

Dr S Kumar & Partners

Quality Report

Stirling Medical Centre,
Grimsby
North East Lincolnshire
DN31 3AE

Tel: 01472 721610

Website: www.skumargpnel.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 29/9/2016

Date of publication: 17/01/2017

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	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 S Kumar & Partners	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 S Kumar & Partners on 29 September 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 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.
- The majority of patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. However, not all felt cared for, supported and listened to or involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Patients were generally positive about their interactions with staff and said they were treated with

compassion and dignity. However, the national patient survey and evidence collected from patients on the day, indicated dissatisfaction with some aspects of the service.

- Information about services and how to complain was available on the website 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.
- The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity.

Summary of findings

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Check that measures introduced following incidents are evaluated for effectiveness.
- Put in place a system to monitor the use of prescription forms.
- Seek patients' views on how to improve the below average patient experience identified in the current national GP patient survey.

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. However a recurrence of a similar event demonstrated the need for the practice to check that measures introduced following incidents are maintained and evaluated for effectiveness.
- 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 a system in place to ensure national medicine safety alerts were actioned.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses.
- 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 similar to the national average.
- Staff assessed needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff.
- Staff worked with 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 lower than others for some aspects of care. For example all questions about GP and nurse consultations were rated below average.

Good



Summary of findings

- The majority of patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. However, not all felt cared for, supported and listened to or involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- 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.

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 practice 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.

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 practice was part of a scheme to take primary care services into the community.

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.
- 92% of patients on the diabetes register had a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This was comparable to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 88%.
- 77% of patients with asthma, on the register, had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that included an assessment of asthma control using the 3 RCP questions. (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This was comparable to the CCG average of 79% and the national average of 75%.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice used social media to inform and interact with patients.
- 73% of women aged 25-64 years notes recorded that a cervical screening test had been performed in the preceding 5 years (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This was below the CCG average of 80% and comparable to the national average of 74%. Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Good



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.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

Good



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 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.
- 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.

Summary of findings

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).

- 88% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was comparable to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 84%.
- 96% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2014 to 31/03/2015). This was comparable to the CCG average of 93% and better than the national average of 88%.
- 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. 325 survey forms were distributed and 111 were returned. This is a response rate of 34% and represented 3% of the practice's patient list. The results showed the practice was performing similar to or better than local and national averages with some exceptions. The exceptions included;

- 66% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.
- 47% 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 73% and the national average of 78%.
- 62% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 72% and the national average of 73%.

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. Three cards expressed difficulty about contacting the practice by phone.

Ten patients completed CQC questionnaires on the day of the inspection. The majority of patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. However, not all felt cared for, supported and listened to, given enough time or involved in their care and decisions about their treatment. In addition, four patients said they had not been provided with information on healthy living or managing long-term conditions.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Check that measures introduced following incidents are evaluated for effectiveness.
- Put in place a system to monitor the use of prescription forms.
- Seek patients' views on how to improve the below average patient experience identified in the current national GP patient survey.

Dr S Kumar & Partners

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

a CQC Lead Inspector and included a GP specialist adviser.

Background to Dr S Kumar & Partners

Dr S Kumar & Partners occupies part of purpose built GP premises in Stirling Medical Centre, Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire DN31 3AE. They have a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract.

There are 4320 patients on the practice list and the majority of patients are of white British background. The practice population profile is similar to the England average except the 0-4 years age group is higher than the England average. The practice scored one on the deprivation measurement scale, the deprivation scale goes from one to ten, with one being the most deprived. The overall practice deprivation score is higher than the England average, the practice is 44 and the England average is 21.8. People living in more deprived areas tend to have a greater need for health services.

The practice is single-handed with one GP and one locum GP. One of the GPs is female and one is male. There is one nurse practitioner, two practice nurses and two healthcare assistants. There is a practice manager and eight administration/reception staff.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday.

GP appointments are Monday to Friday 9am-11am and 3pm-5pm.

When the practice is closed, patients are directed to the Out Of Hours provider and NHS 111. Information for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours is available in the waiting area and on the practice website.

