

Mayflower Medical Centre

Quality Report

419 Main Road,
Harwich,
Essex
CO12 4EX
Tel: 01255201299
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 17 June 2015
Date of publication: 09/07/2015

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

Ratings

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

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	8
Areas for improvement	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Mayflower Medical Centre	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Mayflower Medical Centre on 17 June 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

Specifically, we found the practice to be good for providing safe, caring, well-led, effective and responsive services. It was also good for providing services for older people, people with long term conditions, families, children and young people, working aged people (including those recently retired and students), people whose circumstances make them vulnerable and people with mental health (including people with dementia).

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. Improvements were needed in how safety alerts and significant events were acted on and monitored.

- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered following best practice guidance and referrals to secondary care services were made in a timely way.
- Patients said they were treated with empathy, compassion, dignity and respect. They said that they were listened to and involved in making decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were needed in the way that complaints were responded to.
- Appointments were flexible to meet the needs of all population groups.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff were supported by management. The practice sought feedback from staff and patients.

However there were areas of practice where the provider needs to make improvements.

Importantly the provider should:

Summary of findings

- Review the systems dealing with and acting on safety alerts and significant events to improve patient safety.
- Ensure that staff who undertake chaperone duties complete training regarding these duties.
- Review policies and procedures around handling and storing vaccines and blank prescription pads.
- Ensure that all complaints are responded to in line with practice policies and procedures.
- Ensure that policies and procedures are reviewed so that they reflect accurately the day-to-day management of the practice.

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 were employed in appropriate numbers and trained to treat patients safely. The practice was clean and fully equipped to treat patients in a safe environment. Improvements were required to ensure that safety alerts and serious significant incidents were managed and acted on consistently. Improvements were also required in how medicines were managed within the practice.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services. Data made available to us including comparisons to other GP surgeries within the area showed that most patient outcomes similar in relation to assessing and treating patients with long term conditions, vaccination and screening programmes. Treatment was planned and delivered in line with local and national guidance for GP practices. The practice staff worked with multidisciplinary teams including community nurses, health visitors and social workers to improve outcomes for patients and ensure that they received coordinated care and support as needed.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services. Data from the National GP Survey, Friend and Family Test and NHS Choices showed that patients rated the practice lower than others in the area for several aspects of care. Patients expressed satisfaction for how they were treated by GPs and nurses, their involvement in their care and treatment and being listened to. Patients we spoke with during the inspection said they were treated with dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment. The practice considered the needs of patients and their families when patients were receiving palliative care and nearing their end of their life and supported families following bereavements.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services. It reviewed the needs of its local population and monitored and changed access to services to meet these needs. The appointments system was flexible and extended hours were available on Tuesday evenings and early Wednesday mornings. Walk-in services were available each day whereby patients could be seen by a nurse or GP

Good



Summary of findings

without an appointment. The practice premises were purpose built and easily accessible to patients including those with physical disabilities or impairment. Improvements were needed in the way in which complaints were responded to.

Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as good for being well-led. It had a clear vision and strategy to meet the individual needs of patients taking into consideration the health care needs of the local population. The practice sought and acted on the views of patients and staff to make improvements to the services provided. There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. Learning and improvement was promoted through a system of audits and reviews.

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

This practice is rated as good for the care of older people. Patients over the age of 75 years had a named accountable GP who was responsible for their care and treatment and a full range of screening and vaccinations were available. The practice identified patients who were at risk of avoidable unplanned hospital admissions and planned care in conjunction with other health and social professionals to prevent unplanned admissions. Regular multidisciplinary team meetings were held with other health and social care professionals to support patients and ensure that they received coordinated care and treatment.

Home visits and medicines dispensing services were provided based upon patient's circumstances and needs.

Good



People with long term conditions

This practice is rated as good for the care of people with long term conditions. The practice had effective arrangements for making sure that people with long term conditions had regular health and medication reviews. The practice offered a number of clinics including clinics for diabetes, asthma, COPD, heart disease, peripheral vascular disease and some recurrent eye conditions. Appointments were offered during surgery times, on some Saturday mornings and Tuesday evenings. When patients required referral to specialist services, including secondary care, patients were offered a choice of services, locations and dates. These referrals were made in a timely way and monitored to ensure that patients received the treatments they needed.

Good



Families, children and young people

The practice is rated as good for the population group of families, children and young people. Appointments were flexible and walk-in services were available each day. Ante-natal and post-natal checks were available. The practice monitored the physical and developmental progress of babies and young children and weekly drop in sessions were held at the practice with the health visitor. Appointments for children were made available outside of school hours wherever possible. There were arrangements for identifying and monitoring children who were at risk of abuse or neglect.

