

The Endeavour Practice

Quality Report

The Cleveland Health Centre
Middlesbrough. TS1 2NX
Tel: 01642 242192
Website: endeavour.practice@nhs.net

Date of inspection visit: 21 October 2015
Date of publication: 21/01/2016

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

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	7

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	8
Background to The Endeavour Practice	8
Why we carried out this inspection	8
How we carried out this inspection	8
Detailed findings	10

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Endeavour Practice on 21 October 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

Specifically, we found the practice to be good for providing responsive services.

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

- Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered following best practice guidance. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and planned.
- 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.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that 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.

We saw an area of outstanding practice:

- The practice had increased flexibility of access to appointments and could demonstrate the impact of this by reduced use of the out of hours service and very positive patient survey results.

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. Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Lessons were learned and communicated widely to support improvement. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed. Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. There were enough staff to keep patients safe.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services. Data showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality. Staff referred to guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence and used it routinely. Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered in line with current legislation. This included assessing capacity and promoting good health. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and appropriate training planned to meet these needs. There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff. Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services. Data showed that 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 also saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services. They 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. Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with appointments available the same day. The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs. Information

Good



Summary of findings

about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed that the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as good for being well-led. They had a clear vision and strategy. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this. 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 were systems in place to monitor and improve quality and identify risk. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group (PPG) was active. Staff had received inductions, regular performance reviews and attended staff meetings and events.

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. Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients were good for conditions commonly found in older people. The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population and had a range of enhanced services, for example, in dementia and end of life care. It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and rapid access appointments for those with enhanced needs.

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. Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed. All of these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medication needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

The practice is rated as good for the care of families, children and young people. There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations. 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. Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. We saw good examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Good



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

Good



Summary of findings

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 reflected the needs for this age group.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The practice is rated as good for the care of people whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability. They had carried out annual health checks for people with a learning disability and 95% of these patients had received a follow-up. It offered longer appointments for people with a learning disability.

The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people. It had told vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations. Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The practice is rated as good for the care of people experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia). 100% of people experiencing poor mental health had received an annual physical health check. The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia. It 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. It had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency (A&E) where they may have been experiencing poor mental health. Staff had received training on how to care for people with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

Patients told us they found the staff friendly and professional. Patients stated they found it easy to get an appointment or speak with their GP. Staff were consistently described as polite, helpful and caring. Patients stated they felt listened to by the GPs and that the practice strove to accommodate them.

- 87.9% were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 79.1% and national average of 74.9%.
- 83.1% described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 75.8% and national average of 73.3%.
- 74% said they usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time compared to the CCG average of 71.9% and national average of 64.8%.
- 95% said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 76.6% and national average of 73.3%.
- 94.5% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone compared to the CCG average of 86.8% and national average of 85.2%.
- 95% would recommend this surgery to someone new to the area compared to the CCG average of 77.6% and national average of 77.5%.

The Endeavour Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to The Endeavour Practice

The practice is located within the main shopping centre in Middlesbrough town centre. There are 7,659 patients on the practice list and it is in an area of high deprivation. The practice manager told us there were a higher proportion of younger adults on the practice list compared with the national average.

The practice is open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are fully available between these times.

Patients requiring a GP outside of normal working hours are advised to contact the GP Out of Hour's service by telephoning 111.

The practice is a partnership with 7 partners. There are a mix of male and female GPs. There are practice nurses and one health care assistant. There is a practice managing partner, a practice manager, reception and administration staff.

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. This 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.

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.

How we carried out this inspection

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

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

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

Older people

People with long-term conditions

Families, children and young people

Detailed findings

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)

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit

on 21 October 2015. During our visit we spoke with a range of staff which included GPs, a practice managing partner, a practice nurse, and receptionists and spoke with patients who used the service. We observed how patients were being cared for and talked with. We saw how carers and/or family members were supported and reviewed the personal care or treatment records of patients, where appropriate.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record

The practice prioritised safety and used a range of information to identify risks and improve patient safety. For example, reported incidents and national patient safety alerts as well as comments and complaints received from patients. The staff we spoke with were aware of their responsibilities to raise concerns, and knew how to report incidents and near misses.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports and minutes of meetings where these were discussed for the last two years. This showed the practice had managed these consistently over time and so could show evidence of a safe track record over the long term.

