

Rosemary Surgery

Quality Report

2 Rosemary Avenue
Finchley
London
N3 2QN

Tel: 020 8346 1997

Website: www.rosemarymedicalcentre.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 27 July 2016

Date of publication: 14/02/2017

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

Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Rosemary Surgery	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Rosemary Medical Centre on 27 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 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:

- Review how patients with caring responsibilities are identified and recorded on the clinical system to ensure information, advice and support is available to them.
- To engage with patients and local community to encourage higher uptake of childhood vaccinations.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

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

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

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

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.
- Longer appointments for this population group were available when needed.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Clinical staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) recorded the practice as scoring higher than the national average on four of the five diabetes indicators.
- 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 low for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.

Good



Summary of findings

- 74% of women aged 25-64 notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years which was below the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.

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.
- The practice offered extended hours surgery once a week to meet the needs of this population group.
- Telephone consultations with clinicians were available to meet the needs of this population 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 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).

- 83% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 84%.
- 91% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record in the preceding 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 88%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The National GP Patient Survey results were published in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Four hundred and three survey forms were distributed and 100 were returned. This represented 3% of the practice's patient list.

- 57% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 64% and the national average of 73%.
- 65% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 71% and the national average of 76%.
- 78% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 85%.

- 67% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 44 comment cards which were mostly positive about the standard of care received. The recurrent themes of the responses was that the practice provides good care and that staff are polite and caring.

We spoke with eight patients during the inspection. All eight patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The Friends and Family Test undertaken by the practice during the months January 2016 – June 2016 showed that 653 out of 677 patients would recommend the practice.

Rosemary 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, a practice manager specialist adviser and an Expert by Experience.

Background to Rosemary Surgery

Rosemary Medical Centre is located in a residential area of Finchley, North London. The practice is located in privately owned premises on a quiet residential road. There is parking outside the practice for disabled patients and there is a bus stop located approximately five minutes' walk from the practice.

The practice operates from:

2 Rosemary Avenue

Finchley

London

N3 2QN

There are approximately 3560 patients registered at the practice. Statistics show high income deprivation among the registered population. The practice has a relatively young population, with the registered population higher than the national average for those aged between 20 and 39.

Care and treatment is delivered by four GP partners (three female and one male). Sixteen clinical sessions are

conducted weekly between the four GPs. The practice does not employ a nurse, with the GP's conducting practice nurse duties. Three reception/administrative staff work at the practice and are supervised by a Practice Manager.

The practice is open from the following times:-

- 8am - 9.00pm (Monday)
- 8am - 6.30pm (Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday)
- 8am - 1.30pm (Thursday)

Clinical sessions are run during the following times:-

- 9am - 2.40pm; 3.30pm - 9.10pm (Monday)
- 9am - 1.20pm; 2.00pm - 7.00pm (Tuesday)
- 9am - 1.20pm; 3.30pm - 7.40pm (Wednesday, Friday)
- 9am - 1.20pm (Thursday)

Extended hours surgery is conducted on a Monday when the surgery closes at 7.30pm. Patients can book appointments in person, by telephone and online via the practice website.

Patients requiring a GP outside of normal working hours are advised to contact the NHS GP out of hours service on telephone number 111.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract. GMS contracts are nationally agreed between the General Medical Council and NHS England. The practice conducts the following regulated activities:-

- Surgical Procedures - Maternity and midwifery services
- Diagnostic and screening procedures
- Treatment of disease, disorder or injury
- Family Planning

Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) is the practice's commissioning body.

Rosemary Medical Centre has not previously been inspected by CQC.

Detailed findings

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 27 July 2016. During our visit we:

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, we saw a report regarding a request made by the community health services team for medication for a patient, which was not actioned in a timely manner by the practice. It was noted that a fax received by the practice from the community team was not actioned until late in the day and therefore the medication required for the patient was not immediately available for collection. Following this event, the practice reviewed its processes and have implemented a new procedure which now ensures that urgent faxes are now copied and given to the Duty GP alongside a checklist of actions, instead of the fax being processed through the internal computer system. Once copied, the fax is date stamped and the key actions required highlighted. The fax is then handed to the Duty GP to be actioned with the checklist ticked off when completed. Once the checklist is completed (including the issuing of prescriptions and the completion of any relevant medication charts), the relevant service is faxed a copy of the medication chart for their records and the patient is informed that the medication request has been actioned and is ready to be collected.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3. All other staff were trained to safeguarding level 1.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. One of the partners 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. The most recent infection control audit was undertaken in June 2016 and we saw evidence that action had been taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy

Are services safe?

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.

- 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. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book was available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.