There was information available to inform mothers about all childhood immunisations, what they are, and at what age the child should have them as well as other checks for new-born babies. Staff

Good



Summary of findings

proactively followed up patients who failed to attend appointments for routine immunisation and vaccination programmes. Information and advice on sexual health and contraception was provided during GP and nurse appointments.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The practice is rated as good for the population group of working-age people (including those recently retired and students). Appointments were flexible with telephone consultations, pre-booked appointments and a daily walk-in service. Extended hours were available with evening appointments on Tuesdays and evening appointments on Wednesdays. NHS health checks for patients aged between 40 and 75 years were available and promoted within the practice and on their website. Nurse led clinics were provided for well patient health checks.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

This practice is rated as good for the care of people living in vulnerable circumstances. The practice recognised the needs of people who were vulnerable such as travelling communities and homeless people, those with depression, alcohol or substance misuse issues, people with mental health conditions and those with learning disabilities. The practice worked with the health visiting team to engage with travelling communities and promote health screening and childhood immunisations. Staff were trained and understood their responsibilities to report concerns about the welfare of patients to the appropriate agencies.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The practice is rated as good for the population group of people experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia). People experiencing poor mental health had received an annual physical health check. The practice regularly worked with multidisciplinary teams to support people experiencing poor mental health including those with dementia. The practice had recently commenced dementia screening services and referrals were made to specialist services as required. The practice had suitable processes for referring patients to appropriate services such as psychiatry and counselling, including The Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) and referrals to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) as required.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

We gathered the views of patients from the practice by reviewing data available from NHS Choices and the National GP Patient Survey results from 2014/15. Prior to our inspection we also sent CQC 'Tell us about your care' comment cards to the practice for distribution among patients in order to obtain their views about the practice and the service they received. We spoke with eight patients on the day of the inspection.

The results from the National GP Survey, Friend and Family Test and NHS Choices indicated that the majority of patients were happy with the practice, the appointments system and their involvement in making decisions about their treatment.

We received 24 completed 'Tell us about your care' comment cards. All of the patients who completed these expressed satisfaction with the care and treatments and service they received. We also spoke with eight patients on the day of our inspection, one of whom were involved with the practice Patient Participation Group (PPG). A PPG is usually made up of a group of patient volunteers and members of a GP practice team. Patients told us that they were happy with the service and treatments they received. They said that they could access appointments that suited them and that they were treated with kindness and respect.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Review and the systems dealing and acting on safety alerts and significant events to improve patient safety.
- Ensure that staff who undertake chaperone duties complete training in respect of these duties.
- Review policies and procedures around handling and storing vaccines and blank prescription pads.
- Ensure that all complaints are responded to in line with practice policies and procedures.
- Ensure that policies and procedures are reviewed so that they reflect accurately the day-to-day management of the practice.

Mayflower Medical Centre

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 Care Quality Commission practice manager specialist advisor and a Care Quality Commission GP specialist advisor.

Background to Mayflower Medical Centre

Mayflower Medical Centre is located in a purpose built health centre situated in the grounds of Freyett Hospital in Dovercourt, Harwich. The practice provides services for approximately 17,800 patients living within the Harwich area. The practice holds a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract and provides GP services commissioned by North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group.

The practice population is similar to the national average for younger people and children under four years, working aged and recently retired older people aged over 75 years. Economic deprivation levels affecting children, older people and unemployment were higher than the practice average across England. Life expectancy for men and women are in line the national averages. Their patient list has a higher than national average for long standing health conditions and disability allowance claimants.

The practice is managed by eight GP partners who hold financial and managerial responsibility for the practice. The practice employs one salaried GP, five nurse practitioners / nurse prescribers, seven practice nurses and two health care assistants, a practice manager and a team of administrative, secretarial and reception staff who support the practice.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm on weekdays. The practice provides extended hours up to 8.30 pm on Tuesdays and between 7am and 8am on Wednesdays for pre-booked appointments only. A walk-in service is available each day between 8am and 6.30pm.

The practice has opted out of providing GP services to patients outside of normal working hours such as evenings, weekends and public holidays. Unscheduled out-of-hours care is provided by Harmoni and patients who contact the surgery outside of opening hours are transferred directly to this service. This information is also available on the practice website.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected Mayflower Medical Centre as part of our comprehensive inspection programme. 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:

Detailed findings

- 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
- Working age people (including those recently retired and students)
- People living in vulnerable circumstances
- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations including NHS England and North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 17 June 2015. During our visit we spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nurse practitioners, practice nurses, the practice manager, reception and administrative staff. We reviewed policies, procedures and other documents in relation to the management and day-to-day running of the practice. We spoke with patients who used the service. We talked with carers and family members. We reviewed comment cards, NHS Choices and National GP Patient Survey results where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe Track Record

The practice had policies and procedures for reporting and responding to accidents, incidents and near misses. Staff we spoke with told us that they were aware of the procedures for reporting and dealing with risks to patients and concerns. They told us that they were supported to raise concerns and that the procedures within the practice worked well.