Learning and improvement from safety incidents

The practice had a system in place for reporting, recording and monitoring significant events, incidents and accidents. We reviewed records of six significant events that had occurred during the last year and saw this system was followed appropriately. Significant events were a standing item on the practice meeting agenda and a dedicated meeting was held monthly to review actions from past significant events and complaints. There was evidence that the practice had learned from these and that the findings were shared with relevant staff. Staff, including receptionists, administrators and nursing staff, knew how to raise an issue for consideration at the meetings and they felt encouraged to do so.

Staff used incident forms on the practice intranet and sent completed forms to the practice manager. We tracked an incident and saw records were completed in a comprehensive and timely manner. We saw evidence of action taken as a result and that the learning had been shared. Where patients had been affected by something that had gone wrong they were given an apology and informed of the actions taken to prevent the same thing happening again.

National patient safety alerts were disseminated by e mail to practice staff. Staff we spoke with were able to give examples of recent alerts that were relevant to the care they were responsible for.

Reliable safety systems and processes including safeguarding

The practice had systems to manage and review risks to vulnerable children, young people and adults. We looked at training records which showed that all staff had received relevant role specific training on safeguarding. We asked members of medical, nursing and administrative staff about their most recent training. Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in older people, vulnerable adults and children. They were also aware of their responsibilities and knew how to share information, properly record documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact the relevant agencies in working hours and out of normal hours. Contact details were easily accessible.

The practice had appointed dedicated GPs as leads in safeguarding vulnerable adults and children. They had been trained in both adult and child safeguarding and could demonstrate they had the necessary competency and training to enable them to fulfil these roles. All staff we spoke with were aware who these leads were and who to speak with in the practice if they had a safeguarding concern.

There was a system to highlight vulnerable patients on the practice's electronic records. This included information to make staff aware of any relevant issues when patients attended appointments; for example children subject to child protection plans. There was active engagement in local safeguarding procedures and effective working with other relevant organisations including health visitors and the local authority.

There was a chaperone policy, which was visible on the waiting room noticeboard and in consulting rooms and on the practice web site. (A chaperone is a person who acts as a safeguard and witness for a patient and health care professional during a medical examination or procedure). All nursing staff, including health care assistants, had been trained to be a chaperone. All staff undertaking chaperone duties had received Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. (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).

Medicines management

We checked medicines stored in the treatment rooms and medicine refrigerators and found they were stored securely and were only accessible to authorised staff. There was a policy for ensuring that medicines were kept at the

Are services safe?

required temperatures, which described the action to take in the event of a potential failure. Records showed room temperature and fridge temperature checks were carried out which ensured medication was stored at the appropriate temperature.

Processes were in place to check medicines were within their expiry date and suitable for use. All the medicines we checked were within their expiry dates. Expired and unwanted medicines were disposed of in line with waste regulations.

All prescriptions were reviewed and signed by a GP before they were given to the patient. Both blank prescription forms for use in printers and those for hand written prescriptions were handled in accordance with national guidance as these were tracked through the practice and kept securely at all times.

We saw records of practice meetings that noted the actions taken in response to a review of prescribing data. For example, patterns of antibiotic, hypnotics and sedatives and anti-psychotic prescribing within the practice. The prescribing of antibiotics was in the lowest three practices in the CCG and much lower than the CCG average. This information was taken over the past 12 months and the practice had also reviewed and documented all prescriptions for antibiotics.

There was a system in place for the management of high risk medicines such as warfarin, methotrexate and other disease modifying drugs, which included regular monitoring in accordance with national guidance. Appropriate action was taken based on the results.

Cleanliness and infection control

We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. We saw there were cleaning schedules in place and cleaning records were kept. Patients we spoke with told us they always found the practice clean and had no concerns about cleanliness or infection control.

An infection control policy and supporting procedures were available for staff to refer to, which enabled them to plan and implement measures to control infection. For example, personal protective equipment including disposable gloves, aprons and coverings were available for staff to use and staff were able to describe how they would use these to comply with the practice's infection control policy.

