

Woodlands Family Medical Centre

Quality Report

106 Yarm Lane
Stockton On Tees
TS18 1YE

Tel: 01642 607398
Website: www.woodlandsmedical.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 24 November 2015
Date of publication: 04/02/2016

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

Ratings

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

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Woodlands Family Medical Centre	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Woodlands Family Medical Centre 24 November 2015. 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 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.

- The patients said they were able to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. This means providers must be open and transparent with service users about their care and treatment, including when it goes wrong.

We saw area of outstanding practice:

- The practice offered minor surgery which was delivered by a trained nurse practitioner who had undertaken further training to deliver this service.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

Summary of findings

- Ensure recruitment arrangements include all necessary employment checks for all staff.
- Ensure patient privacy is maintained in the minor surgical and consulting rooms.

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 there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients receive reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and 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 people 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 showed patient outcomes were average for the locality.
- 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. However we noted that clinical supervision for nurses was currently peer review and not always recorded.
- Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data showed that patients rated the practice average for aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We also saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.
- The practice was proactive in identifying and supporting carers.

Good



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- The practice 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. Examples of these were medicines management and improving the care of patients with learning disabilities.
- The majority of patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day. However some patients found it difficult with problems getting through to the practice via the telephone. During the lunch period there were fewer staff answering the telephone which patients said caused delays in the telephone being answered.
- The practice was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs. However the practice is housed in a grade two listed building spread over a large area with entrances at the front and rear of the building. Some patients with mobility issues or pushchairs accessing services at the rear of the building would need to go outside to the front of the building to access reception.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed that the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about their responsibilities in relation to this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management team. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular management 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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on, the practice often conducted their own patient surveys outside of or following the national surveys supported by the patient participation group (PPG). The patient participation group was active and committed to improving the patient experience.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- It was responsive to the needs of older patients and offered home visits, urgent and extended appointments for those with enhanced needs. The practice provided input into 22 care homes.
- The practice identified poorly patients who required open access to the clinician. Patients at high risk of hospital admission had a personalised care plan which was reviewed every three months or sooner if necessary.
- Every patient over 75 had a named GP.
- Patients who were carers were identified and added to the carers' register. Information about support groups and useful contact details was provided.

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.
- The nurses were trained to manage all long term conditions and there were designated GPs who liaised with nurses to provide patients with timely appropriate care. The proportion of patients on the diabetes register with a record of foot examinations in the preceding 12 months was 86% which is below the national average of 88%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All of these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

The practice is rated as good for the care of families, children and young people.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 proportion of women aged 24 -64 who had been cervical screening performed was 81 % which is the same as the national average of 81%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. The practice also had a list of patients with open access to the practice, such as those at risk.
- The practice provided a dedicated sexual health clinic where trained nurses provided teenagers with advice on contraception and sexual health.
- We saw good examples of joint working with community nurses and community matrons who were based at the practice.

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. 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 reflected the needs for this age group.
- The practice offered patients aged 40 to 74 year old a cardiovascular disease (CVD) check and all patients over 35 who smoke were offered a lung health check.
- The practice invited in the benefits agency every two weeks to provide support and help to their patients as required.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The practice is rated as good for the care of people whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability (LD).

Good



Summary of findings

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

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 proportion of patients with mental illness and other psychoses who had had a comprehensive agreed care plan documents in the last 12 months was 82% compared with the national average of 86%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- They carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- It had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support people with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on July 2015. The results showed the practice was performing just below the local and national averages. 280 survey forms were distributed and 109 were returned.

- 53% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 73% and a national average of 73%. The practice was working with patients to improve telephone access and was monitoring patient satisfaction in this area.
- 79% found the receptionists at this surgery helpful (CCG average 89%, national average 87%).
- 80% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 85%, national average 85%).
- 81% said the last appointment they got was convenient (CCG average 93%, national average 92%).
- 55% described their experience of making an appointment as good (CCG average 73%, national average 73%).

- 59% usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen (CCG average 70%, national average 65%).

The practice recognised that some of these scores were below average and had developed an action plan to improve patient satisfaction. As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 39 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received and staff. However we received comment cards that although there were positive elements, patients commented about the waiting times for appointments, telephone access and some patients found a particular clinician's communication skills difficult.

