

Dr Anil Kumar Kaistha

Quality Report

The Health Centre,
Mansfield,
Nottinghamshire
NG20 0BP

Tel: 01623 844421

Website: www.riverbankpractice-warsop.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 25 August 2016

Date of publication: 27/09/2016

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 Dr Anil Kumar Kaistha | 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 Dr Anil Kumar Kaistha on 25 August 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patient survey figures were consistently above average when compared with CCG and national averages.
- Comments about the practice and staff were wholly positive and included patients thanking the staff and GPs for the service provided.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day. We saw this to be the case on the day of inspection.
- 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.
- Safety alerts and alerts from Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) were reviewed and cascaded to the appropriate persons. However, we saw no evidence the practice carried out reviews

Summary of findings

and completed searches on the patient record system to ensure action was taken against the alerts. A new process and documentation had been devised to rectify this.

- The practice offered extended hours Wednesday until 7.45pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Ensure actions from the annual infection control audits are addressed.
- Embed new process for the management of safety alerts.

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 including complaints investigated and discussed as such.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were mainly at or above average compared to the national average.
- Areas for improvement had been noted and were part of the business plan for the coming year.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.
- Staff had areas of responsibility to ensure that patients were followed up and reviewed accordingly.
- Reviews and other recalls were done by telephone three times and a letter as a last resort.

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 all aspects of care.

Good



Summary of findings

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Staff telephoned patients instead of sending letters where possible so that they could communicate effectively.
- 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.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

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

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

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.
- The nursing staff and GPs had visited patients homes to provide flu vaccinations for those that could not attend the surgery.
- Reviews were completed in patients home were required by the practice nurse.

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.
- Other staff had responsibilities to ensure patients were booked in and attending reviews when required.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was worse compared to the national average. (67% compared to 82% CCG average and 89% national average).

The practice had highlighted diabetes as a concern for them in their business plan and the practice nurse that had been recently employed was looking at ways that this could be improved.

- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All 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.

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 in line with CCG averages 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 practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 77%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. The practice was breast feeding friendly.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

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

Good



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.
- The register was monitored to ensure patients were attending for their annual reviews.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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).

- 92% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was above the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 84%.
- 97% of patients experiencing poor mental health were involved in developing their care plan in last 12 months which was better than the national average of 89%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above with local and national averages. 256 survey forms were distributed and 102 were returned.

This represented 2.3% of the practice's patient list.

- 89% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 68% and the national average of 73%.
- 92% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.
- 94% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 85%.

- 83% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 75% and the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 34 comment cards which were all highly positive about the standard of care received. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent and efficient service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. Comments included that thanked the staff and GPs for the service and care that was provided

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Ensure actions from the annual infection control audits are addressed.
- Embed new process for the management of safety alerts.

Dr Anil Kumar Kaistha

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser.

Background to Dr Anil Kumar Kaistha

Dr Anil Kumar Kaistha is a two partner practice which provides primary care services to approximately 4400 under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract.

- The practice is situated in Warsop in a purpose built building that is fully accessible to patients with wheelchairs and those with limited mobility.
- There is a large car park at the practice with disabled spaces available.
- Services are provided from Dr Anil Kumar Kaistha, The Health Centre, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, NG20 0BP
- The practice consists of two partners (male and female).
- The all nursing team consists of two practice nurses and one health care assistant (HCA) who is also a phlebotomist.
- The practice has a practice manager who is supported by three clerical and administrative staff to support the day to day running of the practice.
- This practice provides training for doctors who wish to become GPs and at the time of the inspection had one doctor undertaking training at the practice.
- When the practice is closed patients are able to use the NHS 111 out of hours service.

- The practice has a lower than average number of patients aged 35 to 49 years of age and higher than average number of patients over 50 years of age.
- The practice has high deprivation and sits in the fourth more deprived centile.
- The practice is registered to provide the following regulated activities; surgical procedures; family planning, diagnostic and screening procedures and treatment of disease, disorder or injury.
- The practice lies within the NHS Mansfield and Ashfield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). A CCG is an organisation that brings together local GPs and experienced health professionals to take on commissioning responsibilities for local health services.
- The practice is open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are from 8.50am to 10.20am and 2pm to 5.30pm other than Wednesdays when extended hours appointments are offered until 7.45pm. There are also appointments 10.40am to 11.50am each day that are available to be booked on the day from 8am.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The inspection was 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.

Detailed findings

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 24 August 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, practice manager, nursing staff and administrative staff).
- Spoke with a member of the patient participation group (PPG).
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.'

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

- Is it safe?

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

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- We saw evidence that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, an incident of a drug not been available had meant that the emergency drugs were reviewed and the drug that was missing was purchased, one for surgery and one if needed for visits. We saw that staff had personally reflected and all staff had been informed of incidents and learning. Patient safety alerts had been identified before our inspection and the practice had a new process for the recording of these and a process to ensure that they were all disseminated, actioned and discussed in practice meetings.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had

concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3. We saw examples of safeguarding concerns raised and multi-disciplinary meetings that were held to discuss individual cases.

- A notice in the waiting room and on the doors of all treatment rooms advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS)
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. Some actions were still in progress as the practice needed to liaise with the company that managed the building. We saw communication from the practice manager to the company to request information and to request changes to complete the actions.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.

Are services safe?

