

Tramways Medical Centre - O'Connell

Quality Report

54 Holme Lane
Sheffield
S6 4JQ
South Yorkshire
Tel: 01709 234 3418
Website: www.tramwaysmedicalcentre.com

Date of inspection visit: 23 November 2016
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?

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	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Tramways Medical Centre - O'Connell	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Tramways Medical Centre - O'Connell on 23 November 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- The practice had clearly defined and embedded systems, processes and practices in place to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were assessed and mostly well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

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

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

Summary of findings

- The practice should review its carer identification process to ensure that all patients who act as carers are identified.
- Review national GP patient survey results to establish why patient's satisfaction with telephone access was lower than national averages.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

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

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

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

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the national GP patient survey showed the practice was above others for patient care.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We saw staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained patient and information confidentiality.

Good



Summary of findings

- A lockable breastfeeding room was available at the practice for all patients.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.
- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice worked closely with social care agencies to ensure patients and their carers needs were met.

Good



People with long term conditions

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

- Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority.
- Data from 2015/16 showed the practice had achieved 100% in the majority of areas relating to long term conditions.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and social care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 94%, which was higher than the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives and health visitors. Also Neighbourhood working with three local practices.
- Post natal checks and baby vaccinations were available.
- A&E attendances was checked by doctors and Safeguarding concerns acted upon.
- Meetings between midwife, health visitor and GP were held six weekly.
- Vulnerable families were discussed and action plans created. Concerns were also shared among all clinicians.
- Sick children are always seen on the day, even if no appointments are available. The reception staff were trained to add them as an extra appointment.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- The practice offered early morning appointments, 7am to 8am, on a Wednesday and Friday morning for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours. Telephone appointments were also available each day, with each GP, to allow opportunity for patients to speak with the GPs.
- The practice was open Monday to Friday. Wednesday and Friday from 7am, Monday, Tuesday and Thursday from 8am. The practice closed at 6pm everyday apart from Thursday when it closed at 12 noon for staff training. The practice was open every first Saturday of the month from 7:45am to 11am.
- NHS health check, diet and exercise advice, stop smoking services were available. Brief intervention for alcohol use, as well as detailed information of Sheffield alcohol services were available.

Good



Summary of findings

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.
- Four appointments were made available every day specifically for vulnerable patients such as those living with dementia, those with a learning disability, carers or those under one year of age who may require same day appointments.
- The practice regularly worked with other health care professionals in the case management of vulnerable patients.
- The practice informed vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice had Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) workers in-house and gave advice on on-line and group sessions which were available.
- For housebound patients the practice liaised with the Community Support worker to access or signpost services including the social and voluntary sector.
- Homeless patients were taken on as temporary residents. These patients were treated by the practice and were also referred to specialised local support services, both statutory and voluntary.
- The practice had a Learning Disabilities register. These patients were offered, annual medicals and longer appointments were available.

Good



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).

- 73% of patients diagnosed with dementia had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was 12% lower than the local and national average.
- Performance for Mental health related indicators was 94%, which was similar to the local average and the national average.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia. Staff and the patient participation group members had attended dementia friends training.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above local and national averages in some respects, and below local and national averages in others. 218 survey forms were distributed and 104 were returned. This represented 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 63% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.
- 86% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the national average of 85%.
- 95% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the national average of 85%.
- 89% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the national average of 78%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received three comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Patients commented they received an excellent service and staff were helpful and friendly.

We spoke with three patients during the inspection. All these patients said they were satisfied with the care they received. They told us it was easy to get through to the practice by telephone and to get an appointment. They said the reception staff were friendly and helpful. They said the nurses were very good and monitored their health closely.

In the Friends and Families for October 2016 test 15 patients said they would recommend the practice.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- The practice should review its carer identification process to ensure that all patients who act as carers are identified.
- Review national GP patient survey results to establish why patient's satisfaction with telephone access was lower than national averages.

Tramways Medical Centre - O'Connell

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 Tramways Medical Centre - O'Connell

The practice, Tramways Medical Centre - O'Connell, provides services for 8,600 patients within the Sheffield CCG under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract.

The services are provided from a purpose built building which has car parking and easy access for wheelchairs and disabled toilet facilities.

The patient population is comparable to the national average and the practice is situated in one of the third most deprived areas nationally.

There are three full time and two part time partner GP (three male and two female), a practice manager, two deputy practice managers, practice nurses, health care assistants and a reception team.

The practice is open Monday to Friday. Wednesday and Friday from 7am, Monday, Tuesday and Thursday from 8am. The practice closes at 6pm everyday apart from Thursday when it closes at 12 noon for staff training. The practice is open every first Saturday of the month from 7:45am to 11am.

When the practice is closed patients are directed to contact the NHS 111 service.

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 registered provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 23 November 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (including GPs, practice nurses, practice manager, receptionists, CCG Pharmacist and two deputy practice managers) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed interactions between staff and patients and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.

Detailed findings

- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.’
- Reviewed 10 questionnaires given to reception/ administration staff prior to the inspection.

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

Safe track record and learning

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

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

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, staff told us about how the practice showed us how they had changed their procedures following patients presenting at surgery with urgent needs. We were told that from significant event records and meeting minutes the practice had responded appropriately to a significant event regarding a missed Prostate Specific Antigen (PSA) error and the patient had received an apology. We also saw in response to other significant events action plans for improvement had been developed and policies and procedures had been updated where necessary.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly

outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities in relation to safeguarding. Staff told us they had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs told us they were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection 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 in place and records showed staff, other than two GPs, had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). The temperatures of the vaccine fridges were monitored twice daily and records were maintained.
- Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. There were systems in place to monitor the use of blank prescriptions. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed two personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to

Are services safe?

employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and the practice carried out regular fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control. There were systems in place to minimise the risk of legionella which were managed by the practice. (Legionella is a bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure enough staff were on duty.

