

Gillan House Surgery

Quality Report

457 Green Lanes
Palmers Green
London
N13 4BS
Tel: 020 8882 9393
Website: www.gillanhousesurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 24 August 2016
Date of publication: 23/02/2017

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Gillan House Surgery	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	11

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Gillan House Surgery on 24 August 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 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.
- The practice had recently started a "walk-in(g)" clinic, which encouraged patients to be more active and allowed access to clinicians in a non-formal setting.
- 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 PPG within this practice was very active.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

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 patients rated the practice higher than others for several aspects of 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

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 (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. For example, the practice conducted minor surgery procedures on behalf of other practices within the CCG area.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff 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. The PPG held meetings and produced a newsletter quarterly.
- 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.
- Annual health checks were available for this population group.
- All patients within this population group had a named GP.

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.
- The Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) recorded the practice as scoring higher than the national average on all five diabetes indicators.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For those patients with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.

Good



Summary of findings

- 78% of women aged 25-64 notes record that a cervical screening test has been performed in the preceding 5 years which was comparable the CCG average of 81% 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.

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.
- Telephone consultations were available for those unable to attend the practice during working hours
- Extended hours surgery was held on a Tuesday and Thursday evening, in addition to the Saturday morning surgery.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

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



Summary of findings

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The practice is rated as good for the care of people experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia).

- 99% of patients diagnosed with dementia who had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months, which was better than the national average of 84%.
- 94% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months, which is comparable to the national average of 89%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The National GP Patient Survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. Three hundred and thirty survey forms were distributed and one hundred and six were returned. This represented just over 1% of the practice's patient list.

- 82% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 66% and the national average of 73%.
- 77% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 69% and the national average of 76%.
- 92% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 80% and the national average of 85%.

- 83% of patients said they would recommend this GP practice to someone who has just moved to the local area compared to the CCG average of 73% and the national average of 79%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 44 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received. The comments received stated the reception staff were helpful and pleasant, and that the doctors care and listen to concerns as well as providing good quality treatment.

We spoke with five patients during the inspection. All five patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. The Friends and Family Test undertaken by the practice during the months February 2016 – July 2016 showed that 126 out of 133 patients would recommend the practice.

Gillan House Surgery

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 nurse specialist adviser

Background to Gillan House Surgery

Gillan House Surgery is located in a commercial area of the London Borough of Enfield. The practice is located in a privately owned two-storey converted terrace house. The practice has recently undergone some modernisation which included refurbished treatment rooms. There is limited parking directly outside the practice, but with parking on the streets nearest to the practice. The nearest bus stop is approximately three minutes' walk from the practice.

There are approximately 8,300 patients registered at the practice. Statistics shows moderate income deprivation among the registered population. The registered population is slightly higher than the national average for those aged between zero - four and 20-48. Patients registered at the practice come from a variety of backgrounds including Asian, Western European, Eastern European and African Caribbean.

Care and treatment is delivered by four GPs (two female and two male) including two partners and two salaried GPs who conduct 33 clinical sessions weekly. There is one practice nurse (female) who conducts nine sessions weekly. Five administrative and reception staff work at the practice and are led by a practice manager. The practice is also a training and teaching practice.

The practice is open from the following times:-

- 8am - 6:30pm (Monday, Wednesday, Friday)
- 8am - 8pm (Tuesday)
- 8am - 7pm (Thursday)
- 8am - 11am (Saturday)

Clinical sessions are as follows:-

- 8:10am - 12:40am (Monday - Friday)
- 3pm - 6pm (Monday)
- 3pm - 7:40pm (Tuesday)
- 2:30pm - 6pm (Wednesday)
- 2pm - 7pm (Thursday)
- 3pm - 6pm (Friday)
- 8am - 11am (Saturday)

An extended hours surgery is conducted on Tuesday evenings between 6:20pm and 7:40pm, and Thursday evenings between 6:10pm and 7:00pm. Patients can book appointments in person, by telephone and online via the practice website.

