

Weelsby View Health Centre - Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu

Quality Report

Ladysmith Road,
Grimsby
North East Lincolnshire
DN32 9SW
Tel: 01472 255211
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 11/4/2017
Date of publication: 05/05/2017

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	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	10
Background to Weelsby View Health Centre - Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Weelsby View Health Centre - Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu on 30 June 2016. The overall rating for the practice was requires improvement. The full comprehensive report on the 30 June 2016 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Weelsby View Health Centre on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

We carried out a further announced comprehensive inspection at Weelsby View Health Centre - Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu on 11 April 2017. 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 a system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems to minimise risks to patient safety.

- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- Patients we spoke with 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 the requirements of the duty of candour. Examples we reviewed showed the practice complied with these requirements.

Summary of findings

However, there was an area of practice where the provider needs to make improvement.

Importantly, the provider should

- Carry out clinical re-audits to ensure improvements have been achieved.

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.

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed, we found there was an effective system 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 were informed as soon as practicable, 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 to minimise risks to patient safety.
- Staff demonstrated that they understood their responsibilities and all had received training in safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- The practice had adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were at or above average compared to the national average.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- There was limited evidence that audit was driving improvement in patient outcomes.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- There was evidence of personal development plans for all staff. There was no evidence of annual staff appraisals.
- 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 higher than others for all aspects of care.
- Survey information we reviewed showed that patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.

Good



Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was 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.

- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting conditions, including patients with a condition other than cancer and patients living with dementia.
- Patients we spoke with 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 evidence from two examples reviewed 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 policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- An overarching governance framework supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- Staff had received inductions and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. In three examples we reviewed we saw evidence the practice complied with these requirements.
- The practice encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems for being aware of notifiable safety incidents and sharing the information with staff and ensuring appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients and we saw examples where feedback had been acted on.

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.

- Staff were able to recognise the signs of abuse in older patients and knew how to escalate any concerns.
- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice identified at an early stage older patients who may need palliative care as they were approaching the end of life. It involved older patients in planning and making decisions about their care, including their end of life care.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any extra needs.
- Where older patients had complex needs, the practice shared summary care records with local care services.
- Older patients were provided with health promotional advice and support to help them to maintain their health and independence for as long as possible.

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 long-term disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- 95% of patients on the diabetes register had a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months (01/04/2015 to 31/03/2016). This was better than the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 90%.
- The practice followed up on patients with long-term conditions discharged from hospital and ensured that their care plans were updated to reflect any additional needs.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- There were emergency processes for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.
- Patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for a structured annual review to check their health

Good



Summary of findings

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.

Families, children and young people

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

- From the sample of documented examples we reviewed we found there were systems 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 accident and emergency (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.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- The practice worked with midwives, health visitors and school nurses to support this population group.

Good



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

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.
- The practice offered longer appointments for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice had information available for vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff interviewed knew how to recognise signs of abuse in children, young people and adults whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. They 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).

- 94% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the CCG average of 90% and better than the national average of 84%.
- 100% of patients with schizophrenia and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in preceding 12 months which is better than the CCG average of 92% and better than the national average of 89%.
- The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and dementia. For example home visits were offered.
- The practice had a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving medicines for mental health needs.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those living with dementia.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment.
- The practice had information available for patients experiencing poor mental health about how they could access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing better than local and national averages. 314 survey forms were distributed and 108 were returned. This represented 4% of the practice's patient list.

- 94% 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%.
- 93% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 76%.
- 99% 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%.

- 88% 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 74% and the national average of 80%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 44 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients commented that they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The most recent three months results of the Friends and Family Test showed that 100% of patients were likely or extremely likely to recommend the practice to their friends and family.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

Importantly, the provider should

- Carry out clinical re-audits to ensure improvements have been achieved.

Weelsby View Health Centre - Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

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

Background to Weelsby View Health Centre - Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu

Weelsby View Health Centre – Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu practice operates from a purpose built building on Ladysmith Road, Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire DN32 9SW. The building is shared with a number of other GP practice. Weelsby View Health Centre – Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu provides Alternative Provider Medical Services (APMS) to approximately 2,788 patients living in the Hainton and Heneage area of North East Grimsby.

