

Milnrow Village Practice

Quality Report

44-48 Newhey Road

Milnrow

Rochdale

OL16 4EG

Tel: 01706 641409

Website: www.milnrowvillagepractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 3 February 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	3
The six population groups and what we found	6
What people who use the service say	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to Milnrow Village Practice	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 Milnrow Village Practice on 3 February 2016. Overall the practice is rated as good.

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

- There was an open and transparent approach to safety and an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Feedback from patients about their care was consistently and strongly positive.
- 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.

- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.
- The practice worked closely with other organisations and with the local community in planning how services were provided to ensure that they meet patients' needs.

One area of outstanding practice was that the practice held regular events for all patients such as a recent bowel screening event and regular cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training sessions.

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 there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information and 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.
- The GPs took part in peer reviews to ensure best and safe working practice.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Our findings at inspection showed that systems were in place to ensure that all clinicians were up to date with both National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines and other locally agreed guidelines.
- Data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality and 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.
- Not all staff had regular appraisals however the practice had a plan in place for all staff during March and April.
- Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data from the National GP Patient Survey showed patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of care.

Good



Summary of findings

- Feedback from patients about their care and treatment was consistently and strongly positive.
- 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.
- Bereaved families were contacted and most visited by the GP and offered ongoing support.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- The practice worked closely with other organisations and with the local community in planning how services were provided to ensure that they meet patients' needs.
- With help from the PPG, the practice organised and held quarterly CPR training events attended by patients, nursing home staff, local group leaders and representatives of health related organisations.
- With help from the PPG the practice held a bowel screening event so that their patients could learn about the screening and treatment of bowel cancer.
- At busy times the practice would add an extra clinic during the week to cope with the added demand.
- 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.
- Patients can access appointments and services in a way and at a time that suits them.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.
-

Good



Are services well-led?

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

Good



Summary of findings

- 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 this.
- 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.
- High standards were promoted and owned by all practice staff and teams worked together across all roles.
- 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 knowing about 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.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- All older people were offered shingles and pneumonia vaccinations.
- 80.39% of people aged over 65 had received a seasonal flu vaccination compared to the national average of 73.24%
- The practice embraced the Gold Standards Framework for end of life care. This included supporting patients' choice to receive end of life care at home.
- The practice had a dedicated member of staff available for carers who arranged health checks, immunisations, respite and social services support where needed.

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.
- Patients diagnosed with asthma and COPD had personalised care plans. Those with COPD were supplied, in advance, with emergency medication.
- Where appropriate one longer review appointment was made to enable those patients with multiple conditions to have all conditions and medicines reviewed at the same time, preventing patients having to make repeat visits.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.
- The practice was visited annually by a consultant in diabetes who reviewed patients' management plans.

Good



Summary of findings

Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- The practice had a Childrens Co-ordinator who followed up where children and babies failed to attend for immunisations.
- 75.2% of people diagnosed with asthma had a review in the preceding twelve months which was the same as the national average of 75.35%.
- 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.
- 84.84% of women aged 25-64 had their notes recorded as having a cervical screening test performed in the preceding 5 years which was comparable to the national average of 81.83%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- Same day appointments were offered to all children under 12.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.
- The practice provides full contraceptive services including coils and sub dermal implants.
- The practice welcomed breast feeding mothers.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of 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. This included electronic prescribing where a person can nominate a pharmacy and collect their repeat prescriptions direct.
- Extended hours were offered from 7.30am to 9pm on Tuesdays. Telephone consultations were offered for those that could not attend the surgery.
- Seasonal campaigns such as flu were offered on Saturdays.

Good



Summary of findings

- NHS Health check clinics and health promotion support was offered during late opening to encourage uptake in this population group.
- Blood tests are offered by the practice all day due to a later collection from the pathology laboratory.

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 and home visits, where needed, for patients with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- 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.

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).

- 82.93% of people diagnosed with dementia who had had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 84.01%.
- 87.5% of people with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan in the preceding 12 months which was comparable to the CCG average of 88.47%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice added a daily alert to the relevant GP to carry out dementia screening for appropriate patients attending the surgery.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for people with dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice had told people experiencing poor mental health about how to access various local support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up people who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support people with mental health needs and dementia.
- People who experienced difficulties attending appointments at busy periods were offered appointments at the beginning or the end of the day to reduce anxiety.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published in January 2016. The results showed the practice was performing above local and national averages. 266 survey forms were distributed and 123 were returned. This represented a return rate of 46%.

- 97% of people found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 59% and a national average of 73%.
- 93% of people were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 81%, national average 85%).
- 97% of people described the overall experience of their GP surgery as fairly good or very good (CCG average 83%, national average 85%).
- 97% of people said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 72%, national average 78%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 36 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. Comments included praise for the staff, good treatment from the GPs and a safe and hygienic environment

We spoke with eight patients and four members of the Patient Participation Group (PPG) during the inspection. All eight patients and the PPG members said they were happy with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The PPG group members told us the practice listened and responded to suggestions and issues raised.

Comments we received included “easy to arrange appointments at short notice”, “service has always been excellent” and “couldn’t ask for any better”.

Milnrow Village Practice

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 and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Milnrow Village Practice

Milnrow Village Practice provides primary medical services in Milnrow near Rochdale from Monday to Friday. The practice is open between 8.30am and 6pm. The first appointment of the day with a GP is 8.30am and the last appointment with a GP is 5.50pm. Extended hours are offered on Tuesday mornings from 7.30am and Tuesday evenings until 9pm. Same day urgent appointments are available each day.

