

The Health Centre - Holmes Chapel

Quality Report

London Road
Holmes Chapel
Cheshire
CW4 7BB

Tel: 01477 533100

Website: www.holmeschapelhealthcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 18 May 2016

Date of publication: 17/08/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service		Good	
Are services safe?		Good	
Are services effective?		Good	
Are services caring?		Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?		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 The Health Centre - Holmes Chapel	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 The Health Centre Holmes Chapel on 18 May 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

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

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

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure systems are in place that accurately record the actions and learning following significant events.

Summary of findings

- Ensure vaccine stocks are audited monthly and recorded.
- Ensure risk assessments relating to personnel files are present when necessary. The practice should review its complaints procedures to ensure all final

response letters correctly signpost complainants to the Public Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO) should they be dissatisfied with the practice's response.

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 a system in place for reporting and recording significant events, however the practice should review its processes for documenting accurately completed actions and learning.
- 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.

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

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good



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

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.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of their local patient population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said it was sometimes difficult to make an appointment with a named GP, but urgent appointments were available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

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 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.

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.
- The practice kept up to date registers of patient's health conditions and data reported nationally was that outcomes were comparable to that of other practices for conditions commonly found in older people.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the national average. For example: the percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) was 87% compared to 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.

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.

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.
- 80% of female patients aged 25-64 attended cervical screening within the target period compared with the national average of 74%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

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

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people who were encouraged to register the practice as a home address 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).

- 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 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 January 16 2016. The results showed the practice was comparable or below local and national averages. 237 survey forms were distributed and 136 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 54% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 83% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 78% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 76% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 4 comment cards which were positive about the standard of care received, however one person raised concerns regarding the availability of appointments.

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

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure systems are in place that accurately record the actions and learning following significant events.
- Ensure vaccine stocks are audited monthly and recorded.

- Ensure risk assessments relating to personnel files are present when necessary.

The practice should review its complaints procedures to ensure all final response letters correctly signpost complainants to the Public Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO) should they be dissatisfied with the practices response.

The Health Centre - Holmes Chapel

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to The Health Centre - Holmes Chapel

The Health Centre Holmes Chapel provides primary care services to its registered list of approximately 11,792 patients. The practice is located at London Road, Holmes Chapel, Cheshire. The practice catchment area is classed as within the group of the least deprived areas in England relative to other local authorities. For example, income deprivation affecting children was 5% compared to the national average of 20%.

There are seven GPs, four male and three female. They are supported by three practice nurses. There is also a practice manager and administration staff. The practice is also a training practice.

The male life expectancy for the area is 83 years compared with the CCG averages of 81 years and the national average of 79 years. The female life expectancy for the area is 86 years compared with the CCG averages of 84 years and the national average of 83 years.

The reception, waiting areas, consulting rooms and disabled toilet facilities are on the ground floor of the

practice, training room and administration offices are located on the first floor. There is step free access into the building and access for those in wheelchairs or with pushchairs.

The practice was open between 7.30am and 7.30pm on Monday, 8.30am and 6.30pm on Tuesday and Wednesday and 7.30am and 6.30pm Thursday and Friday.

Out of hours care can be accessed via the surgery telephone number and is provided by GP Out of Hours Primary Care Centre or by calling the NHS111 service.

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 18 May 2016. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff, GPs, nurses, the practice manager and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.'
- Reviewed information from CQC intelligent monitoring systems.
- Reviewed patient survey information.
- Reviewed various documentation including the practice's policies and procedures.

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 found that significant event meetings were held quarterly. Clinical staff were present, as were representatives from the administrative staff team. All significant events were passed to the medical secretary, who coded them red, amber or green depending on severity.
- The practice used different reporting mechanisms – some report using an online template, others sent an email to the medical secretary outlining the issue.
- We found that all significant events were summarised on a template – there was no record of who reported the significant event and we were told that this was deliberate to keep it completely anonymised. Upon reviewing the template it did not indicate who was present at the discussion, although this information was held on a separate document.
- We found the reviewing process to be unclear, for example the majority of significant events were noted as completed but it was not clear as to what had been completed, if all actions had been met, or the date of the review discussion.
- 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.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For

example, an incident had taken place which involved a patient injuring themselves on safety glass; we saw that the practice had ensured that protective film was fitted to all such glass within the practice.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and procedures 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 three.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS)
- 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

Are services safe?

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 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. However, we found that the practice did not ensure its vaccine stock was audited monthly and recorded.
- The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse) and had procedures in place to manage them safely. There were also arrangements in place for the destruction of controlled drugs.
- We reviewed five personnel files, and found overall that 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. However, two members of administration staff did not have references on file. We questioned this and were informed that the practice manager had conducted a risk assessment of the two employees and opted, due to them both being school leavers, not to seek references, but there was no evidence of risk assessment contained within the file nor was there reference to this process within the practice's recruitment policy.

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 the safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

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 and
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book was available.

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 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 showed that the practice had achieved 95% of the total number of points available.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/2015 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the national average. For example: the percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015) was 86% compared to the national average of 88%
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was comparable to the national average. The practice rate was 80% compared to the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was above the national average. For example: the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a

comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). The practice rate was 94% compared to the national average of 88%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been clinical audits completed in the last two years, we reviewed two of these and found they were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, the practice reviewed its prescribing of "Gliptins" (oral diabetic medicine for glycaemic control) based on NICE (national institute for clinical excellence) guidelines, following the audit the practice identified 11 patients whose medication was not achieving sufficient glycaemic control as suggested by NICE and their medication was ceased.

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 topics such 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 their 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,

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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. 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.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 83% 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 also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds were 99% and five year olds ranged from 93% to 97%.

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 four of the patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with members of the patient panel also known as a 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 patients needed help and provided support when required.

Results from the national GP patient survey provided responses from patients when asked if they felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was generally comparable for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 84% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and the national average of 89%.
- 82% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 90% 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 96% and the national average of 95%.

- 84% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 89% 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%.
- 84% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 86% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 90% 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 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 national average of 85%.

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.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Are services caring?

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 120 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- The practice offered extended hours on Mondays, Thursdays and Fridays for working 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. Those only available privately were referred to other clinics.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 7.30am and 7.30pm on Monday, 8.30am and 6.30pm on Tuesday and Wednesday and 7.30am and 6.30pm Thursday and Friday. Appointments were from 8.30am until 11.30am in the morning and 3.30pm to 5.30pm in the afternoon. There were also early and late pre-bookable appointments available on Mondays, Thursdays and Fridays.

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 63% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.

- 54% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

We discussed these results with the practice, they explained that they had recently held open meetings in a local church, where over 200 patients had attended and were able to ask GPs and the practice manager any questions about the health centre, including access to the service. Following this the practice had identified areas for improvement and were developing a plan to take these forward.

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.

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.

- However we noted some final response letters to the complainant that did not provide them with information directing them to the Public Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO) if they were not satisfied with the response.
- 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

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found these had been handled in an open and transparent way. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and discussed regularly within the practice.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

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

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient panel also known as a participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The patient panel met bi monthly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, improving patient privacy in the reception area by suggesting a separate hatch so conversation could be more private and the addition of clinician's photographs in reception.
- Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking to improve outcomes for patients in the area.