

Dr Bointon and partners

Quality Report

Back Ends
Chipping Campden
Gloucestershire
GL55 6AU
Tel: 01386 841894
Website: 01386 841894

Date of inspection visit: 14 September 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 Dr Bointon and partners	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 Dr Bointon and Partners on 14 September 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.
- 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.

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.

Good



- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified. The practice provided additional routine appointments between January and March to respond to winter pressures. Patients diagnosed with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) could also have a review with a nurse to avoid unnecessary hospital admissions. COPD is the name for a collection of lung diseases, including chronic bronchitis and emphysema.
- 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 participated in a Gloucestershire scheme called 'Choice Plus', which provided additional GP appointments for patients with acute on the day problems at various locations in the county.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs. However some patients such as those with a mobility issue needed to use a door bell to summon assistance to gain entry to the practice. The reception desk was too high for patients using a wheelchair, however, patients could be assisted in a private area by receptionist staff if required.
- 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.
- The practice took part in a local social prescribing initiative whereby patients with non-medical issues, such as financial debt or loneliness could be referred by a GP to a single hub for assessment as to which alternative service might be of most benefit. The social prescribing coordinator held weekly clinics at the practice.

Are services well-led?

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

Good



- 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.

Summary of findings

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older patients in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice supported a local nursing home and a dedicated GP visited the home every week. The practice also supported a local residential home where another GP provided fortnightly visits.
- Patients at the practice had access to a volunteer transport service to enable them to attend their appointment at the practice.
- The practice held quarterly multi-disciplinary meeting with community based staff where care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Good



People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for the care of patients 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 percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months (04/2014 to 03/2015) was 96% which was above the clinical commissioning group of 90% and national average of 88%.
- 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.
- The practice participated in the winter resilience program. They provided additional appointments between January and March

Good



Summary of findings

primarily for patients diagnosed with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease to avoid unnecessary hospital admissions. All the practice's patients could access the additional appointments.

Families, children and young people

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

- 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 patients 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 patients were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80% (2014/15) which was comparable to the clinical commissioning group average of 84% and national average of 82%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- Weekly ante-natal clinic with the midwife and a fortnightly drop in clinic with the health visitor were held at the practice.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

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 ran a 5pm clinic every week day for urgent cases and the practice told us any patients who feel they need to be seen by a clinician will be seen on the day.
- The practice offered extended hours from 6.30pm and 9pm on the first Tuesday of the month and on Wednesday evenings for the rest of the month. There were plans to introduce extended hours on one Saturday every eight weeks.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- The practice told us how they responded quickly to the needs of a group of students who needed travel vaccine at short notice by providing an additional evening travel clinic specifically for those students.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers 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 through social prescribing.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.
- The practice could refer patients to see a local alcohol advisor and they could book a room to see patients at the practice if this was needed.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- 100% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the last 12 months (04/2014 to 03/2015), which was above the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 86% and the national average of 84%.
- The percentage of patients with severe mental health problems who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in their record, in the preceding 12 months (04/2014 to 03/2015) was 100% compared to the CCG average of 93% and national average of 88%.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- There was a mental health gateway worker who held fortnightly clinics at the practice.
- 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.

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. Two hundred and fifteen survey forms were distributed and 128 (a response rate of 60%) were returned. This represented approximately 3% of the practice's patient list.

- 90% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) of 83% and national average of 73%.
- 93% of patients were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 85%.
- 96% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 89% and national average of 85%.
- 94% 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 83% and 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 30 comment cards, of which, one was from a community professional. All the comment cards were positive about the standard of care received although one of the comment cards highlighted difficulties getting an appointment with a named GP. Patients commented on the excellent and professional service they have received from all staff at the practice. Patients also commented on the kind, caring and compassionate nature of the GPs and nurses.

We spoke with eight patients during the inspection. All eight patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed and caring. Some patients however, commented that the waiting area was small and having to wait for some time after their appointment time.

We received one comment on our website through the 'share your experience'. The comment related to difficulties for wheelchair users to access the practice as the corridors around the reception area are not wide enough and there were no low level reception desk.

We looked at the NHS Friends and Family Test for July 2016, where patients are asked if they would recommend the practice. The results showed 100% of respondents would recommend the practice to their family and friends.

Dr Bointon and partners

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 an Assistant Inspector.

Background to Dr Bointon and partners

Dr Bointon and Partners, also known locally as The Chipping Campden Surgery is a GP partnership located in Chipping Campden. The practice's premises are purpose built and have a ramp access to the main door. The practice does not have automatic doors, however, there is a door bell to assist patient with mobility issues and wheelchair. There are five consulting rooms and one treatment room which are all located on the ground floor of the practice.