We spoke with 11 patients during the inspection. All of these patients said that they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were committed and caring. However six patients commented about the attitude of a particular clinician. Four patients commented about appointments running late and not always being kept informed. On the day of the inspection appointments were running between 30 and 50 minutes late, for different clinicians.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Ensure recruitment arrangements include all necessary employment checks for all staff.
- Ensure patient privacy is maintained in the minor surgical and consulting rooms.

Woodlands Family 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 GP specialist advisor, a second CQC inspector, and an Expert by Experience

Background to Woodlands Family Medical Centre

Woodlands Family Medical Centre is near the centre of Stockton and has a mixed client group. There are 13,000 patients on the practice list and the majority of patients are of white British background. There are a higher proportion of patients over the age of 50 on the patient list compared to the practice average across England. 10% of the practice population are over the age of 75.

There are four GP partners; one (female), and three (male). There are also two salaried GPs male and female, two nurse practitioners, three practice nurses, two health care assistants (all female). There is a practice manager who is supported by an assistant practice manager. The team are supported by reception, medicines management, secretarial and other administration staff.

The practice is training and a teaching practice (Teaching practices take medical students and training practices have GP trainees and F2 doctors). There was one GP registrar at the time of the inspection.

The practice is open from 8.00 am to 6.00 pm, Monday to Friday. The practice does not provide extended hours. We

saw that appointments can be booked by walking into the practice and on line from 8 am. However patients could only book appointments by the telephone from 8.30 am when the telephone lines opened each day. Patients requiring a GP outside of normal working hours are advised to contact the GP out of hour's service provided by Northern doctors via the NHS 111 service. The practice has a General Medical Service (GMS) contract.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new 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. The inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 24 November 2015. During our visit we:

Detailed findings

- Spoke with a range of staff, GPs, nurses and administration staff and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how people were being cared for and talked with carers and family members
- 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 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 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 also a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events. The practice recently improved the monitoring and learning from significant event analysis (SEAs) to ensure all staff were able to learn from and contribute to improvements.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, we saw that following a recent SEA the practice had introduced a policy of always adding a start and finish date for the prescribing of medicines. These ensured prescriptions for medication were not issued beyond the prescribed period.

We saw further training had been provided to staff such as understanding the Mental Capacity Act recommendation and assessing patient's capacity. The practice had also produced a briefing paper for staff simply explaining all aspects of the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients receive reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and 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 and a lead administration staff

identified to support and monitor 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 relevant to their role and were able to provide examples. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level 3.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that nurses would act as chaperones, if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a disclosure and barring check (DBS). 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. However the infection control lead had recently taken on this responsibility and was still reviewing how they would manage the process in the future. 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. However we saw open ended pillows and plugs in sinks within the clinical areas.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). 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. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable Health Care Assistants (HCAs) to administer vaccinations. We saw that the HCA were well supported, monitored and assessed.
- We reviewed five personnel files and found that the majority of recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration

Are services safe?

with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service. However we saw that two references had not always been obtained, interview summaries were not available and verbal references not dated and signed.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice also 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.
- 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 that enough staff were on duty. The practice manager told us this was continually monitored.

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. There was also an emergency button on the desks to raise the alarm. Following incidents investigations had been completed to improve staff safety. Examples of these were visitors to the practice wearing name badges and access to staff areas improved.
- 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. There was also a first aid kit and accident book 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 fit for use.
- 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 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 peoples' 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 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 showed the practice had achieved 542 of the 559 total number of points available. The clinical exceptions rate was 16.6 this was above the CCG and national average. Practices can exclude patients which is known as 'exception reporting', lower exception reporting rates are more positive 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 above the CCG and national average.
82 out of 86 points were achieved.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 86.7% which was better than the national average 83%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the CCG and national average at 96%.
- The dementia diagnosis rate was 100% which is above the CCG and national average.
Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been four clinical audits completed in the last two years, where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in applicable local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included ensuring assessments and prescribing for patients with chronic obstructive airways disease and asthma is appropriate. The practices were also running monthly searches of all patients to ensure this was adhered to.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed clinical and non-clinical members of staff that 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 e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme.
- 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 these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for the revalidation of doctors. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received mandatory training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, and basic life support and information governance awareness. 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring people to other services and regularly monitored this.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated. We saw that the district nurses and matrons were based at the practice and allowed communication on a daily basis.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment. We saw that following an investigation of a SEA the practice had held in house training for staff to help them understanding and assess a patient's mental capacity.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through records and audits to ensure it met the practices responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Health promotion and prevention

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support.