The practice had a lead for infection control. All staff received induction training about infection control specific to their role and received annual updates. We saw evidence that the lead had carried out audits and that any improvements identified for action were completed on time.

Notices about hand hygiene techniques were displayed in staff and patient toilets. Hand washing sinks with hand soap, hand gel and hand towel dispensers were available in treatment rooms.

The practice had a policy for the management, testing and investigation of legionella (a bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings). We saw records that confirmed the practice was carrying out regular checks in line with this policy to reduce the risk of infection to staff and patients. The practice had undertaken a risk assessment for legionella and had decided that the risk was sufficiently low to make formal testing unnecessary.

Equipment

Staff we spoke with told us they had equipment to enable them to carry out diagnostic examinations, assessments and treatments. They told us that all equipment was tested and maintained regularly and we saw equipment maintenance logs and other records that confirmed this. All portable electrical equipment was routinely tested and displayed stickers indicating the last testing date. A schedule of testing was in place. We saw evidence of calibration of relevant equipment; for example weighing scales, spirometers, blood pressure measuring devices and the fridge thermometer.

Staffing and recruitment

The practice had a recruitment policy that set out the standards it followed when recruiting clinical and non-clinical staff. Records we looked at contained evidence that appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service (These 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).

Are services safe?

Staff told us about the arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. We saw there was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty. There was also an arrangement in place for members of staff, including nursing and administrative staff, to cover each other's annual leave.

Staff told us there were usually enough staff to maintain the smooth running of the practice and there were always enough staff on duty to keep patients safe. The practice manager showed us records to demonstrate that actual staffing levels and skill mix met planned staffing requirements.

Monitoring safety and responding to risk

The practice had systems, processes and policies in place to manage and monitor risks to patients, staff and visitors to the practice. These included regular checks of the building, the environment, medicines management, staffing, dealing with emergencies and equipment. The practice also had a health and safety policy. Health and safety information was displayed for staff to see and there was an identified health and safety representative.

We saw that staff were able to identify and respond to changing risks to patients including deteriorating health and well-being or medical emergencies. For example:

- There were emergency processes in place for patients with long-term conditions. Staff gave us examples of referrals made for patients whose health deteriorated suddenly.
- Staff gave examples of how they responded to patients experiencing a mental health crisis, including supporting them to access emergency care and treatment.
- The practice monitored repeat prescribing for patients receiving medication for mental ill-health.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had arrangements in place to manage emergencies. Records showed that all staff had received training in basic life support. Emergency equipment was available including access to oxygen and an automated external defibrillator (used in cardiac emergencies). Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.

A business continuity plan was in place to deal with a range of emergencies that may impact on the daily operation of the practice. Each risk was rated and mitigating actions recorded to reduce and manage the risk. Risks identified included power failure, adverse weather, unplanned sickness and access to the building. The document also contained relevant contact details for staff to refer to.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The GPs and nursing staff we spoke with could clearly outline the rationale for their approaches to treatment. They were familiar with current best practice guidance, and accessed guidelines from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and from local commissioners. We saw that guidance from local commissioners was readily accessible in all the clinical and consulting rooms.

We discussed with the practice manager, GP and nurse how NICE guidance was received into the practice. They told us this was downloaded from the website and disseminated to staff. We saw minutes of clinical meetings which showed this was then discussed and implications for the practice's performance and patients were identified and required actions agreed. Staff we spoke with all demonstrated a good level of understanding and knowledge of NICE guidance and local guidelines.

Staff described how they carried out comprehensive assessments which covered all health needs and was in line with these national and local guidelines. They explained how care was planned to meet identified needs and how patients were reviewed at required intervals to ensure their treatment remained effective. For example, patients with diabetes were having regular health checks and were being referred to other services when required. Feedback from patients confirmed they were referred to other services or hospital when required.

The practice used computerised tools to identify patients who were at high risk of admission to hospital. These patients were reviewed regularly to ensure multidisciplinary care plans were documented in their records and that their needs were being met to assist in reducing the need for them to go into hospital. We saw that after patients were discharged from hospital they were followed up to ensure that all their needs were continuing to be met.

