

Heathbridge Practice

Quality Report

125 Upper Richmond Road,
Putney, London, SW15 2TL
Tel: 020 8246 4070
Website: www.heathbridgepractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 17 March 2016
Date of publication: This is auto-populated when the report is published

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	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Heathbridge Practice	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Heathbridge Practice on 17 March 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:

- The practice should review their arrangements for identifying and supporting carers.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- 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, for example the practice provides in-house phlebotomy services.
- 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.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

The practice is rated as good for the care of older 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 are available for older people, with the provision of up to 30 minute appointments to discuss care planning and self-management of conditions.

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 these patients had a named GP and 90% had 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.
- The practice performed in line with or above local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and national averages for diabetes care. For example;
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last HbA1c (a specific blood sugar level test) is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 82% (CCG 75%, National 78%)
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood

pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 86% (CCG 74%, National 78%)

- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who have had influenza

immunisation in the preceding 1 August to 31 March was 98% (CCG 92%, National 94%)

Good



Summary of findings

- 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% (CCG 75%, National 78%)

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination

and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 84% (CCG 78%, National 80%).

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.
- The percentage of women aged 25-64 whose notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years was 77% compared to the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 81% 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, 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 to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.

Good



Summary of findings

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.
- 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 had a lead GP for engaging with seldom-heard groups of vulnerable people. This GP regularly visited support groups and other organisations, sharing learning with colleagues and using the information to provide additional support and assistance to patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice performed better than or in line with local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and national averages for patients experiencing poor mental health including those diagnosed with dementia, for example:
- All the 48 patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months which was better than the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 84% with 0% exception reported.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 95% (CCG 91%, National 88%)
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 90% (CCG 89%, national 90%).

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. There were 406 survey forms distributed and 117 returned. This represented 0.7% of the practice's patient list.

- 89% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 79% and the national average of 73%.
- 88% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG 79%, national 76%).
- 90% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good (CCG 87%, national 85%).
- 93% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG 84%, national 79%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection.

We received 36 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Comments included that the service was first rate, staff were attentive, efficient and caring. Patients commented that they thought staff were helpful, that they were treated with respect and dignity and that both emergency and routine care met and exceeded their expectations.

We spoke with two patients during the inspection and three patient participation group members. All five patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The practice encouraged patients to give feedback via the friends and family test. At the time of the inspection 52 responses had been received in the previous 12 months with 90% of respondents saying they were likely or extremely likely to recommend the services at the practice to a friend or family member.

Heathbridge 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 adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Heathbridge Practice

Heathbridge Practice provides primary medical services in Wandsworth to approximately 16,000 patients and is one of 44 member practices in the NHS Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The practice operates under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract and provides a number of local and national enhanced services (enhanced services require an increased level of service provision above that which is normally required under the core GP contract).

Wandsworth has 50% more 20 to 40 year olds, but 33 per cent fewer older people than other south west London boroughs, reflected in the patient demographics for the practice with 9% of patients aged 65 or over, 76% of patients aged 18-65 years old and 15% aged 18 or younger.

The practice population is in the third least deprived decile with income deprivation affecting children and adults lower than national averages. Ethnicity data shows that 82% of patients are white, 8% Asian, 4% black, 4% have mixed ethnicity and 2% are from other non-white ethnic backgrounds.

The practice operates from two floors of a shared-use purpose built property with patient facilities including reception and waiting areas on both the ground and first

floor mezzanine as well as practice management facilities on the first floor, all of which are accessible by lift or stairs. The building is wheelchair accessible with disabled accessible facilities.

The practice clinical team is made up of six GP partners equivalent to 6.9 whole time GPs, one nurse partner, three salaried GPs, three nurses and two healthcare assistants. Four of the doctors are male and six doctors are female. All other clinical staff are female. The practice is a training practice and has one GP registrar. The non-clinical team consists of one practice manager, one data manager, one secretary, one reception manager and 11 receptionists.

The practice opens between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Telephone lines are operational between the hours of 8.00am and 6.30pm. Extended hours are available Monday from 6.30pm to 8.30pm and Tuesday from 6.30pm to 8.50pm. Appointments during extended hours are prebookable only.

The provider has opted out of providing out-of-hours (OOH) services to their own patients between 6.30pm and 8.00am, at weekends and bank holidays when the practice directs patients to seek assistance from the locally agreed out of hours provider.

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

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

Detailed findings

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 17 March 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nursing staff, the practice manager and reception 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?

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We 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, a patient was twice diagnosed with a medical condition and given antibiotics by two different doctors. When the patient's condition did not improve they were referred to A&E where a different diagnosis was made. The patient made a complaint to the practice, the complaint was investigated and the patient received an apology. The practice investigation included a clinical case review by GPs who were reminded to consider differential diagnoses, especially with conditions with similar presentations.

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. For example reception staff were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 1 and GPs and nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PDG) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment). Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a

Are services safe?

patient specific prescription or direction (PSD) from a prescriber. (PSDs are written instructions from a qualified and registered prescriber for a medicine including the dose, route and frequency or appliance to be supplied or administered to a named patient after the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis).