Patients requiring a GP outside of practice opening hours are advised to contact the NHS GP out of hours service on telephone number 111.

The practice has a General Medical Services (PMS) contract. GMS contracts are nationally agreed between the General Medical Council and NHS England. The practice is registered with the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to provide the following regulated activities:-

- Diagnostic and screening procedures
- Treatment of disease, disorder or injury
- Maternity and midwifery services

Detailed findings

- Surgical procedures
- Family planning

Enfield CCG is the practice's commissioning body.

Gillan House Surgery has not previously been inspected by the CQC.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew. We carried out an announced visit on 24 August 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (three doctors, one practice nurse, one practice manager, three non-clinical staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members.
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the service.

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?

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

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 carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, we viewed a significant event log where hospital test results for a patient were received over the telephone on a Friday afternoon. This details of the telephone call were sent as a task on the in-house computer system, to a doctor who was not on duty until the following week Tuesday. This error led to a delay in the practice being able to take action immediately on the results received. We saw evidence that the significant event was discussed at the next team meeting and as a result staff had been advised to always inform a doctor immediately and speak face-to-face about urgent phone results received over the telephone. If a member of staff was unsure of what to do, they had been informed to always ask a colleague.

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 always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3 and the practice nurse to level 3. Non-clinical staff were trained between levels 1 and 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 (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions (PGDs) had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation.
- We reviewed three personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of

Are services safe?

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

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

- There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency.
- All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room.
- The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. A first aid kit and accident book were available.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and stored securely.
- The practice 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 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 99% of the total number of points available, with an exception reporting rate of 4% (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 diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) is 5 mmol/l or less was 82% compared to the national average of 80%
- Performance for mental health related indicators was better than the national average. For example, the percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 99% compared to the national average of 84%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had seven clinical audits carried out in the last two years, two of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored. For example, we viewed an audit which focused on the medicine reviews of patients who were receiving multiple medicines and how often reviews were being conducted by the practice. During the first audit, the practice identified 134 patients prescribed multiple medicines, of which all patients had a medicines review date recorded within their patient notes. Of the 134 patients, 114 patients received a face-to-face review with a clinician, which equates to 80% of the identified target group. As a result of this audit, the practice put in place an action plan to increase the number of patients receiving medicines review which included measures to reduce patients stockpiling medicines through clinical staff prescribing two months of medicines at a time.

The second audit identified 112 patients prescribed multiple medicines of which 111 patients had a medicines review date recorded within their patient notes. Of the 111 patients, 101 patients received a face-to-face review with a clinician, which equates to 90% of the identified target group. The second audit showed an improvement in the way the practice conducted medicine reviews of patients taking multiple medicines.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. All staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire safety awareness, basic life support and information governance. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

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

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to understand and meet the range and complexity of patients' needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when patients moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. Meetings took place with other health care professionals (such as health visitors and district nurses) on a monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.

- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through patient records audits.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support. 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.
- Dietary information was available from the in-house clinical staff and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 78%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 81% and the national average of 82%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test, as well as opportunistic screening of patients. The practice demonstrated how they encouraged uptake of the screening programme by using information in different languages and for those with a learning disability and they ensured a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. There were failsafe systems in place to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. The practice uptake for females screened for breast cancer was 60% which was lower than the CCG average of 69% and the national average of 72%.

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 20% to 95% and five year olds from 74% to 87% compared to the national averages of 73% to 95% and 81% to 95% for five year olds.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 44 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.

We spoke with seven members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected. 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:

- 89% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 85% and the national average of 89%.
- 91% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 87%.
- 95% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94% and the national average of 95%.
- 89% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 85%.

- 80% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 90%.
- 97% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 87%.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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:

- 91% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 82% and the national average of 86%.
- 81% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 76% and the national average of 82%.
- 76% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG of 80% and the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.
- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.
- Several members of staff spoke a second language (including Hindi and Turkish) which enabled them to communicate with patients whose first language was not English.

