from the PPG.

- The practice had also gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. We saw that appraisals were completed in the last year for staff. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. For example, we saw nurse attended regular training sessions organised by CCG.
- We saw practice nurse was supported to attend further training in diabetes, asthma, family planning, ear syringing, wound dressing and spirometry (a test that can help diagnose various lung conditions).
- We noticed that a GP partner was working as a primary care strategy lead in Slough CCG.
- We noted that a GP partner was working with an external organisation to design and deliver a new way of group consultations for patients with similar long term conditions.