- 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.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty. At the time of our inspection there were two administrative vacancies and the existing staff were working extra hours to ensure cover.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. The oxygen and defibrillator were not stored together however all staff knew where they were stored. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.

The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff. The practice held a copy electronically and a paper copy was also held. This had been accessed recently when the practice manager had been unable to access the building. By using the business continuity plan they were able to contact the relevant people and gain access.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 90% of the total number of points available. Exception reporting for the practice was 6.9% which was lower than national and CCG averages. (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 2014/15 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was worse compared to the national average. (67% compared to 82% CCG average and 89% national average).

The practice had highlighted diabetes as a concern for them in their business plan and the practice nurse that had been recently employed was looking at ways that this could be improved.

- Performance for mental health related indicators was better compared to the national average. (100% compared with 91% CCG average and 93% national average).

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been four clinical audits completed in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in 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 change of practice for the GPs who had developed new skills for joint injections following an audit of orthopaedic referrals. This had reduced the number of referrals however future audit was to be undertaken to ascertain the effectiveness or if it just delayed the need for the referral.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as: emphasis on improving diabetes care in practice following the identification of this area been lower than CCG and national averages in QOF.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions. New staff members had been able to attend courses that were funded by the practice, for example a nurse had been attending a practice nurse course at De Montfort University. A phlebotomist that was newly appointed to the role of HCA was enrolled on courses including immunisations and wound care.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

- 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.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.
- Smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group and the practice was also able to refer to an exercise programme.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 77%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 82%. The practice policy for all recalls was to make three telephone calls and then follow up if necessary with a letter. This was found to be a better way of arranging the appointments for the patients and also allowed for any literacy problems patients may have. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme and ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. 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.

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 98% to 100% which was comparable to the CCG average of 93% to 97% and five year olds from 86% to 100% which was comparable to the CCG average of 90% to 98%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. 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 34 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were highly positive about the service experienced with no negative comments. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent and efficient service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect. Comments included that thanked the staff and GPs for the service and care that was provided.

We spoke with a member of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were very 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 and how staff had assisted on a personal level when patients had needed extra support, such as coping with bereavement.

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

- 95% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 94% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%
- 92% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 85%.
- 99% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 91%.
- 94% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 92% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 86%.
- 87% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 82%.
- 93% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 85%.

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

Are services caring?

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information given to patients when joining the practice included a form so that patients could highlight the language spoken or if they had any other communication needs such as impaired hearing
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- Where possible communication was done verbally over the telephone rather than by letter to overcome any literacy issues and to make it a more personal service.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. Information about support groups was also available on the practice website. There was also information for support group for young carers.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 75 patients as carers (1.7% of the practice list). The practice had a staff member that had attended a course on carer's services and the practice were looking at putting a pack together for carers once identified. The new patient checklist asked if patients were carers and enabled them to be given information about a referral for support from social services if necessary. The practice were looking at ideas of how to improve this figure. Leaflets were available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, a sympathy card was sent. Reception staff or their usual GP contacted them and there had been occasion for a member of staff represent the practice at the funeral. Phone calls were 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.

- The practice offered extended hours so that appointments could be made up to 7.45pm on a Wednesday evening for patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice nurse and GPs had attended patients homes to deliver flu vaccines and to ensure that reviews were completed for those patients that required it.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice had online booking facilities and patients could book on the day or up to six weeks in advance.
- The practice sent birth cards to all new babies with a leaflet giving parents information on registering their child and other useful information such as opening hours and vaccinations.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.50am to 10.20am and 2pm to 5.30pm other than Mondays when extended hours appointments are offered until 7.30pm. There were also appointments available each day from 10.40am to 11.50am which could be booked on the day from 8am. Pre-bookable appointments could be booked up to six weeks in advance and 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 above local and national averages.

- 79% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 76%.
- 89% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 68% and the national average of 73%.

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system for example a complaints poster in reception.
- The practice recorded all complaints as written even if they were made verbally.

We looked at three complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Response letters that were sent included details of lessons learned and how learning would be shared in the practice. Apologies were given where appropriate. The practice had completed an annual review of the complaints and the practice had identified trends. Action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, one staff member had analysed complaints made about them, reflected and reviewed their own practice. Changes had been made and since this there had been no complaints in the past six months.

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 staff understood.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plan for 2016/17 which reflected the vision and values.

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 either on the shared drive or hard copy in a folder in reception.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners and management were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when

things go wrong with care and treatment). The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment::

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology
- The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

There was a clear leadership structure in place and staff felt supported by management.

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings of which minutes were available.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the management in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.
- The practice had recently become a training practice and had one registrar working at the time of our inspection. We were told that the practice and the GPs were supportive and they were enjoying working at the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, changes in the reception area seating plan.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The PPG had developed a newsletter with the practice which was produced with information to share with patients, such as new staff starting, how to cancel appointments and the next date for PPG meetings.
- The PPG had purchased equipment for the practice such as a new fridge for vaccines and a computer with printer to enable the newsletter to be produced. This was from fundraising that was done by the PPG over a number of years.
- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings and annual appraisals. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management, such as suggestions made to change staff shift times. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and was looking forward in relation to staffing. The practice had recently recruited a practice nurse and a phlebotomist and was providing training to enable these roles to grow.

The practice had plans to improve the waiting area however the centre was under a property management company and therefore there were a lot of changes that had to go through the company first. This was a challenge to the practice that they were trying to address.