Discrimination was avoided when making care and treatment decisions. Interviews with GPs showed that the culture in the practice was that patients were cared for and treated based on need and the practice took account of patient's age, gender, race and culture as appropriate.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

Information about people's care and treatment, and their outcomes, was routinely collected and monitored and this information used to improve care. Staff across the practice had key roles in monitoring and improving outcomes for patients. These roles included data input, scheduling clinical reviews, and managing child protection alerts and medicines management. The information staff collected was then collated by the management partner and practice manager to support the practice to carry out clinical audits.

The practice showed us four clinical audits that had been undertaken in the last year. An example of a completed audit where the practice was able to demonstrate the changes resulting since the initial audit was to assess the practice's implementation on NICE guidelines for X-ray investigation of lower back pain (LBP) and subsequent re-audit if educational intervention. The completion of the audit cycle showed a positive change with 0% of patients with simple back pain having an x-ray. Other examples included audits to confirm that the GPs who undertook minor surgical procedures, contraceptive implants and the insertion of intrauterine contraceptive devices were doing so in line with their registration and National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guidance.

The GPs told us clinical audits were often linked to medicines management information, safety alerts or as a result of information from the quality and outcomes framework (QOF). QOF is a voluntary incentive scheme for GP practices in the UK. The scheme financially rewards practices for managing some of the most common long-term conditions and for the implementation of preventative measures. For example, we saw an audit regarding the prescribing of analgesics and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Following the audit, the GPs carried out medication reviews for patients who were prescribed these medicines and altered their prescribing practice to ensure it aligned with national guidelines. GPs maintained records showing how they had evaluated the service and documented the success of any changes and shared this with all prescribers in the practice.

The practice also used the information collected for the QOF and performance against national screening

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. It achieved 97.3% of the total QOF target in 2014. Specific examples to demonstrate this included:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 96.5%, 7.3% above the national average.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 100%, 2.1% above the national average.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 84.6%, 8.2% below the national average.
- Hypertension QOF indicators was 100%, 2% above the national average.
- The dementia diagnosis rate was 100%, 5.5% above the national average.

The practice was aware of all the areas where performance was not in line with national or CCG figures and we saw action plans setting out how these were being addressed.

The practice also kept a register of patients identified as being at high risk of admission to hospital and of those in various vulnerable groups: homeless, travellers, learning disabilities. Structured annual reviews were also undertaken for people with long term conditions e.g. Diabetes, COPD, Heart failure.

Effective staffing

Practice staffing included medical, nursing, managerial and administrative staff. We reviewed staff training records and saw that all staff were up to date with attending mandatory courses such as annual basic life support. We noted a good skill mix among the doctors and all GPs were up to date with their yearly continuing professional development requirements and all either had been revalidated or had a date for revalidation. (Every GP is appraised annually, and undertakes a fuller assessment called revalidation every five years. Only when revalidation has been confirmed by the General Medical Council can the GP continue to practise and remain on the performers list with NHS England).

All staff undertook annual appraisals that identified learning needs from which action plans were documented. Our interviews with staff confirmed that the practice was proactive in providing training and funding for relevant

courses. As the practice was a training practice, doctors who were training to be qualified as GPs were offered extended appointments and had access to a senior GP throughout the day for support.

Practice nurses and health care assistants had job descriptions outlining their roles and responsibilities and provided evidence that they were trained appropriately to fulfil these duties. For example, on administration of vaccines, cervical cytology. Those with extended roles, for example, seeing patients with long-term conditions such as asthma, COPD, diabetes and coronary heart disease were also able to demonstrate that they had appropriate training to fulfil these roles.

Working with colleagues and other services

The practice worked with other service providers to meet patient's needs and manage those of patients with complex needs. It received blood test results, x ray results, and letters from the local hospital including discharge summaries, out-of-hours GP services and the 111 service both electronically and by post. The practice had a policy outlining the responsibilities of all relevant staff in passing on, reading and acting on any issues arising these communications. Out-of hours reports, 111 reports and pathology results were all seen and actioned by a GP on the day they were received. Discharge summaries and letters from outpatients were usually seen and processed on the day of receipt and all within five days of receipt. The GP who saw these documents and results was responsible for the action required. All staff we spoke with understood their roles and felt the system in place worked well. There were no instances identified within the last year of any results or discharge summaries that were not followed up.