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation and weight management. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- The practice had access to smoking cessation advice and alcohol management was available from a local support groups.

The practice had a failsafe system for ensuring results were received for every sample sent as part of the cervical screening programme. The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to the national average of 81%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. 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 91% to 99% and five year olds from 94% to 99%. Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 34%, and at risk groups 41.3%. These were below the CCG and national averages. The CCG average was over 65s figure 73.2% and the under 65s was 50.8%. In response to this the practice had increased flu clinics, the GPs and nurses undertook opportunistic vaccination and no patient arriving at the practice for vaccination was turned away. The practice system indicated that there had been an improvement.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

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

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments. However we saw there was no privacy screen available in the minor surgery room and one of the GP consulting rooms. We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations and that conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

All of the 37 patient CQC comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced and the respect and care the staff showed. However three of the comments although positive about the care included dissatisfaction with access to appointments. On the whole patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. However we received comments from patients who found a particular clinician's communication skills difficult

We also spoke with two members of the patient participation group. 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 were below average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with doctors and nurses. For example:

- 73% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 88% and national average of 89%.
- 69% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 87%, national average 87%).

- 90% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 95%, national average 95%)
- 70% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 95%, national average 95%).
- 90% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 92%, national average 90%).
- 79% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 89%, national average 87%)

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients told us that 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 on the comment cards we received was also positive however the national survey results were below average. The practice had responded by undertaking further surveys which demonstrated an improvement.

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

- 76% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 86%.
- 71% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 82%, national average 81%)

Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 68 carers on the

Are services caring?

practice carers' register. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. The practice communicated regularly with the local carers groups.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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. Examples of these were improving the management of patients with learning disabilities and reducing the waste of medicines.

- The practice offered same day appointments, pre-bookable for non-urgent appointments and telephone consultations. The sessions were provided by GPs and by nurses for minor ailments.
- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and those who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities, automated doors, and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were between these times. The practice did not provide extended hours. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was comparable to local and national averages. People told us on the day that they were able to get appointments when they needed them.

- 70% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 76% and national average of 75%.
- 53% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 73%, national average 73%).
- 55% patients described their experience of making an appointment as good (CCG average 73%, national average 73%).
- 59% patients said they usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time (CCG average 70%, national average 65%).

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- The practice had two GPs and the practice manager designated as responsible for handling all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system on the web site and a summary leaflet was available.

We looked at 13 complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. We saw that the practice responded using openness and transparency when dealing with the complaints. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, following a complaint about payment for certain letters or interventions by the practice a full list of costing was made available in the waiting room.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

- The practice had a mission statement which was available in the practice information and policies. However not all staff were aware of the mission statement or vision.
- 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 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
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which 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, openness and transparency

The partners in the practice had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff. Over the last two years the practice had undergone significant changes with three partners retiring and a senior nurse leaving and new partners and nursing staff being employed.

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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology
- They 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 that the practice held team meetings. We saw that the practice had improved the frequency and recording of meetings. Staff confirmed that they were kept informed about developments and changes within the practice.
- Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues and were confident in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners and practice manager. 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.

- It had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met every six weeks, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, proposing

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

near patient testing, rather than going to secondary care and telephone appointments. They also introduced tip of the month for patients covering such areas as seasonal health advice and first aid.

- 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 strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice was a teaching and training practice and the lead clinician also held a prominent position with NHS England which allowed them to keep updated and share the latest developments. The practice was hoping in the future to develop telephone consultations, improve communication and develop the clinical roles of staff. Currently a nurse practitioner had undertaken specific training to allow them to undertake minor surgery.