There were systems for sharing safety received from the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and National Patient Safety Agency (NPSA) alerts. These alerts have safety and risk information regarding medication and equipment often resulting in the review of patients prescribed medicines and/or the withdrawal of medication from use in certain patients where potential side effects or risks are indicated.

The practice manager told us that MHRA and other relevant alerts were forwarded to GP partners for review and to identify patients who may be affected. However we saw that the procedures in relation to acting on safety alerts were not always carried out consistently. For example we looked at two safety alerts in relation to medicines, which were issued in 2014. These related to risks associated with the combined prescribing of Simvastatin (used to lower cholesterol) and Amlodipine (used to treat high blood pressure) and the long term use of Domperidone (used to treat nausea and vomiting). We found that a number of patients were prescribed these medicines. There were no records to demonstrate that the risks had been considered or the rationale for continued use of the medicines.

Learning and improvement from safety incidents

The practice had a system in place for reporting, recording and monitoring significant events, incidents, accidents and near misses. Staff we spoke with said that the practice had an open and 'no blame' culture and they would record, and report any significant or untoward event to their line manager. We saw that reporting forms were available on the computerised system and hard copies were also available and staff were aware of where to find these. We reviewed the 19 significant events recorded and investigated within the previous six months. The majority of these related to incorrect patient information being recorded in records. We saw that the description of the

event, discussion and learning was recorded. Records did not always include a detailed analysis of what went wrong, what could be done better to mitigate the risk of reoccurrence, or the date by which learning outcomes should be achieved. We found on reviewing complaints that a number of these relating to clinical issues such as delayed referrals to secondary care, had not been identified as significant events and should have been considered and investigated in more detail.

Through discussions with GPs and a review of records we saw that significant events were discussed at six monthly meetings and that they were not routinely reviewed or discussed at more regular clinical meetings. There was therefore scope to discuss learning arising from investigations more frequently in order to improve patient safety.

Reliable safety systems and processes including safeguarding

The practice had suitable policies and procedures in place to identify risks to vulnerable children, young people and adults. All staff at the practice had undertaken appropriate safeguarding children and adults training. The practice had a dedicated lead GP who had oversight of the safeguarding arrangements. Staff we spoke with were aware of the practice procedures for protecting vulnerable patients. They knew how to identify signs of potential abuse or neglect in children, older and vulnerable patients and who to report these concerns to. Staff were aware of their responsibilities for reporting concerns externally such as referring concerns to the local safeguarding team if appropriate.

Information about vulnerable patients was shared with staff appropriately. There was a system to highlight vulnerable patients on the practice's electronic records. GPs were appropriately using the required codes in electronic records to ensure risks to vulnerable adults and children and young people who were looked after (under the care of the local authority / in foster care) or on child protection plans were clearly flagged and reviewed. Information was used to make staff aware of any relevant issues when patients attended (or failed to attend) appointments. Records showed that information was shared with appropriate agencies including local social services, the police and health visitors as appropriate.

Are services safe?

The practice had a chaperone policy, which was available and easily visible in the waiting room and consulting rooms. (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). Chaperone duties were carried out by nursing staff and those we spoke with had an awareness of their responsibilities when acting as chaperones. Records we views and discussions with staff confirmed that staff had not undertaken training around chaperone duties and responsibilities.

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. The practice had written procedures in place for the receipt, handling and storage of temperature sensitive medicines such as vaccines to ensure that medicines remained effective and suitable for use. The temperatures of fridges used to store medicines were monitored daily. However only the actual fridge temperature was recorded and not the minimum and maximum temperature achieved within a 24 hour period. This would help identify any issues with the storage of medicines such as vaccines and other medicines which require cold storage to ensure that they did not exceed those recommended by the medicine manufacturer. From records we saw that the temperature of one vaccine fridge regularly reached 8 °C, which is at the higher end of the recommended storage temperatures (2 °C to 8 °C).

The nurses administered vaccines using directives that had been produced in line with legal requirements and national guidance. We saw up-to-date copies of these directives and evidence that nurses had received appropriate training to administer vaccines.

The practice provided medicines dispensing services. The dispensary was well organised. Dispensary staff were appropriately trained and had undertaken the necessary competencies. There were clear standard operating procedures in place and we saw evidence that these were followed. There were procedures for checking patients' identity before dispensing medicines. There were robust checking procedures in place to reduce risks of errors and near misses in relation to dispensing practices. Patients we spoke with told us they were given information about any prescribed medicines such as side-effects and that when their prescriptions were reviewed and any changes were explained fully.

Systems were in place to check medicines were within their expiry date and suitable for use and all the medicines we checked were within their expiry dates. Expired and unwanted medicines were disposed of in line with waste regulations. We found that blank prescription pads were not logged or audited so that risks of misuse were minimised.

