

# Chartfield Surgery

## Quality Report

30 Chartfield Avenue, London,  
Wandsworth, SW15 6HG  
Tel: 02087886442  
Website: [www.chartfieldsurgery.co.uk](http://www.chartfieldsurgery.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit: 13 October 2016  
Date of publication: 03/02/2017

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

### Ratings

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

# Summary of findings

## Contents

### Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	8

### Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Chartfield Surgery	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Chartfield Surgery on 13 October 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

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

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When things went wrong patients received reasonable support, truthful information, and a written apology. They were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

Good



### Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) showed patient outcomes were comparable to local and national averages.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with other health care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



### Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed patients rated the practice above others locally and nationally for several aspects of care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.

Good



# Summary of findings

- 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 governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Good



# Summary of findings

## The six population groups and what we found

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

### Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- All older people had a named GP responsible for their care.

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 comparable to the local and national average.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and were offered 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.
- 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 81%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors.
- The practice carried out a survey specifically targeted to teenagers who are often an under represented group. The results of the survey were analysed and the practice put in place plans to start a clinic for teenagers and young people during after school hours where patients in this group could drop in for advice and treatment covering a range of issues including mental health and sexual health.

## **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, telephone appointment booking, and telephone consultations 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 homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for vulnerable patients.
- 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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to local and national averages.
- 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 July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and sixty four survey forms were distributed and one hundred and fifteen were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 82% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 86% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 76%.
- 89% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to 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 national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 26 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patient comments included that all staff were, caring, kind, courteous and treated them with dignity and respect. Comments named specific GPs and nurses and mentioned they were calm, reassuring and empathetic toward patients.

We spoke with two patients during the inspection. Both patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The most recently available NHS Friends and Family test data showed that 99% of practice patients would recommend the practice to a friend or family member.



# Chartfield Surgery

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### Our inspection team was led by:

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

## Background to Chartfield Surgery

Chartfield Surgery provides primary medical services in Wandsworth to approximately 12,300 patients and is one of 44 member practices in the NHS Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The practice operates under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract and provides a number of local and national enhanced services (enhanced services require an increased level of service provision above that which is normally required under the core GP contract). The practice is a training and teaching practice affiliated with two universities, training and teaching medical students and GP registrars.

The practice operates from a converted residential property with patient facilities on the ground floor which is wheelchair accessible throughout and the first floor. There are four consultation rooms, one treatment room, a meeting room, practice management offices and a reception and waiting area. There are staff facilities and accessible facilities for patients with baby changing and breast feeding areas available.

The practice team at the surgery is made up of four full time GP partners, five part time and one full time salaried GPs. Seven of the GPs are female and three GPs are male. Together the GPs provide 62 clinical sessions per week. The practice employs one full time female practice nurse, one part time female health care assistant, and one part time

female phlebotomist. The non-clinical team consists of one practice manager, one development manager, one reception manager and fourteen administrative and clerical staff.

The practice opens between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are available from 8.00am to 12.00am and 2.00pm to 6.00pm daily. Extended hours appointments are offered from 7.00am on a Monday, Thursday and Friday morning, from 6.30pm until 8.30pm on a Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday evening and from 6.30pm to 7.00pm on a Thursday evening. The practice is also open every Saturday between 7.30am and 10.30am.

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

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

The practice has not previously been inspected by CQC.

## 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 13 October 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, nursing staff, administrative and reception staff and the practice manager.
- Spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and 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 or a GP partner 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, ensuring all staff were made aware of any findings, actions and outcomes.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, a receptionist gave a patient test results over the phone but gave results for a previous test. The incident was reported to the practice manager and senior partner and investigated by the practice. The practice policy and procedure covering the incident was reviewed and deemed to be effective when followed. The practice arranged a meeting called directly after the incident where all reception staff were made aware of the correct procedure to follow. The incident was also discussed at the next scheduled practice meeting.

### 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 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, nurses were trained to safeguarding level 2 and non-clinical staff were trained to level 1.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. For example, we saw that the practice had replaced carpeted flooring with impermeable flooring that could be more easily cleaned in consultation and treatment rooms.
- 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 (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line

## Are services safe?

with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific direction (PSD) from a prescriber. (PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presentation for treatment. PSDs are written instructions from a qualified and registered prescriber for a medicine including the dose, route and frequency or appliance to be supplied or administered to a named patient after the prescriber has assessed the patient on an individual basis).

- We reviewed six 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 risk assessment, with actions identified and completed, and a policy available with a poster in the reception office. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments with completed actions and carried out fire alarm and emergency lighting tests weekly and six monthly fire evacuation drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of

substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

### Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

# Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

## Our findings

### Effective needs assessment

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

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

### Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 98% of the total number of points available, with an exception reporting rate of 5% (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 2014/2015 showed:

Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the local and national average. For example:

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c (a specific blood glucose level test) is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 75%, compared to the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 75% and the national average of 78%.
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 82% (CCG 75%, national 78%).

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, who have had influenza immunisation in the preceding 1 August to 31 March was 95% (CCG 92%, national 94%).
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) is 5 mmol/l or less was 74% (CCG 78%, national 81%).
- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 94% (CCG 88%, national 88%).

Performance for mental health related indicators was comparable to the local and national averages. For example:

- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 90% (CCG 91%, national 88%).
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 92% (CCG 89%, national 90%).
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 93% (CCG 87%, national 84%).

