

# Crystal Peaks Medical Centre

## Quality Report

15 Peaks Mount, Sheffield, S20 7HZ  
Tel: 01142510040  
Website: [www.crystalpeaks.co.uk](http://www.crystalpeaks.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit: 13 April 2016  
Date of publication: 31/05/2016

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

### Ratings

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

# Summary of findings

## Contents

### Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9

### Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Crystal Peaks Medical Centre	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Crystal Peaks Medical Centre on 13 April 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses.
- The practice used innovative methods to improve patient outcomes, working with other local providers to share best practice. For example, the practice is participating in neighbourhood working with local practices.
- Feedback from patients about their care was strongly positive.
- The practice worked closely with other organisations and with the local community in planning how services were provided to ensure that they meet patients' needs. For example, the practice is a test site and part of a locality pilot for Shared Medical Appointments for patients suffering with hypertension.

- The practice made changes to the way it delivered services as a consequence of feedback from patients and from the patient participation group. For example, changes have been made to the telephone and appointment systems to improve access.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs. Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand
- The practice had a clear vision which had quality and safety as its top priority.

We saw several areas of outstanding practice including:

- The practice will be delivering as part of a locality pilot Shared Medical Appointments

However there were areas of practice where the provider should make improvements:

- The practice should review its emergency equipment provision.
- Sharps boxes in treatment rooms should be safely re-positioned and ensure that temporary closures in place.

**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 received 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.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and generally well managed. However, the practice should review its emergency equipment provision to include emergency oxygen containers and arrangements for the sharing of a defibrillator.

Good



### Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



### Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the National GP Patient Survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Good



# Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

## Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

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

Good



## Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There 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 and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.

Good



# Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted upon and had a virtual patient participation group.
- 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 people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.

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.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. For example the percentage of patients with diabetes on the register who had a blood test the preceding 12 months was 75% (national average 77%)
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



### Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- 82% of patients diagnosed with asthma, on the register had had an asthma review in the the last 12 months compared to the national average of 75%.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.

Good



# Summary of findings

- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 94%, which was above the national average of 81%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, and health visitors.

## **Working age people (including those recently retired and students)**

The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age people (including those recently retired and students).

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflected the needs for this age group.

Good



## **People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable**

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

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

Good



## **People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)**

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

Good



# Summary of findings

- 88% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was comparable to the national average of 84%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was lower than the national average. For example the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record was 78% (national average 88%).
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and those living with dementia.

# Summary of findings

## What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on January 2016 showed the practice was performing below local and national averages. 236 survey forms were distributed and 119 were returned.

- 59% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a national average of 73%.
- 66% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (national average 78%).
- 69% described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (national average 85%).
- 59% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 43 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

We spoke with three patients during the inspection. All three patients said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. Some patients told us that they found it difficult to get a non urgent appointment but emergency appointments were always available on the same day.

# Crystal Peaks Medical Centre

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### Our inspection team was led by:

a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser, a practice nurse specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

### Background to Crystal Peaks Medical Centre

Crystal Peaks Medical Centre is situated in Sheffield 20 which is an area of moderate deprivation. The practice is situated in purpose built premises with on site car parking and there are good links to the city centre. The practice has a list size of 6,500 patients.

There are four GP partners (two female and two male), one salaried GP (female) and a trainee GP (male); two practice nurses (both female); one nurse practitioner (female) (who is a nurse prescriber, a health care assistant (female) and a phlebotomist (female). There is a practice manager, a practice manager assistant, two administration staff and five receptionists. Crystal Peaks is a teaching practice.

The practice is open Monday to Fridays between 8 am and 6.30 but closes for lunch between 12.30 pm and 2.00 pm. Morning pre-bookable appointments are from 8.30am to 10.00am and there are also urgent access appointments available between 10am – 11.40am. Afternoon appointments are from 2.00 pm and 6.30 pm and there are also book on the day afternoon slots which patients can access by telephone at 2 pm. Extended surgery hours are offered on Tuesday and Friday mornings from 7.30 and

Wednesday evenings from 6.30 pm until 7.00 pm. Saturday morning clinics are available from 9 am until 11 am one Saturday per month. NHS 111 out of hours services are in place if the practice is closed.

### 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 registered provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

### How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 13 April 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, practice nurses, nurse practitioner, health care assistant, the community support worker, administration and reception staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.

# Detailed findings

- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.'

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

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

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

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

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

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

### Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

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, practice protocols had been updated and staff training put in place to ensure events do not re-occur.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received 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.

### Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse 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. 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. GPs were trained to Safeguarding children level three.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service check (DBS

check). (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).

- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The nurse practitioner was the infection prevention and control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection prevention and control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection prevention and control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any required improvements identified as a result.
- 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. The nurse practitioner had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could prescribe for her area of expertise. She received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. 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 to administer vaccinations after specific training when a doctor or nurse were on the premises.
- We reviewed five personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.
- There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

### Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

## Are services safe?

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty.
- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator on the premises but this was shared with another practice and stored on the upper floor of the building which did not give ease of access. There was emergency oxygen with adult and children's masks. However, oxygen cylinders should be half full or above and their cylinder was found to be below half full. The practice were informed of this. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were 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.

### **Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents**

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

# Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

## Our findings

### Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met 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 and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 96% of the total number of points available, with 6% exception reporting. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from January 2016 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. For example the percentage of patients with diabetes on the register who had a recent blood test was 75% (national average 77%).
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 87%, similar to the national average of 83%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was below the national average. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their records was 78% (national average 88%).

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been 7 clinical audits completed in the last two years, all of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation and peer review.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements in a number of areas including improving governance around the prescribing of statins in renal disease.

### Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. It covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff for example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, Staff administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. Staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, 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

# Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. 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 patients to other services.

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 patients 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 regular basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

## 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, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits.

## Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- Counselling and Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) was available on the premises. The practice had access to a community support worker.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 94%, which was above 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 demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer.

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 97% to 98% and five year olds from 96% to 98%.

Flu vaccination rates for the at risk groups was 97%. This was also comparable to national averages.

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 for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

# Are services caring?

## Our findings

### Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

All of the 43 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. Some patients told us that they found it difficult to obtain non urgent appointments but there was access to emergency appointments on the day. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

The practice had a virtual patient participation group. We were unable to speak to any members of the group but we were shown evidence of email engagement and feedback from the group.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. The practice was in line or below average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 83% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 88%.
- 84% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 86%, national average 86%).
- 96% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%).
- 85% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (national average 85%).

- 85% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (national average 90%).
- 89% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 85%, national average 86%).

### Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 90% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 86%.
- 85% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (national average 81%).
- 74% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (national average 85%).

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 10% of the practice list as carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

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

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

## Our findings

### Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice was part of a satellite system to provide seven day care as part of the Prime Minister's Challenge Fund to improve access.

- The practice offered extended surgery hours on Tuesday and Friday mornings from 7.30 am and Wednesday evenings until 7.00 pm with monthly Saturday morning clinics for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS and were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice offered a range of additional services including minor operations, retinal screening for diabetes, contraceptive implants and joint injections for rheumatoid arthritis.
- In order to improve access a new telephone system was implemented due to complaints regarding the lines being congested and an access audit was undertaken due to feedback from the PPG regarding waiting times.

### Access to the service

The practice was open Monday to Fridays between 8 am and 6.30 and closed for lunch between 12.30 pm and 2.30 pm. Morning pre-bookable appointments are from 8.30am to 10.00am and there are also urgent access appointments available between 10am – 11.40am. Afternoon appointments were from 2.00 pm and 6.30 pm and there were also book on the day afternoon slots which patients

can access by telephone at 2 pm. Extended surgery hours were offered on Tuesday and Friday mornings from 7.30 and Wednesday evenings from 6.30 pm until 7.00 pm. Saturday morning clinics were available from 9 am until 11 am one Saturday per month. NHS 111 out of hours services were in place if the practice is closed.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was below local and national averages.

- 66% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 78%.
- 58% of patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (national average 73%).
- 66% patients said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (national average 76%).

Some patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were unable to get non urgent appointments when they needed them but there was access to urgent appointments. The practice was addressing this issue to improve access.

### 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 manager was the designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system for example a poster was displayed in the waiting room and there were patient advice leaflets.

We looked at nine complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way using openness and transparency with dealing with the complaint. Lessons were shared from concerns and complaints at regular practice meetings and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care.

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

## Our findings

### Vision and strategy

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

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

### Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit 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 and culture

The partners in the practice had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritise safe, high quality and compassionate care. The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us they were approachable and always took the time to listen to members of staff.

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

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through their virtual patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG did not meet regularly but did carry out patient surveys and submit proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, a new telephone system was implemented due to complaints regarding the lines being congested and an access audit was undertaken due to feedback from the PPG regarding waiting times.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff generally through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved 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 team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the locality through a

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

neighbourhood working scheme. One of the GPs was a clinical lecturer at Sheffield Medical School and the practice had submitted a transformational fund bid to expand the premises.