The GPs discussed the arrangements for the management of high risk medicines which may have serious side-effects. GPs told us that patients who were prescribed these medicines had regular blood tests carried out and that these were reviewed when authorising repeat prescriptions.

Cleanliness & Infection Control

The practice had policies and procedures in place to protect patients and staff against the risk of infections. These included procedures for dealing with bodily fluids, handling and disposing of clinical waste, dealing with needle stick injuries and managing risks associated with Legionella (a germ found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings). Records showed that all staff had infection prevention and control training. The practice had an identified infection control lead nurse who had undertaken appropriate training.

Patients we spoke with during the inspection told us that they found the practice was always clean and that they had no concerns. We observed the premises to be visibly clean and tidy. Hand sanitising gels were available for patient use. Hand washing sinks with liquid soap, sanitising gel and paper towel dispensers were available in treatment rooms and toilet facilities, as were posters promoting good hand hygiene. We saw records to confirm that patient disposable privacy curtains were changed on a regular basis. We saw that the practice had arrangements to segregate and safely store clinical waste including disposable instruments and needles at the point of generation until it was disposed of.

Staff were provided with appropriate personal protective equipment including disposable gloves and aprons. Spillage kits were available for cleaning and disposing of body fluids and staff we spoke with were aware of where to locate these when needed. Records showed that all clinical staff underwent screening for Hepatitis B vaccination and

Are services safe?

immunity. People who are likely to come into contact with blood products, or are at increased risk of needle-stick injuries should receive these vaccinations to minimise risks of blood borne infections.

We saw there were cleaning schedules in place for daily, weekly and periodic cleaning tasks for general and clinical areas. Records were kept to show when cleaning had been carried out and these were audited on a weekly basis. The practice had arrangements for monitoring the infection control procedures and regular infection control audits were carried out to test the effectiveness of the procedures in place to protect staff and patients against the risks of infection. Following audits action plans were put in place, reviewed and updated to show that any areas for improvement were dealt with promptly.

GPs carried out minor surgical procedures such as skin excisions and joint injections. We saw that single use disposable instruments were provided for all procedures and staff were trained in aseptic technique to minimise the risks of infections. Records showed that audits were carried out in respect of surgical procedures to help monitor and minimise the risks of infections.

Staff recognised patients who may be more vulnerable and susceptible to infections, such as babies, young children, older people and patients whose immune systems may be compromised due to illness, medicines or treatments. Advice and information was provided so as to help patients protect themselves against the risks of infections.

Equipment

Staff we spoke with told us they had equipment to enable them to carry out diagnostic examinations, assessments and treatments. We found that the practice had sufficient stocks of equipment and single-use items required for a variety of diagnostic and screening procedures, such as blood tests, respiratory, diabetes and well person procedures. Records we viewed showed that all equipment was tested and maintained regularly. All portable electrical equipment was routinely tested. All diagnostic equipment such as weighing scales, spirometer, thermometers, ear syringe and the fridge thermometer were calibrated in line with the manufacturer's instructions so as to ensure that this equipment was fit for use. Through discussion with staff and a review of records we saw that equipment was replaced as needed.

Staffing & Recruitment

The practice had suitable and robust procedures for recruiting new staff to help ensure that they were suitable to work in a healthcare setting. We reviewed five staff records for staff including GPs, nurses and administrative staff and found that these procedures had been followed. Appropriate checks including proof of identification, employment references and security checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) had been carried out for all staff. Pre-employment interviews had been carried out and checks made to ensure that GPs and nurses had appropriate qualifications and effective registration with the appropriate professional body, such as the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) for nurses and the General Medical Council (GMC) for GPs. These checks helped to ensure that staff employed were suitable to work with vulnerable people. Inductions were in place for new staff so that they could familiarise themselves with their roles and responsibilities.

There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a staff rota in place and staffing levels were reviewed to ensure that actual staffing levels and skill mix were in line with planned staffing requirements. The practice had arrangements for providing staff cover in the event of unplanned absence due to illness and planned leave. Staff told us there were enough staff to maintain the smooth running of the practice and there were always enough staff on duty to keep patients safe.

Monitoring Safety & Responding to Risk

The practice had robust arrangements for identifying and managing risks to staff and patients. There was a detailed health and safety policy, which staff were aware of. Risks were identified through a variety of assessments, which covered fire safety, security of premises and records, medicines management, staffing levels and untoward issues which may impact on the running of the practice. These assessments were reviewed on a monthly basis to ensure that the practice environment, equipment and staff practices were safe.