The practice held multidisciplinary team meetings every month to discuss patients with complex needs. For example, those with multiple long term conditions, mental health problems, people from vulnerable groups, those with end of life care needs or children on the at risk register. These meetings were attended by district nurses, social workers, palliative care nurses and decisions about care planning were documented in a shared care record. Staff felt this system worked well. Care plans were in place for patients with complex needs and shared with other health and social care workers as appropriate.

Information sharing

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The practice used several electronic systems to communicate with other providers. For example, there was a shared system with the local GP out-of-hours provider to enable patient data to be shared in a secure and timely manner. We saw evidence there was a system for sharing appropriate information for patients with complex needs with the ambulance and out-of-hours services.

The practice had systems to provide staff with the information they needed. Staff used an electronic patient record to coordinate, document and manage patients' care. All staff were fully trained on the system. This software enabled scanned paper communications, such as those from hospital, to be saved in the system for future reference. We saw evidence that audits had been carried out to assess the completeness of these records and that action had been taken to address any shortcomings identified.

Consent to care and treatment

We found that staff were aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005, the Children Acts 1989 and 2004 and their duties in fulfilling it. All the clinical staff we spoke with understood the key parts of the legislation and were able to describe how they implemented it. For some specific scenarios where capacity to make decisions was an issue for a patient, the practice had drawn up a policy to help staff. For example, with making do not attempt resuscitation orders. The policy also highlighted how patients should be supported to make their own decisions and how these should be documented in the medical notes.

Patients with a learning disability and those with dementia were supported to make decisions through the use of care plans, which they were involved in agreeing. These care plans were reviewed annually (or more frequently if

changes in clinical circumstances dictated it) and had a section stating the patient's preferences for treatment and decisions. Performance for learning disabilities related indicators was 100%, 0.2% above the national average. All clinical staff demonstrated a clear understanding of the Gillick competency test. (These are used to help assess whether a child under the age of 16 has the maturity to make their own decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions).

Health promotion and prevention

Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice. These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, where the clinical team worked hard to maintain continuity of care. Patients who were carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation were signposted to the relevant services. Many of these were provided within the surgery buildings.

The practice had a comprehensive screening programme. The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80.4% which was slightly lower than the national average of 81.8%. The practice encouraged their patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. They encouraged female patients over the age of 74 to self-refer for breast screening.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. All new patients had a health assessment with a GP and there were NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups on the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We observed throughout the inspection that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients both attending at the reception desk and on the telephone and that patients were treated with dignity and respect. Curtains were provided in consulting rooms so that patients' privacy and dignity was maintained during examinations, investigations and treatments. We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations and that 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.

Patients told us they felt all staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. We were told how everyone responded with compassion when patients needed help and how they were provided support when required. They commented positively about the consistent, continuity of good care they received from their named and known GP.

We reviewed the most recent data available for the practice on patient satisfaction. This included information from the national patient survey in July 2015, and patient satisfaction questionnaires sent out to patients.

The evidence from all these sources showed patients were satisfied with how they were treated and that this was with compassion, dignity and respect. For example, data from the national patient survey showed the practice was rated 'among the best' for patients who rated the practice as good or very good. The practice was also well above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with doctors and nurses. For example:

- 97.6% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 88.7% and national average of 88.6%.
- 93.7% said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 88.2% and national average of 86.6%.
- 100% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94.8% and national average of 95.2%

- 98.7% said the last nurse they saw gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 93.4% and national average of 91.9%
- 97.2% said the last nurse they saw was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92.3% and national average of 90.4%

Staff told us that if they had any concerns or observed any instances of discriminatory behaviour or where patients' privacy and dignity was not being respected, they would raise these with the practice manager. The practice manager told us she would investigate these and any learning identified would be shared with staff.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The patient survey information we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment and generally rated the practice well in these areas. For example:

- 88.4% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86.6% and national average of 86.0%.
- 92.6% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 81.6% and national average of 81.4%.
- 97.2% said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 91.4% and national average of 89.6%.
- 91.4% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87.2% and national average of 84.8%.