The practice provides its services to approximately 4800 patients under a General Medical Services (GMS) contract. (A GMS contract is a contract between NHS England and general practices for delivering general medical services and is the commonest form of GP contract). The practice delivers its services from the following location:

Back Ends,
Chipping Campden,
Gloucestershire,
GL55 6AU.

The practice partnership has three GP partners and one salaried GP making a total of approximately two and a half whole time equivalent GPs. There are one male and three

female GPs. The clinical team includes four practice nurses and two phlebotomists, all of which are female. The practice management and administration team consist of a practice manager, an accounts manager, an IT administrator, one medical secretary, an administration manager, a receptionist team leader and six receptionists. The practice is approved for teaching medical students.

The practice also has a dispensary and it dispenses to around 26% of the practice registered patients. The dispensary team included three dispensers and a dispensary manager. Two of the dispensers also share the role of receptionist.

The practice population demographic shows there is a lower than average patient population aged between 20 to 44 years and higher than average patient population aged between 45 to 85 years and above compared with local and national averages. The general Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) population profile for the geographic area of the practice is in the least deprivation decile. (An area itself is not deprived: it is the circumstances and lifestyles of the people living there that affect its deprivation score. It is important to remember that not everyone living in a deprived area is deprived and that not all deprived people live in deprived areas). Average male and female life expectancy for the practice is 84 and 88 years, which is above the national average of 79 and 83 years respectively.

The practice is open from 8.30am to 1.30pm and 2pm to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours are available from 6.30pm and 9pm on the first Tuesday of the month then on Wednesday evenings for the rest of the month. There are plans to introduce extended hours on one Saturday every eight weeks. When the practice is closed during core hours, calls are diverted to a call handling service (Message Link), which diverts any urgent calls to a designated member of staff at the practice.

Detailed findings

The practice has opted out of providing out of hours services to its patients. Patients can access the out of hour's services provided by South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust via the NHS 111 service.

At the time of our inspection, one of the GPs was not registered as a partner with the Care Quality Commission and was in the process of registering as a partner.

This is the first inspection of Dr Bointon and Partners.

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 14 September 2016. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including three GPs, two practice nurses, the dispensary manager, four members of the administration and reception team and the practice manager.
- We also spoke with patients who used the service and three members of the patient participation group.

- 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?

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 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, following a late home visit request for an older patient, the practice arranged for a GP who was already undertaking home visits, to visit this patient before afternoon surgery. The visiting GP did not have the patient record to know the patient's past history and a decision was made for hospital admission. After a review the practice made a number of changes which included that the visiting GP would speak with a GP or nurse at the practice to obtain information about the patient prior to visiting.

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 and nurses were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level three.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. One of the practice nurses 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 clinical commissioning group pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems 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. PGDs are written instructions for the supply or administration of medicines to groups of patients who may not be individually identified before presenting for treatment.

Are services safe?

- There was a named GP responsible for the dispensary and all members of staff involved in dispensing medicines had received appropriate training and had opportunities for continuing learning and development. Any medicines incidents were recorded for learning and the practice had a system in place to monitor the quality of the dispensing process. We saw that, although errors and "near misses" in dispensing medicines that reached patients were recorded and investigated, the dispensary had no process for collecting administrative "near-miss" error data and as such were unable to identify potential areas for improvement to keep patients safe. Following the inspection, the practice told us they would be adding this to their record book to ensure administrative "near misses" are recorded and reviewed. Dispensary staff showed us standard procedures which covered all aspects of the dispensing process (these are written instructions about how to safely dispense medicines).
- The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage because of their potential misuse) and had procedures in place to manage them safely. There were also arrangements in place for the destruction of controlled drugs.
- We reviewed six personnel files and found appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken 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.

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. There was an agreement between the different staff groups on how many staff can take leave at the same time and the practice manager maintained oversight of this.

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 100% of the total number of points available.

The practice had a higher exception rate for four clinical domains. 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. For example, exception rate for:

- Diabetes was 16% compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 12% and national average of 11%.
- Heart failure was 19% compared to the CCG average of 10% and national average of 9%.
- Cancer was 21% compared to the CCG average of 14% and national average of 15%.
- Rheumatoid arthritis was 33% compared to the CCG average of 7% and national average of 7%.

We reviewed the high exception rates and found that patients had been appropriately recalled and reviewed in

line with the practice's contractual obligations. We did however find that there were some coding issues which the practice was addressing and a low prevalence in some clinical domains.

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2014/15 showed:

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, with a record of a foot examination and risk classification within the preceding 12 months (04/2014 to 03/2015) was 96% which was above the clinical commissioning group of 90% and national average of 88%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100% which was above the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 93%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

- There had been 18 clinical audits undertaken in the last two years, six 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, recent action taken as a result included increasing the identification of patients who could be at risk of stroke and ensure those patients had been prescribed blood thinning medicines as recommended by guidelines. Twenty seven new patients were identified and were now receiving the appropriate treatment. The practice also identified 14 patients whose blood thinning medicines were not optimised and had taken actions to change those patients to a different medicine.