The practice had policies and procedures in place for recognising and responding to risks to patients. Staff we spoke with told us that they were aware of these procedures. For example staff had access to policies and procedures for treating sudden deterioration in patients including children and treating patients in the event of a mental health crisis. Staff were able to demonstrate that

Are services safe?

they were aware of the correct action to take if they recognised risks to patients; for example they described how they would escalate concerns about an acutely ill or deteriorating child or a patient who was experiencing a mental health issue or crisis.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had policies and procedures in place to manage medical emergencies. Records showed that all staff had received training in basic life support. Emergency medicines and equipment were available including access to oxygen and an automated external defibrillator (used to attempt to restart a person's heart in an emergency). Nurses checked emergency equipment each month and these checks were recorded. Dispensary staff checked emergency medicines every month and maintained records, which were kept in the dispensary and not with medicines. The lead dispenser said that if medicines were due to expire before the next check that they would identify these medicines with a label. All emergency medicines we checked were in date.

A business continuity plan was in place to deal with a range of emergencies that may impact on the daily operation of the practice such as loss of power, adverse weather conditions, staff shortages or other circumstances that may affect access to the building or a disruption of the service. The plan described staff roles and responsibilities in the event of any untoward event. Staff we spoke with were aware of the plan and what action to take should the need arise. We saw that the plan contained relevant details and contact numbers to assist staff. Any changes to the plan were communicated at the weekly practice meetings and through email communications. There were robust arrangements for assessing and managing risks of fire within the practice. Regular fire alarm tests and evacuation drills were carried out. Staff were trained in fire safety procedures. Records showed that fire safety equipment including extinguishers and alarms were tested and serviced regularly.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

We saw that patient care and treatment was delivered in line with recognised best practice standards and guidelines including the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), Clinical Commissioning Group guidelines and policies. Staff told us that information and any changes in legislation or national guidelines were shared during regular clinical staff meetings. Records we viewed confirmed this. New patients were offered health checks when they joined the practice and staff proactively contacted patients where appropriate to attend for regular health checks and reviews.

GPs had lead roles for a number of long term conditions including heart disease, respiratory conditions and diabetes. They served as a source of expertise for colleagues in the practice and were responsible for ensuring new developments or specific clinical issues were discussed at the relevant practice meetings. There were a number of clinics held at the practice including those for asthma and chronic obstructive airways disease, family planning, minor surgery and diabetes. The nurse practitioner and practice nurses supported this work through nurse led clinics which allowed GP's to focus on patients with more complex healthcare needs.

All GPs we spoke with used national standards guidance for patients with suspected cancers to be referred and seen within two weeks. We saw that regular discussions were held between GPs to discuss patient care and appropriate pathways for medical conditions such as diabetes and gastro-intestinal conditions to help ensure that appropriate referrals were made to secondary care services where appropriate.

Staff told us that information relating to patients who accessed the out-of-hours services and patients' test results were reviewed by GPs on a daily basis. We saw that when patients were discharged from hospital, their discharge summary letters were reviewed by administrative staff who made changes to prescriptions, which were then sent to the patient's GP to review and agree the changes.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

Staff across the practice had key roles in monitoring and improving outcomes for patients. These roles included data input, scheduling clinical reviews, summarising patients' records, managing child and adult protection alerts and medicines management. Information was shared widely with staff and other healthcare professionals.

The practice participated in enhanced services commissioned from the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), Public Health and NHS England. (Enhanced services require an enhanced level of service provision above what is normally required under the core GP contract to improve outcomes for patients). The practice kept registers of patients with learning disabilities, those receiving palliative care and patients who were identified as vulnerable or at risk of unplanned hospital admissions. Patients had care plans and the practice held regular multidisciplinary meetings which were well attended by external professionals such as the community nursing team to help ensure that patients were treated and supported appropriately according to their assessed needs. We found that the practice was performing in line with local and national targets for the uptake of all childhood vaccinations and immunisations, flu vaccinations and women's cervical screening.

Data we reviewed showed that the practice's performance in assessing and treating the majority of patients with long term conditions such as diabetes, asthma, chronic respiratory diseases and heart disease were generally in line with or just below that the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and national averages. We looked at data from the practice electronic search facilities and found that there were a number of patients who were prescribed ACE inhibitors (used in the treatment of high blood pressure) who had no medicine review or renal checks within the previous 15 months. These checks help to ensure that medicines are prescribed effectively and that side effects are monitored.

The practice had a system in place for carrying out clinical audits, a process by which practices can demonstrate ongoing quality improvement and effective care. Clinical audits are ways in which the delivery of patient treatment and care is reviewed and assessed to identify areas of good practice and areas where practices can be improved. We saw that a number of clinical audits had been carried out including one which monitored patients with type 2 diabetes and associated chronic kidney disease. The

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

results of the audit showed that these patients blood pressure was being controlled in line with NICE guidelines. Other clinical audits were conducted around identifying patients who were at greater risks of developing disease or cancer as a result of long term medication use. Following the audits alternative medicines were prescribed where appropriate and the rationale for continued use was recorded where this occurred.

The practice protocol for repeat prescribing was in line with national guidance and staff regularly checked that patients receiving repeat prescriptions had been reviewed by the GP. The practice were among the best in the CCG area for some medicine prescribing such as use of frontline antibiotics and use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medicines NSAIDs (used to treat inflammatory conditions such as arthritis).