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

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor 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 were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met patients' needs.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality 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 99% of the total number of points available, compared to the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 92% and the national average of 95%.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better than the CCG and national averages. For example;
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last HbA1c is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 82% (CCG 75%, National 78%)
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 86% (CCG 74%, National 78%)
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, who have had influenza immunisation in the preceding 1 August to 31 March was 98% (CCG 92%, National 94%)

- 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% (CCG 75%, National 78%)
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 84% (CCG 78%, National 80%).
- Performance for mental health related indicators was above or similar to the CCG and national averages. For example;
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months was 100% which was above the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 84%.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 95% (CCG 91%, National 88%)
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 90% (CCG 89%, national 90%).

The practice engaged directly with patients on the practice dementia register via telephone and letter to encourage uptake in the annual health screening programme. Where appropriate, the practice also worked with carers to ensure good uptake. A named GP for each person on the dementia register ensured continuity of care for these patients.

The practice regularly met as part of multi-disciplinary teams (MDT) to discuss and put in place any needs their patients on their mental health register may have. Engagement also included regular contact with the local NHS Mental Health Trust and community psychiatric nurses to encourage patients to attend regular screening and health checks at the practice.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been ten clinical audits completed in the last two years, four of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

For example; the practice audited a random sample of patient blood samples tested for cholesterol levels to see if the processes were in line with current guidelines. In the first audit cycle the practice found that of 30 random samples, the guidelines were followed for 23 patients but not for seven patients. The practice found that there were sometimes good reasons for not adhering to the guidelines however that these reasons were not always clearly documented. The practice discussed the findings and put in place actions including circulating the current guidelines for all clinical staff, and a new reporting template to make it easier for staff to properly document investigations and outcomes. The second audit cycle showed that of 30 random samples taken, 29 were in line with guidelines and the other sample was for a patient who hadn't attended the practice for a follow up and treatment. The second audit cycle also showed GPs were more consistently applying the guidelines and recording investigations and outcomes.

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. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions we saw that the lead GP and nurse had attained a diploma in diabetes management in primary care, that nurses had attended a local insulin management programme and that staff had attended other suitable courses such as managing the diabetic foot. All nurses and GPs had also attended training in mental health related conditions such as dementia and schizophrenia.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support and placed them into registers dependent on their needs. For example, the practice held registers of the following:

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition, elderly patients, housebound patients and patients with learning disabilities. Patients were signposted to the relevant service for their condition if these services were not available at the practice.
- The practice provides smoking cessation advice and also directs patients to local support groups and services for diet and healthy living advice and exercise referrals.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 67%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 82%. The practice demonstrated improvements made in cervical screening uptake since 2011 where the uptake was 60% and provided evidence that they were continuing efforts to improve further including; improving access by training all four nurses to perform the screening, ensuring there was always

a female sample taker, and offering extended hours appointments. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 73% to 91% and five year olds from 64% to 97%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. In 2014/15, the practice carried out 598 health checks for patients aged 40-74 out of a target 600. The practice actively approached specific patients for health checks based on their risk factors and also offered health checks at other opportunities such as at registration and appointments. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

All of the 36 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with three 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 was above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 87% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 90% and the national average of 89%.
- 83% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 95%.
- 89% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to CCG average of 86% and the national average of 85%.

- 91% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 91%.
- 94% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

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

The practice provided facilities to help patients be involved in decisions about their care:

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The practice had a comprehensive website covering many aspects of care including signposting patients to further information and guidance.

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 94 patients as carers (0.5% of the practice list). Carers were offered an annual health check, longer appointments and were

directed to local support services specifically for carers. The practice had carried out health checks for 63% of the carers register. 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;

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on a Monday and Tuesday evening until 8.30pm and 8.50pm respectively 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, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- Other reasonable adjustments were made and action was taken to remove barriers when patients find it hard to use or access services.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Telephone lines were operational between the hours of 8.00am and 6.30pm. Extended hours were available Monday from 6.30pm to 8.30pm and Tuesday from 6.30pm to 8.50pm. Appointments during extended hours were prebookable only. 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 that patient satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was comparable to local and national averages.

- 87% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.

- 89% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

The practice telephoned the patient or carer who had requested the home visit to gather information to allow for an informed decision to be made on prioritisation according to clinical need. In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- 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 including posters in the practice patient areas, at reception and information on the practice website.

We looked at seven complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way and with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, when sending out reminder letters for a screening programme to multiple patients, a member of staff printed address labels, and affixed them to the envelopes and posted them out. Patients complained that their date of birth had been included on their address labels, which was not in line with information governance best practice. The

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

practice immediately stopped the practice of printing address labels and reminded all staff to hand write addresses only, taking care to adhere to practice information governance policy.

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 and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, 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. We noted team away days were held every 12 months.
- 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 patient group provided feedback from patients to the practice out of hours provider, resulting in improvements to out of hours services;
- improved patient privacy in reception by suggesting signage to be used which the practice installed; and
- suggested the diabetes prevalence was low resulting in the practice performing an audit of patients with diabetes risk factors that identified seven new cases.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff away days and generally through staff meetings,

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

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