The practice has one male GP and a female practice nurse. They are supported by a practice manager and four reception/ administrative staff.

The majority of patients are of white British background and 1.5% of the local population is from eastern Europe. The practice population profile is similar to the England average except the 50+ years age group is lower than the England average and the 0-9 and 15-29 years age groups are higher than the England average. The practice scored

two on the deprivation measurement scale, the deprivation scale goes from one to ten, with one being the most deprived. People living in more deprived areas tend to have a greater need for health services.

The practice is open 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are available Monday to Friday 9am to 11am. Afternoon appointments are 4pm to 6pm Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday. Extended hours appointments are offered on Monday 6pm to 7.45pm.

We also inspected the branch practice at Hilary Way, Grimsby during this inspection.

Out of Hours care (from 6.30pm to 8am) is provided through the local out of hours service.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service. 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.

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Weelsby View Health Centre - Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu on 30 June 2016 under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The practice was rated requires improvement overall. The full comprehensive report on the 30 June 2016 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Weelsby View Health Centre on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Detailed findings

We undertook a follow up comprehensive inspection at Weelsby View Health Centre - Dr Pillanna Suresh Babu on 11 April 2017 to check that action had been taken to comply with legal requirements.

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 11 April 2017. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GP, practice manager, practice nurse, reception/ and administration staff).
- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed a 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.
- Visited both practice locations.
- Looked at information the practice used to deliver care and treatment plans.

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 living 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

At our previous inspection on 30 June 2016, we rated the practice as inadequate for providing safe services as the arrangements in respect of infection control, recruitment of staff, training and safe systems and processes were not adequate.

These arrangements had significantly improved when we undertook a follow up inspection on 11 April 2017. The practice is now rated as good for providing safe services.

Safe track record and learning

There was a system for reporting and recording significant events.

- Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was a recording form available on the practice's computer system. The incident recording form supported the recording of notifiable incidents under the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment).
- From the sample of two documented examples we reviewed we found that when things went wrong with care and treatment, patients were informed of the incident as soon as reasonably practicable, received reasonable support, truthful information, a written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.
- We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where significant events were discussed. The practice carried out an analysis of the significant events.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to minimise risks to patient safety.

- Arrangements for safeguarding 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.

- Staff interviewed demonstrated they understood their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and non-clinical staff had received training in safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. However we found no evidence that the GP was trained in child protection or child safeguarding, level three and we found no evidence that the practice nurse was trained in child protection or child safeguarding, level two. During the inspection we received assurances that these staff were booked on appropriate training.
- 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. There were cleaning schedules and monitoring systems in place.
- The practice nurse was the infection prevention and control (IPC) clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. The practice nurse was new to this role and was booked on appropriate training. There was an IPC protocol. IPC 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 minimised risks to patient safety (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). We found a vaccines fridge was insecure; this was resolved during the inspection.

- There were processes for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. Repeat prescriptions were signed before being dispensed to patients and there was a reliable process

Are services safe?

to ensure this occurred. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local clinical commissioning group 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 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 four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, evidence of satisfactory conduct in previous employments in the form of references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the DBS.

Monitoring risks to patients

There were procedures for assessing, monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety.

- There was a health and safety policy available.
- The practice had an up to date fire risk assessment and carried out regular fire drills. There were designated fire marshals within the practice. There was a fire evacuation plan which identified how staff could support patients with mobility problems to vacate the premises.
- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.
- The practice had a variety of other risk assessments 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).

- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system to ensure enough staff were on duty to meet the needs of patients.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had adequate arrangements 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 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

At our previous inspection 30 June 2016, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing effective services as the arrangements in respect of alerts from the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA), clinical audits, knowledge of and reference to national guidelines, multidisciplinary working, record keeping and staff appraisal needed improving.

These arrangements had improved when we undertook a follow up inspection on 11 April 2017. The provider is rated as good for providing effective services.

Effective needs assessment

Clinicians were aware of relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.

- The practice had systems 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 (2015/16) were 99% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 95% and national average of 95%.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators (95%) was better than the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 90%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators (89%) was similar to the CCG average of 87% and below the national average of 93%.

There was some evidence of quality improvement including clinical audits.