Effective staffing

The practice employed staff who were suitably skilled and qualified to perform their roles. All GPs were up to date with their yearly continuing professional development requirements. (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 clinical and non-clinical staff had clearly defined roles within the practice and were able to demonstrate that they were trained to fulfil these duties. All staff undertook annual appraisals of their performance from which learning and development needs were identified. Records viewed showed that staff had individual personal development plans in place. Staff we spoke with were positive about the peer support arrangements and working relationships between all members of staff within the practice. The practice also had systems in place for identifying and managing staff performance and providing support and further training to assist staff should they fail to meet expected standards.

Working with colleagues and other services

The practice worked with other service providers, including social services, the local hospital trust and community services to meet patients' needs and support patients with complex needs. There were clear procedures for receiving and managing written and electronic communications in

relation to patients' care and treatment. Correspondence including test and X-ray results, letters including hospital discharge, out – of - hour's providers and the 111 summaries were reviewed and actioned on the day they were received. All staff we spoke with understood their roles and felt the system in place worked well.

The practice held monthly multidisciplinary team meetings to which the relevant community health and social care professionals were invited to review and plan care and treatment for patients such as those who with life limiting illnesses and vulnerable patients. The out-of-hour's service had access to appropriate information to assist doctors to treat patients as needed when the practice was closed. The practice engaged with the local Clinical Commissioning Group for support and advice on issues relating to primary medical services.

Information Sharing

The practice had systems to share information with staff, patients and other healthcare providers Staff used an electronic patient record to coordinate, document and manage patients' care. All staff were fully trained on the system, and commented positively about the system's safety and ease of use. This software enabled scanned paper communications, such as those from hospital, to be saved in the system for future reference. The practice used several electronic systems to communicate with other providers. For example, there were facilities for sharing patient records between GP practices when a patient registered or deregistered and the community nursing team and health visitors had access to the patient records where patients had consented to the sharing of their medical information. Electronic systems were also in place for making referrals to secondary care services such as specialist consultants. Staff reported that the systems were easy to use.

The practice had ensured the electronic Summary Care Records were completed and accessible on line. Summary Care Records provide faster access to key clinical information for healthcare staff treating patients in an emergency or outside of normal hours. Information about the sharing of patient information was available on the practice website and in written leaflets which were readily available.

Consent to care and treatment

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The practice had policies and procedures in place for obtaining a patient's consent to care and treatment where patients were able to give this. The policy covered obtaining and documenting consent for specific interventions such as minor surgical procedures and vaccinations. GPs and nurses we spoke with had a clear understanding of these procedures and told us that they obtained patient's consent before carrying out physical examinations or providing treatments. We saw that where a patient's verbal consent was given this was documented in the electronic patient notes with a record of the relevant risks, benefits and complications of the procedure. Consent procedures included information about people's right to withdraw consent.

Staff we spoke with understood the Mental Capacity Act 2005, the Children Acts 1989 and 2004 and their duties to meet the requirements of these legislations when treating patients. All the clinical staff we spoke with understood the key parts of the legislation and were able to describe how they implemented it in their practice. Patients with a learning disability and those with dementia were supported to make decisions through the use of care plans, which they and / or their carers were involved in agreeing, where they were able to do so. All clinical staff demonstrated a clear understanding of Gillick competencies. (These help clinicians to identify children aged under 16 years who have the legal capacity to consent to medical examination and treatment). Patients we spoke with confirmed that their treatment, options available, risks and benefits had been explained to them in a way that they could understand. They told us that their consent to treatment was sought before the treatment commenced.

Health Promotion & Prevention

There was a wide range of information leaflets, booklets and posters about health, social care and other helpful topics in the waiting room with dedicated patient information boards. These included information to promote good physical and mental health and lifestyle choices including advice on diet, smoking cessation, alcohol consumption and substance misuse. There was information available about the local and national help, support and advice services. Information about the range of immunisation and vaccination programmes for children and adults, including MMR, Shingles and a range of travel vaccinations were well signposted throughout the practice and on the website.

The practice offered a full range of health checks. All newly registered patients were offered routine medical check-up appointments. Patients between 40 and 74 years old who had not needed to attend the practice for three years and those over 75 years who had not attended the practice for a period of 12 months were encouraged to book an appointment for a general health check-up. Data we viewed for 2013/14 showed that the practice performed at or above the local and national averages for the uptake of standard childhood immunisations, seasonal flu vaccinations, cervical screening (smear tests) and annual health checks for patients with one or more long-term health condition such as diabetes and respiratory diseases and those with learning disabilities.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, Dignity, Compassion & Empathy

Each of the seven patients we spoke with during our inspection and 24 patients who completed comment cards said that all staff were caring and that staff listened to them and took their views and concerns into consideration. We reviewed the most recent data available for the practice on patient satisfaction. This included information from the 2014/14 National GP Patient Survey. 86% of patients who responded said that the receptionists were helpful. 82% said the last GP who they saw were good at treating them with care and concern. These results were similar to GP practices both locally and nationally .