Milnrow Village Practice is situated within the geographical area of Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Commissioning Group (CCG).

The practice has a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract. The PMS contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities.

Milnrow Village Practice is responsible for providing care to 5455 patients.

The practice consists of three GP partners one of whom is female, one nurse practitioner, one practice nurses and one health care assistant. The practice is supported by a practice manager, a secretary an admin assistant and receptionists.

When the practice is closed patients are directed to the out of hour's service.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive inspection programme.

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 5 and 8 October 2013. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including GPs, practice manager, members of the nursing team, secretary, administration assistant and receptionist. and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.'

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

Detailed findings

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

We also looked at how well services were provided for specific groups of people and what good care looked like for them. The population groups are:

- Older people
- People with long-term conditions

- Families, children and young people
- Working age people (including those recently retired and students)
- People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable
- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Please note that when referring to information throughout this report, for example any reference to the Quality and Outcomes Framework data, this relates to the most recent information available to the CQC at that time.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

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 practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. This was an informal and ad hoc process however during the inspection the practice put plans in place to formalise all practice meetings held in future.

When there were unintended or unexpected safety incidents, patients received reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and were told about any actions to improve processes to prevent the same thing happening again.

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 that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding level 3.
- 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 check (DBS

check). (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).

- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. A recent infection control audit had been undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). 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. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed four personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken, for newer members of staff, prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.
- There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.

Monitoring risks to patients

Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available with a poster in the reception office which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out regular fire drills. All

Are services safe?

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.

- 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 that enough staff were on duty.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.

- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room. This training was extended to patients and their carers.

- 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 fit for use.

- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

- The practice had systems in place to keep all clinical staff up to date. Staff had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to deliver care and treatment that met peoples' 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 97.9% of the total number of points available, with 6.5% exception reporting. (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects). This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/2015 showed;

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average. For example the percentage of patients with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months was 91.09% compared to the national average of 88.3%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was 88.58% which is better than the national average of 83.65%
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average. For example 87.5% of people with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record in the preceding 12 months compared to the national average of 88.47%.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been two clinical audits completed in the last two years, one of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, the practice had reduced the prescribing of antibiotics due to a recent audit.

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. It 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 vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccinations 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 an informal 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 during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. Not all staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months. As a result of the inspection the practice put plans in place for all appraisals to take place in March and April.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- 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 services 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. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Consent to care and treatment

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

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

- The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits .

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then seen by a member of the nursing team, or signposted to the relevant service.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 84.4%, which was comparable to the national average of 81.83%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 95.1% to 98.3% and five year olds from 96.4% to 98.2%.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people 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 36 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

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

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

- 97% of people said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 90% and national average of 89%.
- 93% of people said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 87%, national average 87%).
- 100% of people said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%)
- 93% of people said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 86%, national average 85%).

- 98% of people said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 91%, national average 91%).
- 99% of people said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 86%, national average 87%)

These results are aligned with what we were told on the day by patients that we spoke to.

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 on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

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:

- 93% of people said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 87% and national average of 86%.
- 90% of people said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 83% , national average 82%)
- 97% of people said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 88% , national average 85%)

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

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. A dedicated member of staff was available to ensure that written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Are services caring?

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified.

- The practice offered extended hours on Tuesday mornings from 7.30am and Tuesday evenings until 9pm 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 would benefit from these.
- Same day appointments were available for children under 12 years and those with serious medical conditions.
- Seasonal campaigns such as flu were offered appointments on Saturdays.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- With help from the patient participation group (PPG), the practice organised and held quarterly CPR training events attended by patients, nursing home staff, local group leaders and representatives of health related organisations. More CPR training events were in the diary throughout 2016.
- With help from the PPG the practice held a bowel screening event so that their patients could learn about the screening and treatment of bowel cancer. Other events are planned to cover other health conditions.
- At busy times the practice would add an extra clinic during the week to cope with the added demand.
- The GPs used Ipads so that they could access patient information and refer onwards where necessary when they were not in the surgery.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8.30am and 6pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were from 8.30am to 5.50pm daily. Extended surgery hours were offered at the following times; on Tuesday mornings from 7.30am and until 9pm on Tuesday evenings. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to 3 months in advance, urgent appointments were also available for people that needed them.

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

- 90% of people were satisfied with the practices' opening hours compared to the CCG average of 73% and national average of 75%.
- 97% people said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 59%, national average 73%).
- 79% people said they always or almost always see or speak to the GP they prefer (CCG average 56%, national average 59%).

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

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, leaflets were on display in the waiting area and the practice website explained how to make a complaint.

We looked at one complaint received in the last 12 months and found that it was satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had clear values and staff knew and understood the values.
- The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

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

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

Leadership and culture

The partners in the practice had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritise safe, high quality and compassionate care. The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

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 knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology

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

- Staff told us the practice held ad hoc team meetings, however during the inspection a formal plan was put in place to hold structured and regular meetings in the future.
- 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 in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG were keen to hold regular educational events for patients such as the bowel screening events and CPR training. They felt this was beneficial to patients' health and wellbeing.

- 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 strong 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. For example

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- The practice were looking at ways to improve the take up of breast screening and cervical cytology screening in the patient group with learning disability.
- The practice manager was hoping to become an EMIS (the clinical system used by all practices in the CCG) trainer in order to use the clinical system to its full advantage enabling more thorough audit of the service provided.