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 91% of the total number of points available with an Exception Reporting rate of 2% (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

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

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) is 5 mmol/l or less was 82% compared to the national average of 80%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. For example, the percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 83% compared to the national average of 84%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

There had been four clinical audits completed in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the

improvements made were implemented and monitored. For example, we viewed an audit where the practice conducted a search of their systems to identify pregnant women in order to check whether these women had been offered the Whooping Cough vaccine. In the first audit, 5 out of 38 identified patients had not been offered the vaccine either via the practice or through the ante-natal clinic. Of the 5 patients offered the vaccine by the practice, four accepted and one declined. As part of the review of the first audit, the practice identified that although there was good communication between GP's and the Midwife led care team, there was still uncertainty who took the responsibility for giving this vaccination and letting the other party know and secondly, that some pregnant women did not seem knowledgeable about the importance of the whooping cough vaccination in pregnancy. To address these issues, to raise further awareness of the importance of receiving the vaccine, the practice placed a poster regarding the importance of this immunisation in the waiting area of the practice and discussions held with the mid-wife led team regarding shared responsibility of offering patient the vaccine. A second audit conducted revealed that of 31 patients identified, 18 patients had received the vaccine and it had been entered on their record. 13 patients did not have a record receiving the vaccine either from the practice or the ante-natal clinic. These women were contacted by the practice and asked whether they had been offered/received/declined the vaccine via the ante-natal clinic and their records updated accordingly. As a result of the second audit, the practice has put in a programme of continuous audit to monitor that all pregnant women records reflect that they have been offered/received/declined the vaccine.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring patients to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a bi-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's 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 dietary advice was given by the partners and if required, patients could be referred to a dietician at the local hospital. Smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 70% which was comparable to the CCG average of 68% and the national average of 74%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were low compared to CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 12% to 21% and five year olds from 2% to 93% in comparison to CCG average of 69% to 81% for under two year olds and 64% to 91% for five year olds.

On the day of inspection, the practice told us staffing issues during the previous year had meant that the data for child immunisations had not been updated on the relevant computer systems. We saw evidence that the practice had

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

been in contact with NHS England regarding this issue and had provided them with the missing data. NHS England subsequently confirmed that the practice had achieved a 90% and above for child immunisations during the stated period.

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.

The majority of the 44 Care Quality Commission patient comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Some of the comment cards mentioned that patients found it sometimes difficult to book an appointment by telephone. However, 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 four members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 86% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 87% and the national average of 89%.
- 89% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 87%.
- 94% 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%.

- 77% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 85%.
- 79% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 84% 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:

- 88% 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%.
- 78% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 82%.

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.
- A number of staff spoke a second language which included languages spoken as a first language by a number of patients, such as Hindi and Gujarati.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

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 28 patients as carers which is under 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. For example, we saw that the practice had reviewed its prescribing of high dose statins following guidance from the local CCG Medicines Management Team. Statins are a type of medicine which can help lower the levels of cholesterol in the blood.

- The practice offered extended hours surgery on a Monday evening until 7.30pm 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 as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities and translation services available.
- Telephone consultations were available for patients who are unable to attend the surgery.
- The practice website can be translated into approximately 100 languages. In addition, fact sheets are provided on the website in 21 languages explaining the function of the NHS to persons newly-arrived in the UK.
- The practice offers temporary registration for persons who may require access to a GP away from their permanent address.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6:30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours surgery is conducted on a Monday evening between 6:30pm and 7:30pm. Appointments time are as follows:-

- 9am to 2:30pm; 3:30pm to 7:30pm (Monday)
- 9am to 1:20pm; 2:00pm to 6:30pm (Tuesday)

- 9am to 1:20pm; 3:30pm to 6:30pm (Wednesday, Friday)
- 9am to 1:20pm (Thursday)

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

Results from the National GP Patient Survey showed mixed patient satisfaction results with how they could access care and treatment was compared to local and national averages.

- 77% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 78%.
- 57% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 64% and the national average of 73%.

The practice told us that they were aware of the mixed results from the patient survey and that they had as a result restructured the work of reception team which has seen the introduction of a dedicated person answering the phone during the busy morning period, with back-up provided by other reception staff to ensure that patients are able to contact the surgery easily by telephone.

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; and
- the urgency of the need for medical attention.

If a patient calls the surgery (when the phone lines are open) requesting an urgent appointment or home visit, the receptionists would allocate the next available emergency appointment if the patient was able to come to the practice. For a home visit, the receptionist would take the details of patient and at an available time pass this information on to the duty doctor to call the patient to discuss the request for a home visit. 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.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. Information was available from the practice and on the practice website.
- The practice had produced a leaflet in 21 languages for new patients (including individuals seeking asylum) explaining what services are available to them.

We looked at the two complaints received by the practice in the last 12 months and found that both complaints were dealt with in a timely way and that there was transparency in communications with the complainants. Lessons were

learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. At the reception desk, feedback slips were available to patients to comment on the service they receive from the practice. These slips are read regularly by the practice and any areas that identified for improvement are discussed with staff, with a view to addressing area identified.

For example, one of the complaints we looked at referred to an incorrect name details of a patient on their record. The practice responded with an apology for any distress caused. Following this incident, practice staff have been informed to ensure that a patient's full name should be shown on their records.

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 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 arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the practice undertook a refurbishment of the waiting room following suggestions and discussions with the PPG.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, ad-hoc discussions and annual appraisals. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Practice staff told us that there was a no-blame culture and that staff supported each other. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.