Staff and patients told us that all consultations and treatments were carried out in the privacy of a consulting room. Privacy curtains were provided in consulting rooms and treatment rooms so that patients' privacy and dignity was maintained during examinations, investigations and treatments. We saw that staff were careful to follow the practice's confidentiality policy when discussing patients' treatments so that confidential information was kept private. Reception staff dealing with telephone calls were located separately from the reception desk and this helped to maintain privacy and confidentiality of conversations.

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 who would investigate.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Seven patients we spoke with on the day of our inspection told us that they felt they were listened to and involved in discussions about their care and treatment. They told us that health issues were discussed in a way that they could understand and they felt listened. Patients told us that they had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment they wished to receive. Patient feedback on the 24 comment cards we received was also positive.

We reviewed information from the 2014/15 National GP Patient Survey. 86% of patients who responded to the

survey said that GPs and nurses were involving them in decisions about their care. 88% of patients felt that GPs and nurses were good at listening to them. These results were similar to GP practices both locally and nationally.

The practice had considered the needs of the local population group and had identified patients from ethnic minorities and those whose first language was not English. Staff told us that language interpretation services were available and they knew how to access these. They also told us that they actively engaged with patients from the travelling communities in the area to improve patient's access to the practice within this population group. Discrimination was avoided when making care and treatment decisions and GPs said 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.

Patient/carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patients who we spoke with during the inspection told us that staff were caring and that they offered emotional support as needed. We saw that the practice worked proactively with other health and social care providers including local hospice services to enable patients who wished to remain living in their homes when their health deteriorated. We saw that patients receiving palliative care had care plans, which were shared with relevant health care providers, including the out-of-hours service to ensure that patients received appropriate care as they approached their end of life. The practice had procedures for supporting bereaved families and where families experienced bereavement their GP contacted them by telephone and appointments or home visits were arranged as needed.

The practice had policies and procedures in place for identifying and support patients who voluntarily spent time looking after friends, relatives, partners or others due to illness or disability. Patients who were carers for others were identified at registration and provided with information to ensure they understood the various avenues of support available to them. Information in the patient waiting room, told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations within the local area.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice understood the different needs of the population it served and acted on these to plan and deliver appropriate and responsive services. The appointments system was flexible and most patients could see or speak with their GP within 48 hours. In order to combat long waiting times for appointments the practice had introduced the Doctor First system in 2013. This system ensured that GPs spoke with all patients and assessed those who required urgent or booked appointments, or signposting to other services. The practice had engaged with patients when introducing this system and feedback indicated that the majority of patients were happy with the system. The practice offered extended opening hours and walk-in service. This provided access to treatment to patients who attended the practice without an appointment. The practice worked proactively to support patients to receive treatment closer to home and had introduced phlebotomy services to reduce patients need to attend hospital.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice understood and responded to the needs of patients with diverse needs and those from different ethnic backgrounds and patients whose circumstances made them vulnerable or hindered access to services. The practice population included patients from travelling communities and patients with learning and physical disabilities. The practice offered a full range of health checks and access to telephone consultations, walk in appointments and home visits.

The practice had policies and procedures for promoting diversity and equality. The majority of patients at the practice spoke English as their first language. The practice had access to language translation services if required. A hearing loop system was available to support patients who used hearing aids and devices. The premises and services were suitable to meet the needs of patient with disabilities for example the entrance was accessible via an automatic door. We saw that the waiting area was large enough to accommodate patients with wheelchairs and prams and

allowed for easy access to the treatment and consultation rooms. Accessible toilet facilities were available for all patients attending the practice as well as baby changing facilities.

Access to the service

Details about how to make, reschedule and cancel appointments was available to patients on the practice website. Appointments were booked by GPs rather than receptionists. When patients telephoned the surgery they received a call back from their GP who based upon the patients need arranged an appointment that day or booked in the future. The practice also offered a walk-in service each day between

8am and 6.30pm and patients could be seen by a nurse practitioner or a duty GP without an appointment.

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 they were put through to the out-of-hours GP service.

Patients we spoke with during the inspection and those who completed comment cards told us that they were happy with the appointment system and that they could usually see or speak with their preferred GP and same day appointments for urgent treatments if needed. We reviewed the data from the most recent National GP Patient Survey 2014 /15. Results of the survey showed that the practice scored similar to GP practices nationally and within the local Clinical Commissioning Group area for patient satisfaction around getting through to the practice by telephone, ease of making and convenience of appointments. For example 82% said that they found it easy to contact the practice by telephone. This was higher than the local (73%) and national (74%). 80% said that they got an appointment the last time they tried and 95% said that the appointment was convenient. These were both higher than local and national averages. The practice also performed similar to others in relation to patient satisfaction around waiting times and patients saying that they could see or speak with their preferred GP.

