

Crossfell Health Centre

Quality Report

Crossfell Road
Middlesbrough
TS3 7RL
Tel: 01642296777
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 4 October 2017
Date of publication: This is auto-populated when the report is published

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?	Requires improvement	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

	Page
Summary of this inspection	
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	9
Areas for improvement	9
<hr/>	
Detailed findings from this inspection	
Our inspection team	10
Background to Crossfell Health Centre	10
Why we carried out this inspection	10
How we carried out this inspection	10
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Crossfell Health Centre on 4 October 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.
- 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.

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

- The provider should ensure action is taken to improve telephone access to the practice.

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.

Good

- 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 on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role.
- The practice had adequate arrangements to respond to emergencies and major incidents.

Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

Good

- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were comparable to the national average.
- Staff were aware of current evidence based guidance.
- Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.
- Staff had the skills and knowledge 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.
- End of life care was coordinated with other services involved.

Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

Good

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

Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as requires improvement 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 difficult to make an appointment with a named GP and it was difficult to access an appointment the same day. The practice had tried many different methods of offering appointments to patients but was still met with high demand and high rates of 'did not attend' (DNA) appointments.
- 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 eleven examples reviewed showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Requires improvement



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, annual performance reviews and attended staff meetings and training opportunities.
- The provider was aware of the requirements of the duty of candour. In eleven examples we reviewed we saw evidence the practice complied with these requirements.
- The partners 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. The practice engaged with the patient participation group.

Good



Summary of findings

- GPs who were skilled in specialist areas used their expertise to offer additional services to patients.

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.

Good



- 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.

People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for the care of people with long-term conditions.

Good



- Nursing staff had lead roles in long-term disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5 mmol/l or less was 77%. The local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average was 83%, and the national average was 80%.
- 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.
- There were emergency processes for patients with long-term conditions who experienced a sudden deterioration in health.

All these patients had a named GP and there was a system to recall patients for 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.

Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- We were told that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals.
- 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. For example, in the provision of ante-natal, post-natal and child health surveillance clinics. The health visiting team visited the practice regularly to liaise.
- The practice had emergency processes for acutely ill children and young people and for acute pregnancy complications.

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, for example, extended opening hours on Saturdays.
- 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.
- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- 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).

- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients living with dementia.
- The practice had a system for monitoring repeat prescribing for patients receiving medicines for mental health needs.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption had been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 100% (local CCG average 93%, national average 89%)
- 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.
- Staff interviewed 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 2017. The results showed the practice was performing in line with and sometimes below local and national averages. 309 survey forms were distributed and 115 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 77% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared with the CCG average of 87% and the national average of 85%.
- 45% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 75%.
- 62% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the local CCG average of 78% and the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection.

We received ten comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. For example, patients described GPs and nurses as 'very caring and willing to listen'.

We spoke with five patients during the inspection. All five patients said they were satisfied with the care they received but four of them were unhappy with access to the service. The NHS Friends and Family survey results indicate that for the month of;

- June 2017: Out of 14 people surveyed, three patients were extremely likely to recommend the practice to a friend or family member, while eight were likely to recommend.
- In July 2017: 100 patients were surveyed and of this, 38 patients were extremely likely and 42 were likely to recommend the practice to friends and family.
- In August 2017, 86 patients were surveyed and of this, 38 patients were extremely likely and 32 were likely to recommend the practice to friends and family.

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- The provider should ensure action is taken to improve telephone access to the practice.

Crossfell Health Centre

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 Crossfell Health Centre

Crossfell Health Centre is located in a purpose built building at Berwick Hills, Middlesbrough, TS3 7RL and situated next to a large health centre, supermarket and small shopping complex. It has a large free car park and good public transport links.

The practice provides General Medical Services (GMS) under a contract with NHS England to the practice population of 10,318 patients. Our information shows fewer patients over the age of 85, which reflects the life expectancy within the area. There is also a higher than average number of patients aged 25 and below. The practice deprivation score is in the most deprived decile.

The practice is open from 8.30 - 6pm, Monday – Friday and has extended opening hours on Saturday from 07.45 -1.15pm; these appointments are pre-bookable. Outside of opening hours, patients can access an out of hours service provided to patients across South Tees CCG by ELM Alliance Limited, via the NHS 111 service.

The practice has five GP partners (a mix of male and female) and one salaried GP. They are supported by one Nurse Practitioner (female) and two female practice nurses.

Additionally there are two healthcare assistants providing clinical care. There is an administration team with specific roles identified and there is a practice manager.

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. We carried out an announced visit on 4 October 2017. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (GPs, nurses, administration and reception staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for in the reception area.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.
- 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?

Detailed findings

- 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

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 eleven 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 a thorough analysis of the significant events.
- We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, when a sample obtained through cervical screening had to be destroyed because it was unlabelled when sent to the laboratory; the practice subsequently implemented a system to ensure all samples are double checked.
- The practice also monitored trends in significant events and evaluated any action taken.

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 had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three and nurses were trained to safeguarding level two.

- 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)

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. There was an IPC protocol and staff had received up to date training. Annual 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).

- 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 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. One of the nurses had qualified as an Independent Prescriber and could therefore prescribe medicines for clinical conditions within their expertise. They received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health

Are services safe?

care assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines and patient specific prescriptions or directions from a prescriber were produced appropriately.

- All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely, with the exception of a doctor's bag where a medicine which was no longer being used was out of date, and the bag was not sufficiently stocked with needles and syringes. This was rectified during our inspection.

We reviewed three 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. The practice used locum staff on a weekly basis and these rotas were covered far in advance to ensure patients' access to the service.

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.