Patients we spoke with on the day of our inspection told us that health issues were discussed with them and 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 they wished to receive. Patient feedback on the friends and family which we reviewed was also positive and aligned with these views.

Are services caring?

Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.

Patient/carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

The patient survey information we reviewed showed patients were positive about the emotional support provided by the practice and rated it well in this area. For example:

- 92.3% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 85.1%.

- 98.6% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92.3% and national average of 90.4%.

Notices in the patient waiting room, on the TV screen and patient website also told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

We found the practice was responsive to patient's needs and had systems in place to maintain the level of service provided. The needs of the practice population were understood and systems were in place to address identified needs in the way services were delivered.

The NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) told us that the practice engaged regularly with them and other practices to discuss local needs and service improvements that needed to be prioritised. We saw minutes of meetings where this had been discussed and actions agreed to implement service improvements to better meet the needs of its population.

The practice had met with the Public Health team from the local authority and the CCG to discuss the implications and share information about the needs of the practice population identified by the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). The JSNA pulls together information about the health and social care needs of the population in the local area. This information was used to help focus services offered by the practice.

The practice had also implemented suggestions for improvements and made changes to the way it delivered services in response to feedback from the patient participation group (PPG).

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had recognised the needs of different groups in the planning of its services. For example, longer appointment times were available for patients with learning disabilities, asylum seekers, travellers. The majority of the practice population were English speaking patients with many being university students from other parts of the country and also from abroad. Access to interpreters was available along with online and telephone translation services where they were needed. Staff were aware of when a patient may require an advocate to support them and there was information on advocacy services available for patients.

The premises and services had been designed to meet the needs of people with disabilities. The practice was accessible to patients with mobility difficulties as facilities were all on one level. The consulting rooms were also

accessible for patients with mobility difficulties and there were access enabled toilets and baby changing facilities. There was a large waiting area with plenty of space for wheelchairs and prams. This made movement around the practice easier and helped to maintain patients' independence.

Staff told us that they did not have any patients who were of "no fixed abode" but would see someone if they came to the practice asking to be seen and would register the patient so they could access services. There was a system for flagging vulnerability in individual patient records.

There were male and female GPs in the practice; therefore patients could choose to see a male or female doctor.

The practice provided equality and diversity training through e-learning. Staff we spoke with confirmed that they had completed the equality and diversity training in the last 12 months and that equality and diversity was regularly discussed at staff appraisals and team events.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were available during these times.

Patients requiring a GP outside of normal working hours were advised to contact the GP Out of Hours service by telephoning 111.

Comprehensive information was available to patients about appointments on the practice website. This included how to arrange urgent appointments and home visits and how to book appointments through the website. There were also arrangements to ensure patients received urgent medical assistance when the practice was closed. If patients called the practice when it was closed, an answerphone message gave the telephone number they should ring depending on their circumstances. Information on the out-of-hours service was provided to patients.

Longer appointments were also available for older patients, those experiencing poor mental health, patients with learning disabilities and those with long-term conditions. This also included appointments with a named GP or nurse. Home visits were made to those patients who needed one.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

The patient survey information we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about access to appointments and generally rated the practice well in these areas. For example:

- 87.9% were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 79.1% and national average of 74.9%.
- 83.1% described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 75.8% and national average of 73.3%.
- 74% said they usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time compared to the CCG average of 71.9% and national average of 64.8%.
- 95% said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 76.6% and national average of 73.3%.
- 94.5% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone compared to the CCG average of 86.8% and national average of 85.2%.
- 95% would recommend this surgery to someone new to the area compared to the CCG average of 77.6% and national average of 77.5%.