- There had been five clinical audits commenced in the last two years, one of these was a completed audit where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result included only using antibiotics in line with clinical guidelines.

Effective staffing

Evidence reviewed showed that staff had the skills and knowledge 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 had undertaken additional disease-specific training.
- 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 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. Staff said they received ongoing support, coaching and mentoring but there was no evidence of staff 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results.
- From the sample of two documented examples we reviewed we found that 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. Information was shared between services, with patients' consent, using a shared care record. Meetings took place with other health care professionals on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- 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 and signposted them to relevant services. 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 were signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 88%, which was better than the national average of 81%.

Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 94% to 100% and five year olds from 93% to 100%.

There was a policy to offer telephone or written 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 in different format 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. There were failsafe systems 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.

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

During our inspection we observed that 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.
- Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations. Conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

All of the 44 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. Comments 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 above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 87% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group average of 86% and the national average of 89%.
- 96% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.
- 99% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 92%.
- 92% 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%.
- 97% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group average of 91% and the national average of 91%.

- 99% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 92%.
- 100% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 97%.
- 100% 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%.
- 90% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

Children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and recognised as individuals.

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 with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 86%.
- 84% 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%.
- 97% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 90%.
- 93% 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:

Are services caring?

- Staff told us that interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- The Choose and Book service was used with patients as appropriate. (Choose and Book is a national electronic referral service which gives patients a choice of place, date and time)

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. Support for isolated or house-bound patients included signposting to relevant support and volunteer services.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 1.5% of the practice list as carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. Older carers were offered timely and appropriate support. For example longer appointments and at times to reflect their needs.

Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, the GP contacted them to give 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 offered extended hours on a Monday evening until 7.45pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who 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 vaccines available on the NHS.
- There were accessible facilities, which included a hearing loop, and interpretation services available.
- Other reasonable adjustments were made and action was taken to remove barriers when patients find it hard to use or access services.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.30am to 10.30am every morning and 4pm to 5.45pm daily. Extended hours appointments were offered on Monday until 7.45pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for patients that needed them.

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

- 86% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group average of 78% and the national average of 76%.

- 94% 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%.
- 93% of patients said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 76%.
- 98% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 92%.
- 97% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 73%.
- 81% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 56% and the national average of 56%.

Patients told us they were able to get appointments when they needed them.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system for handling complaints and concerns.

- Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England.
- There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.
- We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. For example, posters were displayed and summary leaflet available.

We looked at the one complaint received in the last 12 months and found it was dealt with in a timely way and with openness and transparency. Lessons were learned from individual concerns and complaints. For example, using a private room for discrete conversations with patients.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

At our previous inspection on 30 June 2016, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing well-led services as policies were undated and required review, no evidence of safeguarding training or training in recognising and reporting significant events, had not proactively sought feedback from staff or patients and did not have a patient participation group.

We issued a warning notice in respect of these issues and found arrangements had significantly improved when we undertook a follow up inspection of the service on 11 April 2017. The practice is rated as good for being well-led.

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 clear strategy and supporting business plan which reflected the vision.

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 and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. The GP and nurse had lead roles in key areas. For example, safeguarding and infection prevention and control.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff. These were updated and reviewed regularly.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained.
- Practice meetings were held three monthly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.

- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. For example, the practice list had been closed whilst there was a staff shortage.
- We saw evidence from minutes of a meetings structure that allowed for lessons to be learned and shared following significant events and complaints.

Leadership and culture

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 GP and manager were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). The practice encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. From the sample of three documented examples we reviewed we found that the practice had systems to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment

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

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

- The practice held and minuted a range of multi-disciplinary meetings including meetings with district nurses and social workers to monitor vulnerable patients. GPs, where required, met with health visitors to monitor vulnerable families and safeguarding concerns.
- 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. Minutes were available for practice staff to view.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and were encouraged 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 and staff. It proactively sought feedback from:

- patients through surveys and complaints received. The practice had attempted to set up a patient participation group but without success

- the NHS Friends and Family test, complaints and compliments received
- 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.

Continuous improvement

The practice team was forward thinking and part of local scheme to expand the range of services available to patients at the practice. The practice shared training events with a neighbouring practice.