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been 14 clinical audits completed in the last two years. The practice participated in local audits through a local audit group, CCG lead pilot studies and improvement programmes.
- We saw evidence of two completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. For example:
- The practice carried out an audit to determine if patients diagnosed with atrial fibrillation (AF, a heart condition) were being treated in line with guidelines. The practice identified 119 patients with AF, 22 of these patients were not being treated in line with guidelines, including specific risk categorisation tests not being carried out or recorded fully, and specific anti

# Are services effective?

## (for example, treatment is effective)

coagulation medicines not being prescribed. The practice discussed these results in their local clinical audit group meeting and at the practice clinical meeting, shared and investigated the latest clinical guidelines and put in place actions to improve compliance. These actions included calling in patients for review and risk categorisation, ensuring results and decisions were fully documented and that patients had access to the right information to make an informed decision. In the second audit cycle, the practice saw improvement in compliance in that all patients with AF had their risk classification assessed and documented, with all patients receiving the appropriate medicine in line with guidelines, or a valid reason documented where this was not possible. The practice discussed and compared results in their local audit group and found that all three participating practices had seen improvement in compliance with guidelines.

### 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, additional training was provided in spirometry, used to monitor and diagnose a range of lung conditions such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support,

one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

### Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

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

The practice had a weekly updated 'watch list' of patients deemed to be in need of additional care or treatment. This included, for instance patients newly diagnosed with cancer and children and adults referred to or identified by safeguarding teams. This list was available on the practice computer system and was available to all relevant staff for awareness and monitoring of high risk patients.

The practice provided a weekly GP visiting service at a local residential care home. Patient notes were only accessible through the practice computer system which meant that there was potential for information to be missed when providing services at the care home and that information would need to be written into patient notes by the GP on their return to the practice. The practice invested in a remote care programme linked to the practice computer

# Are services effective?

## (for example, treatment is effective)

system. Information was captured via a secure application on a tablet computer, allowing patient information to be automatically included in patient notes on returning to the practice.

### 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 patient records audits.

### 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, carers, 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 and diet and lifestyle advice was available on the premises with additional support available from local support services.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%. 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 by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. 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 and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 1% to 92% (CCG 5% to 93%, national 73% to 95%) and five year olds from 73% to 97% (CCG 67% to 93%, national 81% to 95%).

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. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening with performance inline with local averages. For example there was a 48% uptake for the bowel screening programme compared to the local CCG uptake rate of 51%. 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. This service was also advertised. The reception area also had 'privacy slips' available, where patients could write down any confidential or embarrassing information for reception staff. This service was also used by those hard of hearing to communicate.

All of the 26 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with two members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

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

- 90% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and the national average of 89%.
- 88% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 87%.

- 94% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 95%.
- 86% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 85%.
- 86% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 89% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 87% 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:

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

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

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



## Are services caring?

who required a sign language interpreter. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available which was written in more than one language.

- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The practice supported a deaf patient to access online booking services for the practice and installed a dedicated text phone line for all patients. The practice demonstrated how they supported a patient to get a similar service installed at their regular hospital.

### **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.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 144 patients as carers (1% of the practice list). Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them and the practice produced a carer's pack with further information. The carers pack was developed with a local carer's organisation which the practice actively engaged with to identify and support carers.

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

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

## Our findings

### Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice offered blood testing appointments for patients who would otherwise need to travel to another healthcare facility for this service. Blood testing was also available during extended hours.

- The practice offered a 'Commuter's Clinic' on a Monday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday morning and Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday evening. Predominantly aimed at working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours, patients could book appointments with a GP, nurse and the phlebotomy service.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

### Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.00am to 12.00am every morning and 2.00pm to 6.00pm daily. Extended hours appointments were offered from 7.00am on a Monday, Thursday and Friday morning, from 6.30pm until 8.30pm on a Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday and from 6.30pm to 7.00pm on a Thursday. The practice also opened every Saturday between 7.30am and 10.30am. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 86% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 79%.
- 82% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

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

### Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system including information in the reception area and on the practice website.

We looked at six complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way and with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends and action was taken as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a patient complained about the way in which their referral was handled. The practice investigated and made an apology to

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

the patient. The practice reviewed their processes to ensure they were in line with guidelines and found that improvement to wording in the forms used could be made. This change was made and the relevant actions disseminated to the practice clinical team.

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

## Our findings

### Vision and strategy

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

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

### Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

### Leadership and culture

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

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included

support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so. We noted team social events were held regularly and that all staff were invited and encouraged to participate. Staff told us these events were a good way of developing team spirit and helped the team work effectively.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG worked with the practice to improve and make the outside of the premises safer and more accessible. This included improved lighting, painting the edge of steps to make them more visible and installing a hand rail to support patients using the steps.

# Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff 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 and engaged to improve how the practice was run.
- The practice engaged the local population through hosting a practice open day. Patients and non-patients were invited to the practice to meet with clinical and non-clinical staff, ask any questions they may have about the practice and to have a look around. The practice displayed information on current health initiatives and services offered. The practice told us this open day generated lots of interest including four new patients and five new PPG members.

## Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice engaged locally in an audit group with other practices, sharing learning and improving services for patients in the area. The practice was a training and teaching practice affiliated with two universities, training and teaching medical students and GP registrars. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area, including local CCG lead pathology improvement programmes.