- We observed that there were processes in place to prioritise this work and pathology results and letters had been seen by GPs and actioned where necessary.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 94% of the total number of points available with a, below average, overall exception rate of 9%. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

Data from 2015/16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 81% which was better than the national average of 77%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 94% which was similar to the national average.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been 14 clinical audits completed in the last year, six of these were completed audits. However all the audits demonstrated the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking and peer review.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, recent action taken as a result of an audit

included the use of Novel Oral Anticoagulant to reduce the risk of a stroke. Following the audit they had improved the care and treatment for patients at risk of strokes in relation to medication reviews and assessments.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions.
- 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 on-going support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months and the rest were scheduled. The practice manager showed us a 'common themes' from outcomes of appraisals which was used to effectively manage staff.
- Staff told us they had 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan on-going care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Meetings took place with other health and social care professionals and voluntary agencies 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 and had received training in this area.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- Patients receiving end of life care, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were signposted to the relevant service.

- The practice worked closely with the local voluntary organisations and the social prescribing team to ensure patients social needs were met.
- The practice hosted smoking cessation clinics. We saw evidence which showed that practice was the highest performance among GP practices and was providing a high quality stop smoking service. We also saw a record of 240 patients being seen by the smoking cessation advisor in the last six years of which 124(52%) had given up smoking.
- They also hosted mental health counsellors and physiotherapy services.
- The practice also hosted services such as Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) screening, Diabetes outreach clinics, Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) and Locality educational meetings.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 94%, which was higher than the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 82%. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer. There were systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 56% to 100% and five year olds from 77% to 98%. CCG averages were 47% to 96% and 71% to 97%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for patients aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups for the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

We observed members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.

- Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.
- We noted that consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations; conversations taking place in these rooms could not be overheard.
- Reception staff knew when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

All of the three 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. Comment cards indicated staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

We spoke with two members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they received excellent care and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

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

- 90% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and the national average of 89%.
- 86% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 87% 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 96% and the national average of 95%.
- 88% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared the national average of 85%.

- 97% 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%.
- 80% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 87% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 86%.
- 88% 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%.
- 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:

- Staff told us that interpreter services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

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.

Are services caring?

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 38 patients as carers (0.5% of the practice list). Same day appointments were available specifically for vulnerable groups which included carer's. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them. The staff and the patient participation group members had completed dementia friends training.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them and the practice 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.

A private breastfeeding room was available at the practice for all patients.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice hosted monthly meetings with the CCG to share best practice, ideas and feedback.

- The practice offered early morning appointments, 7am to 8am, on a Wednesday and Friday morning for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours. Telephone appointments were also available each day, with each GP, to allow for opportunity for patients to speak with the GPs.
- 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 required same day consultation. Four appointments were made available everyday specifically for vulnerable patients such as those living with dementia, those with a learning disability, carers or those under one year of age who may require same day appointments.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open Monday to Friday. Wednesday and Friday from 7am, Monday, Tuesday and Thursday from 8am. The practice closed at 6pm everyday apart from Thursday when it closed at 12 noon for staff training. The practice was open every first Saturday of the month from 7:45am to 11am.

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to four weeks in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them. We saw pre-bookable appointments were available within three working days. Telephone appointments were also available each day, with each GP, to allow for opportunity for patients to speak with the GPs.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was higher for opening hours and lower for telephone access than national averages.

- 82% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the national average of 76%.
- 63% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

Requests for home visits were put through to the GP who triaged these by calling the patient to determine priority. Same day and pre-bookable home visits were available. 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. A protocol was in place to support practice and this had been reviewed and updated following a significant event.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

We looked at the three complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled with openness and transparency. We saw detailed responses were given to complainants. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. Action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. The mission statement was displayed in the waiting area and staff rooms.

- The practice had a mission statement incorporated in to their business plan and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored although the action plan did not include dates for actions to be completed by.

Governance arrangements

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

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities.
- Practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff.
- An understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions. Safe arrangements for vaccine fridges and access to keys to the storage area for blank prescriptions was effective.
- The practice offered Protected Learning Initiative (PLI) to all staff. Once a month, two hours were given to staff to self develop.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the provider 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 provider was approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems in place to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour. (The duty of candour is a set of specific legal requirements that providers of services must follow when things go wrong with care and treatment). This included support training for all staff on communicating with patients about notifiable safety incidents. The provider encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place to ensure that when things went wrong with care and treatment:

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

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

- Staff told us the practice held regular team meetings.
- Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and felt confident and supported in doing so.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the provider. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the provider encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. The PPG, in its current format had eight members, was active and had met twice this year. The plan to meet quarterly. They had provided patient feedback to the practice and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG had developed the extended hours opening and Saturday opening. Another issue successfully managed was difficulty in booking an appointment with a nurse which resulted in increased nursing hours. Also trying to get

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

through on the phones at busy times. The practice had recently recruited a new receptionist and introduced online bookings and prescription requests. The practice also plan to add an additional phone line in the near future.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us

they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. The practice team was forward thinking and part of local pilot schemes to improve outcomes for patients in the area.