

Holland Park Surgery

Quality Report

Lower Ground Floor
Kensington Central Library
12 Phillimore Walk
London
W8 7RX

Tel: 020 7221 4334

Website: www.hollandparksurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 12 July 2016

Date of publication: 20/02/2017

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Holland Park Surgery	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Holland Park Surgery on 12 July 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 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 improvements are:

- Ensure all staff receive training in infection control.
- Ensure all staff receive basic life support training on an annual basis.

Summary of findings

- Take action to improve the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan; and the percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face to face review.
- Consider improving communication with patients who have a hearing impairment.
- Improve its identification of patients who are carers.

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 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 generally comparable to the national average except for those relating to mental health indicators.
- 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 in line with the national averages for several aspects of care.

Summary of findings

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

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 NHS England and the Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients and staff knew and understood the values.
- 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 meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of 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.

Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Patients over 65 years of age had a named GP and were invited to receive flu immunisations each year.

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 were in line with the national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol was 5 mmol/l or less was 79% which was comparable to the national average of 81%; and the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who received a foot examination, was 87% which was comparable 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages.
- Children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 74% which was below the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

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 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).

Good



- Performance for some mental health related indicators were below the national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan was 64% and the national average is 88%.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face to face review in the preceding 12 months was 76% which was below the national average of 84%.
- 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 about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- 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 were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing generally in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and forty-five survey forms were distributed and 108 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 87% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 78% 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 85%.
- 85% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.

- 83% 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 39 comment cards of which 36 were positive about the standard of care received. Three comment cards indicated patient experienced difficulties in getting an appointment.

We spoke with two patients during the inspection. 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 all staff receive training in infection control.
- Ensure all staff receive basic life support training on an annual basis.
- Take action to improve the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other

psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan; and the percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face to face review

- Consider improving communication with patients who have a hearing impairment.
- Improve its identification of patients who are carers.

Holland Park Surgery

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 Practice Manager specialist advisor.

Background to Holland Park Surgery

Holland Park Surgery provides GP primary medical services to approximately 8,649 patients living in the London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. The practice population was predominantly patients of 19-65 years of age from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

The practice team is made up three GP partners (two female and one male); four female and two male salaried GPs; three trainee GPs; three practice nurses; two Health Care Assistants; a practice manager, a strategy manager; seven receptionists and five administrative staff. The GPs provide 56 sessions per week.

The practice is open between 8am-8pm on Monday and 8pm-6:30pm Tuesday to Friday. Appointments are from 9am-2pm and 3pm-8pm on Monday; 9am-2pm and 3pm-5.30pm on Tuesday; 8:15am-2pm and 3pm-5:45pm on Wednesday; 8:15am-2pm and 3pm-5:30pm on Thursday; 10am-2pm and 3pm-5:30pm on Friday. Home visits are provided for patients who are housebound or too ill to visit the practice.

The practice has a Primary Medical Services (PMS) contract (PMS is one of the three contracting routes that have been available to enable the commissioning of primary medical services). The practice refers patients to the 'London Central West' service for healthcare advice during out of hours.

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

The practice provides a range of services including maternity care, childhood immunisations, chronic disease management and travel immunisations.

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.

This practice has not been inspected before.

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 12 July 2016. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, nurses, Practice Manager, administrative staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a significant event recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- 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 in accordance with the Duty of Candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events. The practice told us significant events were going to become a standard agenda item for new weekly Friday meetings to ensure staff were informed of all significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, in response to a significant event all staff were reminded to use the panic buttons as the layout of the new premises meant incidents at the reception desk could not be heard in the consulting rooms.

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 safeguarding policy clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare and we also observed safeguarding leads contact details displayed within the consulting rooms. One of

the GP partners was the nominated 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 had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs and clinical staff were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3 and non-clinical staff were trained to level 1.

- Notices within the waiting area and consulting rooms 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. One of the practice nurses was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention leads to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control policy in place and annual infection control audits were undertaken. We saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. Clinical staff had received up to date infection control training however, not all non-clinical staff had received infection control training.
- 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). 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. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment).

Are services safe?

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

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had recently moved to the premises at the time of our inspection and plans were in place for an external company to undertake the new premises health and safety risk assessments. There was a fire risk assessment in place and staff had been trained in the new assembly points in the event of a fire following the practice move to new premises. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control.
- 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.
- Emergency medicines available in the treatment room. Our inspection found not all non-clinical staff had received basic life support (BLS) training however, following our inspection arrangements were made for all staff to receive this training and this had been completed.
- 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 also 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 business continuity plan for major incidents such as power failure or building damage was in the process of being updated as a result of the move to the new premises.