Are services caring?

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.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 246 patients as

carers which is 3% of the practice list. The practice offered annual flu vaccines to carers. Written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice 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. For example, the practice is an accredited practice with the local CCG, allowing the practice to conduct minor surgery for patients on behalf of other practices within the CCG geographical area.

- The practice offered extended hours surgery for patients who could not attend the practice during normal working hours on a Tuesday evening until 8pm and on a Thursday evening until 7pm. In addition, the practice held Saturday morning surgery between the hours of 8am to 11am.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with learning disabilities, those experiencing poor mental health and those with multiple conditions.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Telephone consultations were available for patients who were unable to attend the practice.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities and translation services available.
- The practice offered a phlebotomy service twice a week.
- The practice had recently been refurbished partly to incorporate a new minor surgery room.
- Patients experiencing poor mental health had their appointments prioritised so that they could attend the practice at less busy times.

A weekly "walk-in (g)" clinic had been introduced by the Practice and the PPG which aimed to encourage patients to get more active, and to give patients the opportunity to speak to a doctor in a non-formal setting. The clinician would offer non patient specific advice to those requesting

advice and suggest making an appointment at the surgery for those with complex enquiries. The clinic took place twice a week and the "walk-in(g)" commenced from the surgery and moved on to the local park.

Access to the service

The practice was open between the following times:-

- 8am - 6:30pm (Monday, Wednesday, Friday)
- 8am - 8pm (Tuesday)
- 8am - 7pm (Thursday)
- 8am - 11am (Saturday)

Appointments were from as follows:-

- 8:10am - 12:40am (Monday - Friday)
- 3pm - 6pm (Monday)
- 3pm - 7:40pm (Tuesday)
- 2:30pm - 6pm (Wednesday)
- 2pm - 7pm (Thursday)
- 3pm - 6pm (Friday)
- 8am - 11am (Saturday)

In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, urgent daily 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.

- 92% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 78%.
- 91% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 67% and the national average of 73%.

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

In cases where the urgency of need was so great that it would be inappropriate for the patient to wait for a GP home visit, alternative emergency care arrangements were made. Clinical and non-clinical staff were aware of their responsibilities when managing requests for home visits.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- 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. A practice leaflet as well as information on the practice website on how to make a complaint was available to patients.

We looked at one out of five complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these complaints were dealt with in a timely way and that there was transparency in communications with the complainant. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints and also

from analysis of the most recent complaints to improve the quality of care provided by the practice. For example, we viewed a complaint from a patient who was not happy with the information received during a consultation, as well as a delay in actioning a follow-up request for a referral. The practice responded to the complaint by way of issuing an apology for any distress caused and providing a review of events (including clinical decisions made) to the complainant. As a result of this complaint, the practice reviewed and updated its guidance for clinicians regarding informing patients that there are self-referral choices to hospitals online and reception staff had been retrained in the processes of ensuring referrals from the practice were actioned correctly and in a timely manner.

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 a mission statement 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 was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.
- The practice had close links with three local GP practices, meeting regularly with these practices to discuss community issues and the provision of services to patients.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff. The senior partner and the practice manager had daily morning meetings to discuss events of the previous day and to highlight priorities of the coming day.

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 partners 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 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.
- The practice held regular social events for staff.

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, who met quarterly, were very active and carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the PPG organised a raffle to raise funds for equipment for the practice, which rose over £1000. The practice PPG

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

recently conducted as survey (the results of which were to be analysed) of patients to identify whether the practice current opening hours were relevant to their needs.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through ad-hoc discussions, staff meetings and annual appraisals. 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 to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, after undergoing a selection process, the practice hosted a clinical fellow from University College London Hospital who specialised in mental health conditions. The practice team was able to obtain and use the specialist and recent knowledge of the clinician, who held clinical sessions with patients at the practice whilst in residence. The clinical fellow conducted a weekly teaching session and was involved in a project focusing on patients registered with mental health issues at the practice.