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.

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 29 September 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, practice manager, practice nurse, reception and administration staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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

Detailed findings

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

We also looked at how well services 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

- 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, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw some evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. However, the learning from a significant event had not been effective as a similar event had occurred. The practice now checked that measures introduced following incidents were evaluated for effectiveness.

Overview of safety systems and processes

- 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. The GPs were trained to adult and child safeguarding level 3, nurses to level 2 and reception and administration staff to level 1.
- We found no notice in the waiting room that advised patients that chaperones were available if required. This

was resolved on the day of the inspection. 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.
- 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 however we found there were no 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.
- We reviewed three 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 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

Are services safe?

assessments however fire drills needed to be undertaken regularly. 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 did not have a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The practice provided an appropriate plan the day following the inspection.

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.

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 99% of the total number of points available compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 95%.

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 96%. This was better than the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 90%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 92%. This was comparable to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 93%.

There was evidence of quality improvement.

- There had been two two-cycle audits completed in the last two years where improvements made were implemented and monitored. For example, adherence to NICE guidelines to improve outcomes for patients.

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, those reviewing patients with diabetes had undertaken disease-specific diplomas.
- 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, 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 and those nearing end of life.

Consent to care and treatment

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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, 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.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 73% which was below the CCG average of 80% and comparable to the national average of 74%. 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. 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 similar to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 94% to 98% and five year olds from 95% to 100%.

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.

The majority of the 26 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required. Three cards said it was difficult to contact the practice by telephone

We also received ten patient questionnaires that had been completed during the inspection. The majority of patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. However, not all felt cared for, supported and listened to, given enough time or involved in their care and decisions about their treatment. In addition, four patients said they had not been provided with information on healthy living or managing long-term conditions.

We spoke with one member 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.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed the practice was below average for all its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 69% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.
- 66% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 89%.
- 81% 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%.

- 65% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 85%.
- 76% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 91%.
- 80% say the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 91%.
- 78% of respondents say the last nurse was good at giving enough time compared to the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 92%
- 81% say the last nurse they saw or spoke to was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 90%.
- 84% 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

The majority of patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. However, not all felt cared for, supported and listened to.

The majority of patients said they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. However not all felt they sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback from the comment cards and questionnaires we received aligned with these views.

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

- 62% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 86%.
- 61% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 79% and national average of 82%.
- 81% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 90%.

Are services caring?

- 74% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and 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. We saw a notice in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

The practice had a carers' support service attending monthly providing 'drop in' advice. There was a display in the main waiting area providing patient information leaflets and notices which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 2% of the practice list as carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP sent them a sympathy card.

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.

- 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.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open 8am- 6.30pm Monday to Friday.

GP appointments were Monday to Friday 9am-11am and 3pm- 5pm.

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to two weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

When the practice was closed, patients were directed to the Out Of Hours provider and NHS 111. Information for patients requiring urgent medical attention out of hours was available in the waiting area and on the practice website.

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

- 72% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 79%.
- 62% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 72% 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. However, some patients told us that it was difficult to contact the practice by telephone.

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 e.g. posters displayed in reception and information on the practice website.

We looked at the two complaints received in the last 12 months and found they were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. There was evidence that lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints however there was no analysis of trends to enable action to improve the quality of care but this was in progress for 2016/17.

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.

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.
- There were effective arrangements for identifying, recording and managing most risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.
- However the practice did not have a formal business development plan.

Leadership and culture

The management 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 practice 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 practice 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 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.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the practice 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 and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG highlighted issues with telephoning the practice. The practice changed the telephone system and introduced a 'prescription only' line.
- 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 had introduced 15 minute GP appointments in response to the below average scores in the national Patient survey results published in July 2016. However, these had reverted to 10 minute appointments prior to the CQC inspection.

Continuous improvement

The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, the practice was a part of a pilot collaboration of ten practices and an out of hours' organisation. This collaboration provided a centralised GP lead triage service Monday to Friday 8pm-8am and Saturday and Sunday 8am-12pm.