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

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.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 95% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 94% and national average of 95%.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015/2016 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5 mmol/l or less was 77% (local CCG average 83%, national average 80%)
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the CCG and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 97% (local CCG average 92%, national average 89%)

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit:

- There had been four clinical audits commenced in the last two years, all of these were completed audits 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 update training for all staff on the assembly and labelling of sharps bins and the correct colour code to use.

Information about patients' outcomes was also used to make improvements, such as the reduction in the number of prescriptions issued to patients for benzodiazepines, (a sedative medication which is sometimes used in anxiety disorders or sleep disorders) following an improvement in the way that patients were coded in the clinical records.

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.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs and nurses. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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.
- From the sample of 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. The health visiting team made regular visits to the practice and liaised with the GPs and nurses.

The practice ensured that end of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of different patients, including those who may be vulnerable because of their circumstances. The practice accommodated a Macmillan Nurse who was based within the practice building as part of a pilot scheme.

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. All clinical staff were up to date with Mental Capacity Act training.

- 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. There was a written consent form used within the practice.

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.
- A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 82%, which was comparable with the CCG average of 83% and 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 above standard compared to CCG and national averages with the exception of the Measles, Mumps and Rubella vaccine offered to two year olds. This was below the national target of 90%, with only 85% vaccination achieved. In other areas, vaccination rates were better than average, for example, rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds were at 94% and five year olds from 89% to 96%.

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 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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.
- Patients could be treated by a clinician of the same sex.
- There was a visible notice in the patient reception area stating the practice's zero tolerance for abusive behaviour. Receptionists told us referring to this had helped them diffuse potentially difficult situations. We were told that staff had undertaken training relating to managing aggressive behaviour and improving customer service skills.

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

We spoke with five patients including one member of the patient participation group (PPG). All five told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. Comments highlighted that some reception staff responded in a rude manner towards patients. Many patients commented that they found difficulty in accessing appointments.

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

- 84% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 89% and the national average of 89%.

- 78% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 86%.
- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 96% and the national average of 95%
- 85% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 86%.
- 83% of patients said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 94% and the national average of 91%.
- 89% of patients said the nurse gave them enough time compared with the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 92%.
- 97% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw compared with the CCG average of 98% and the national average of 97%.
- 86% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the national average of 91%.
- 72% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared with the CCG average of 89% 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:

Are services caring?

- 84% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 88% 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%.
- 84% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 90%.
- 82% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the national average of 85%

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

- Staff told us that interpretation services were available for the few patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.

- Information leaflets were available in the waiting areas.

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 237 patients as carers (2% of the practice list). Carers were signposted to support services, as needed, and offered an annual winter flu vaccination.

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



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

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice understood its population profile and had used this understanding to meet the needs of its population:

- The practice offered extended hours on a Saturday morning 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.
- The practice took account of the needs and preferences of patients with life-limiting progressive conditions. There were early and ongoing conversations with these patients about their end of life care as part of their wider treatment and care planning.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation. These were in addition to the routine appointments available on the same day.
- The practice sent text message reminders of appointments and test results.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS and were referred to other clinics for vaccines available privately.
- There were accessible facilities, which included a hearing loop, and interpretation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.30am to 11am every morning and 1.30pm to 5.30pm every afternoon. Extended hours appointments which needed to be pre-booked were offered at 7.45am until 1.15pm every Saturday. In addition to pre-bookable appointments with a locum or a nurse that could be booked up to two 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 below local and national averages.

- 71% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 76% and the national average of 79%.
- 26% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 71%.
- 70% 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 84% and the national average of 84%.
- 59% of patients said their last appointment was convenient compared with the CCG average of 83% and the national average of 81%.
- 44% of patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the CCG average of 74% and the national average of 73%.
- 43% of patients said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with the CCG average of 64% and the national average of 58%.

Patients told us on the day of the inspection that they were finding difficulty in getting appointments when they needed them. The provider told us they had a high number of missed appointments every week when they used a pre-bookable system of appointments and this made access even harder for patients needing appointments. A new system of triage was introduced for several months but this did not reduce the number of patients needing a face-to-face consultation. After much discussion with all practice staff, the provider reverted back to a same day appointments system. As such, we were told that patients queue outside the practice every morning at 8.30am in order to secure an appointment. The telephone lines are also extremely busy at this time. This had had a direct effect on patient satisfaction. With a practice list size of 10,000 patients the provider currently offers around 129 GP appointments per day, plus urgent appointments and home visits. In addition to this it provides 15 locum GP appointments per week. Approximately 40 appointments per day are offered by the practice nurse team and there are 55 appointments per day on average with a health care assistant.

The practice had a system to assess:

- whether a home visit was clinically necessary; and

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

- the urgency of the need for medical attention.

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

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had 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.

We looked at eleven complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. Lessons were learned from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. Action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, the practice tried new ways of offering appointments when themes of complaints were about access to the service.

Are services well-led?

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

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

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities. GPs and nurses had lead roles in key areas, for example safeguarding and infection 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 monthly which provided an opportunity for staff to learn about the performance of the practice.
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were appropriate arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.
- 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

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care.

They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. From the sample of eleven 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 verbal and written apology.
- The practice kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

There was a clear leadership structure 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. Minutes were comprehensive and 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 involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.
- There were good staff retention rates, with many staff having joined the practice as apprentices and subsequently gaining permanent employment.

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:

Are services well-led?

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

- patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG met regularly, and carried out patient surveys.
- the NHS Friends and Family test, complaints and compliments received
- Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice used information such as the Quality Outcome Framework (QOF) and patient feedback to continuously improve the quality of services. Staff were able to take time out to work together to resolve problems and share information which was used proactively to improve the quality of services. The practice had completed reviews of significant events and other incidents and shared these with staff at meetings to ensure the practice improved outcomes for patients.