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.
- One of the trainee GPs produced a weekly list of all alerts and guidance received and this was disseminated to all relevant staff.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through clinical meetings.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 93% of the total number of points available with 8% exception reporting. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). Data from 2014/2015 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators were in line with the national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol was 5 mmol/l or less was 79% which was comparable to the national average of 81%; and the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who received a foot examination, was 87% which was comparable to the national average of 88%.
- Performance for some mental health related indicators were below the national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan was 64% and the national average is 88%.

- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face to face review in the preceding 12 months was 76% which was below the national average of 84%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been four clinical audits undertaken in the last twelve months, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, and peer review.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, an audit was undertaken in 2016 relating to the safe use of Domperidone used to treat nausea and vomiting and in cycle one of the audit 16 patients were found to be on active repeat prescription for this medicine. The GPs conducted 'virtual' medication reviews for these patients and all were contacted regarding the safe use of this medicine. At the end of this cycle, of the 16 patients contacted, 14 patients had stopped their prescription and two patients had chosen to continue to take this medicine. The audit was repeated and at the end of this cycle the two patients discontinued their use of this medicine following telephone consultations with their GPs. The audit was repeated for a third cycle and the practice found no repeat prescriptions of this medicine had been generated.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements. For example, in response to feedback from patients the practice had plans in place to install two television screens in the reception area to operate as an automated call screen for patient appointments and to also be used to accurately inform waiting patients of any delays.

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)

- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence.
- 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 and clinical supervision. 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. Attendance at the multidisciplinary team meetings included district, palliative and mental health nurses; and social workers.

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

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.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 74%, which was below the national average of 82%. Telephone reminders were made for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by ensuring a female sample taker was available. There were failsafe systems 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 also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages.

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.

Thirty-six 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. Three comment cards indicated patients experienced difficulties in getting an appointment.

Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 94% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 89% and the national average of 89%.
- 88% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.
- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.
- 91% 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%.
- 79% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 88% 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.

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 generally in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 91% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 86%.
- 85% 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%.
- 77% 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. Notices in the waiting area informed patients this service was available.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patient information leaflets and notices were available which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 35 patients as

Are services caring?

carers (0.40% of the practice list). Staff told us patients identified as carers were offered double appointments. There was written information 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 and this call was either followed by a patient consultation or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice engaged with the local CCG to reduce inappropriate referrals to secondary care and ensure cost effective prescribing. The practice worked collaboratively with other local practices as part of the 'Commissioning Learning Set' group.

The practice was also taking part in a 'Whole Systems Integrated Care' pilot which provides co-ordinated care for patients aged 65 and over with the aim to provide patients with a complete package of care and subsequently reduce potential hospital admissions.

- The practice offered appointments on a Monday evening until 8pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability; patients experiencing bereavement; mothers and babies; patients over 65 years of age with multiple co-morbidities; and patients who had also been identified as carers.
- 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 and were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were accessible facilities and translation services available; however there was no hearing loop in place to assist patients with reduced ranges of hearing.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am-8pm on Monday and 8pm-6:30pm Tuesday to Friday. Appointments were from 9am-2pm and 3pm-8pm on Monday; 9am-2pm and 3pm-5.30pm on Tuesday; 8:15am-2pm and 3pm-5:45pm on

Wednesday; 8:15am-2pm and 3pm-5:30pm on Thursday; 10am-2pm and 3pm-5:30pm on Friday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to two 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 average for opening hours and above average for telephone access to the practice.

- 64% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 87% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

The reception team recorded the patient details of those requesting a home visit and these were passed on to the duty doctor. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- The practice manager was the designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system through practice leaflets.

We looked at two complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with

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

in a timely way with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, as a result of patient complaints received relating to difficulty in

booking routine future appointments, the practice had employed additional salaried GPs and had increased the number of pre-bookable appointments. Staff told us this had reduced the number of patient complaints relating to the appointment system.

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 and staff knew and understood the values.

- The practice business plans actioned to improve the services and quality of care offered to patients included recruitment of additional staff members to the clinical team and relocation to new premises.

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.
- Clinical and internal audits were used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the GP partners demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. Staff told us the GP partners and management team 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). The GP partners and management team 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 weekly 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 management in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, in response to feedback from the PPG in relation to the move of premises, the practice had successfully negotiated a reduced rate for patients to use the premises car park.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. For example, staff had requested the administrative processing of new patient registrations be undertaken between 2pm and 4pm and this change had been implemented. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, two of the practice receptionists had been trained to also provide the Health Care Assistant role for patients and one of the practice

nurses had been supported to undertake a diabetes MERIT (Meeting Educational Requirements Improving Treatment) course. At the time of our inspection the practice had received re-approval to continue operating as a training practice for the next five years.