Patients we spoke with were satisfied with the appointments system and said it was easy to use. They confirmed that they could see a doctor on the same day if they felt they needed to and usually this was their GP of choice. Patients said they rang the practice, spoke with a receptionist and then they were given a time when a GP would call them back. The GP could give advice over the telephone or ask them to come in for an appointment. One patient said the system had saved her a lot of time, being given help from the GP without the problems of transport getting to the practice. They also said they could see another doctor if the GP of their choice was not on duty. Routine appointments were still available for booking in advance. Another patient thought the appointment system

was good because they had contact from the GP very quickly when they needed it. This system also helped with waiting times in the practice. Following a conversation with the GP the patient would then be given a short or long appointment, which helped the appointments run to time. There were less patients not attending for appointments. Reception staff gave out business cards to patients, which included practice telephone numbers and which GPs worked which days.

Since the practice commenced fully accessible appointments on the same day, attendance at walk in centres/accident and emergency hospital admission rates for the practice had reduced significantly to 3.3% of the town's total, despite having over 4.8% of the town's patient list.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system in place for handling complaints and concerns. Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England. There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.

We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system; there were posters in place and a leaflet available. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint. None of the patients we spoke with had ever needed to make a complaint about the practice.

We looked at four complaints received in the last 12 months and found they were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way.

The practice reviewed complaints annually to detect themes or trends. We looked at the report for the last review and no themes had been identified. However, lessons learned from individual complaints had been acted on and improvements made to the quality of care as a result.

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. We found details of the vision and practice values were part of the practice's strategy and business plan. We saw evidence that the strategy and business plan were regularly reviewed by the practice and also saw the practice values were clearly displayed in the waiting areas and in the staff room.

Governance arrangements

The practice had a number of policies and procedures in place to govern activity and these were available to staff on the desktop on any computer within the practice. We looked at some of these policies and they had been reviewed annually and were up to date.

There was a clear leadership structure with named members of staff in lead roles. For example, there was a lead nurse for infection control and two GPs were the leads for safeguarding for vulnerable adults and children. We spoke with four members of staff and they were all clear about their own roles and responsibilities. They all told us they felt valued, well supported and knew who to go to in the practice with any concerns.

The GPs and the management partner took an active leadership role for overseeing that the systems in place to monitor the quality of the service were consistently being used and were effective. The included using the Quality and Outcomes Framework to measure its performance (QOF is a voluntary incentive scheme which financially rewards practices for managing some of the most common long-term conditions and for the implementation of preventative measures). The QOF data for this practice showed it was performing in line with national standards. We saw that QOF data was regularly discussed at monthly team meetings and action plans were produced to maintain or improve outcomes.

The practice also had an on-going programme of clinical audits which it used to monitor quality and systems to identify where action should be taken. Evidence from other data from sources, including incidents and complaints was used to identify areas where improvements could be made. Additionally, there were processes in place to review

patient satisfaction and that action had been taken, when appropriate, in response to feedback from patients or staff. The practice regularly submitted governance and performance data to the CCG.

The practice identified, recorded and managed risks. It had carried out risk assessments where risks had been identified and action plans had been produced and implemented. The practice monitored risks on a monthly basis to identify any areas that needed addressing.

The practice held monthly staff meetings where governance issues were discussed. We looked at minutes from these meetings and found that performance, quality and risks had been discussed.

The management partner was responsible for human resource policies and procedures. We reviewed a number of policies, for example disciplinary procedures, induction policy, management of sickness, which were in place to support staff. Staff we spoke with knew where to find these policies if required. The practice had a whistleblowing policy which was also available to all staff in the staff handbook and electronically on any computer within the practice.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The partners in the practice were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run the practice and how to develop the practice: the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

We saw from minutes that team meetings were held every month. Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and confident in doing so and felt supported if they did. Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice.

Seeking and acting on feedback from patients, public and staff

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients. They had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG), surveys and complaints received. It had an active PPG which included representatives from various population groups.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

The management partner showed us the analysis of the last patient survey, which was considered in conjunction with the PPG. (A PPG is a group of patients registered with a practice who work with the practice to improve services and the quality of care).

We also saw evidence that the practice had reviewed its' results from the national GP survey to see if there were any areas that needed addressing. The practice was actively encouraging patients to be involved in

shaping the service delivered at the practice.

Management lead through learning and improvement

Staff told us that the practice supported them to maintain their clinical professional development through training and mentoring. We looked at four staff files and saw that regular appraisals took place which included a personal development plan. Staff told us that the practice was very supportive of training and development.