Listening and learning from concerns & 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

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

person who handled all complaints in the practice. Patients were provided with information to help them understand the complaints procedure and to raise complaints or concerns.

This information included details of how a complainant could escalate their concerns to the NHS England and the Health Services Ombudsman, should they remain dissatisfied with the outcome or if they felt that their complaints had not been dealt with fairly. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint. Patients we spoke with said that they had not needed to make a complaint about the practice.

We looked at a sample of complaints received by the practice for within the past 12 months and the practice responses to these. We saw that where complaints related to treatment that statements were obtained from the GP or

nurse in question as part of the investigation into the concern and that this information was included within the response. Complaints were acknowledged and responded to within the appropriate timeframe. However we saw that in a number of cases the response did not adequately address the concerns raised. In two instances we saw that the complainants had written to the practice following receipt of the complaint response letter indicating dissatisfaction with the outcome. The practice had not responded to these complainants and records indicated that these complaints were resolved.

The practice manager and GPs confirmed that complaints were periodically analysed to identify trends or themes. When reviewing complaints we identified a number in relation to dissatisfaction with treatment and clinical diagnosis which should have been considered as significant events.

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 and maintain high quality cost-effective patient centred healthcare in a responsive, supportive and courteous manner. Staff we spoke with were aware of the vision and values for the practice and told us that they were supported to deliver these.

The practice was active in focusing on outcomes in primary care. We saw that the practice had recognised where they could improve outcomes for patients and had been making changes accordingly through work with the local Clinical Commissioning Group, conducting reviews and listening to staff and patients.

Governance Arrangements

The practice had a number of policies and procedures in place to govern its activity and these were available to staff. We looked at a sample of these policies and procedures, including those related to medicines management, infection control, staff recruitment and training, fire safety and patient confidentiality. Not all policies were bespoke to, up to date or reflective of the management and day-to-day running of the practice. The senior GP partner acknowledged that some policies did not reflect changes to the practice management in recent years and told us that these would be reviewed.

The practice used a number of clinical and non-clinical audits and reviews to monitor and improve the services provided. Areas for improvement were identified from complaints and analysis of significant events were shared with staff to secure improvements. The practice data from local and national quality schemes such as QOF to benchmark performance. Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) is the annual reward and incentive programme detailing GP practice achievement results. QOF is a voluntary process for all practices in England and awards practices achievement points for managing some of the most common chronic diseases including diabetes, coronary heart disease and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

We saw that the practice had achieved 878 out of a possible 900 points for 2013/14 and 532 out of a possible 559 in 2014/15 demonstrating that they were providing good outcomes for patients.

Leadership, openness and transparency

There was a clear leadership structure with named members of staff in lead roles in several areas of patient care including medicines management and unplanned admission avoidance. Staff also took lead roles in infection control, safeguarding vulnerable patients and fire safety and health and safety. Staff we spoke with were 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. There was good communication between clinical and non-clinical staff. The practice held a range of regular clinical and non-clinical staff meetings to discuss any issues or changes within the practice.

Seeking and acting on feedback from patients, public and staff

The practice sought and acted on feedback from patients on a regular basis. It monitored the results of the NHS Friend and Family Test, National GP Survey and NHS Choices data. We saw that 75% of patients who participated in the survey said they would be extremely or very likely to recommend the practice to friends or family. The practice reviewed comments made by patients and developed action plans to address any issues where these were raised.

The practice had an active Patient Participation Group (PPG) made up of 180 patient representatives and staff from the practice. We spoke with two members of the patient group who told us that 12 members regularly met three or four times each year. A PPG is made of practice staff and patients that are representative of the practice population who are involved in discussions and decisions about the range and quality of services provided by the practice. We spoke with one member of the PPG and they told us that the practice was open to and acted on, where possible, the suggestions made by the group. The PPG carried out patient surveys and the results from these were made available to patients, as they were displayed in the

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

patient waiting area and on the practice website. The results from the most recent survey, carried out in 2014 showed that patients were satisfied with the services they received at the practice.

The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions. Staff told us they were supported to actively contribute and give their feedback, comments and suggestions.

Management lead through learning and improvement

The practice had management systems in place which enabled learning and improved performance. We spoke with a range of staff, all of whom confirmed that they

received annual appraisals where their learning and development needs were identified and planned for. Clinical staff told us that the practice supported them to maintain their professional development through training and mentoring. All the staff we spoke with told us that the practice was very supportive of training and that they had protected time for learning and personal development. Regular clinical meetings were held and consultants from the local hospital trust provided in-house teaching sessions. The practice provided teaching and training to medical students and trainee GPs and learning and development was actively promoted.