Information about patients' outcomes was used to make improvements such as undertaking an audit of all elderly patients and added them to the "at risks" list based on age factors rather than only clinical need with the aim to avoid unnecessary hospital admissions.

Effective staffing

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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, nurses reviewing patients with long-term conditions had diplomas in respiratory disease and diabetes.
- Staff administering vaccines and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training which had included an assessment of competence. Staff who administered vaccines could demonstrate how they stayed up to date with changes to the immunisation programmes, for example by access to on line resources and discussion at practice meetings.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. 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 on a quarterly 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 through the social prescribing service. The practice could also refer patients to the alcohol advisor for additional support and they could also be seen at the practice.
- Smoking cessation advice was available from the nursing team.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 80%, which was comparable to the CCG average of 84% and the national average of 82%. 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. 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 by

Are services effective? (for example, treatment is effective)

ensuring a female sample taker was available. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. The patient uptake for the bowel screening service in the last two and a half years was 60% compared to the CCG average of 63% and national average of 58%. The practice also encouraged eligible female patients to attend for breast cancer screening. The rate of uptake of this screening programme in the last three years was 80% compared to the CCG average of 76% and national average of 72%.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccines given were higher than the CCG averages. For example, childhood

immunisation rates for the vaccines given to under two year olds ranged from 80% to 100% compared to the CCG average of 90% to 96%; and five year olds ranged from 90% to 100% compared to the CCG average of 90% to 96%.

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

We received 30 comment cards, of which, one was from a community professional. All the comment cards were positive about the standard of care received although one of the comment cards highlighted difficulties getting an appointment with a named GP. 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 three members of the patient participation group (PPG). They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice. 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:

- 94% of patients said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and the national average of 89%.
- 94% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 87%.

- 98% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 97% and the national average of 95%.
- 94% 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 national average of 85%.
- 95% of patients said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 93% and national average of 91%.
- 96% of patients said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful compared to the CCG average of 90% 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 above local and national averages. For example:

- 93% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 86%.
- 90% of patients said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85% and national average of 82%.
- 90% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 87% and 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.

Are services caring?

- Information leaflets were available in easy read format.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

Information about support groups was also available on the practice website.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 81 patients as carers (more than 1% of the practice list). The practice held a carers afternoon in March 2015 and invited carers on the practice register to attend a health check. The practice also arranged for a number of voluntary and local organisations to support the event. The practice increased their

appointments times for these health checks from 20 to 30 minutes to enable nurses to carry out a full health check. We saw the practice sought feedback from carers and the organisations involved to determine the benefits of the carers afternoon. Feedback was generally positive and this year, the practice had plans in place to invite carers to see the practice's carers lead and the social prescriber to ensure their health and social needs were met. 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 provided additional routine appointments between January and March to respond to winter pressures. Patients diagnosed with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) could also have a review with a nurse to avoid unnecessary hospital admissions. COPD is the name for a collection of lung diseases, including chronic bronchitis and emphysema. As part of this programme, the practice opened on two Saturdays each month between January and March.

- The practice offered extended hours from 6.30pm and 9pm on the first Tuesday of the month and on Wednesday evenings for the rest of the month. There were plans to introduce extended hours on one Saturday every eight weeks.
- The practice ran a 5pm clinic every week day for urgent cases and the practice told us, any patients who feel they need to be seen by a clinician will be seen on the day.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- The practice supported a local nursing home and a dedicated GP visited the home every week. The practice also supported a local residential home where a GP provided fortnightly visits.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccines available on the NHS as well as those only available privately. The practice was a registered yellow fever centre.
- The practice told us how they held an evening travel clinic in order to be able to respond quickly to the needs of students who needed travel vaccines at short notice.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available. However some patients

such as those with a mobility issue needed to use a door bell to summon assistance to gain entry to the practice. The reception desk was too high for patients using a wheelchair, however, patients could be assisted in a private area by receptionist staff if required.

- Patients at the practice had access to a volunteer transport service to enable them to attend their appointment at the practice.
- The practice took part in a local social prescribing initiative whereby patients with non-medical issues, such as financial debt or loneliness could be referred to a single hub for assessment as to which alternative service might be of most benefit. The social prescribing coordinator held weekly clinics at the practice.

Access to the service

The practice was open from 8.30am to 1.30pm and 2pm to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours were available from 6.30pm and 9pm on the first Tuesday of the month and on Wednesday evenings for the rest of the month. There were plans to introduce extended hours on one Saturday every eight weeks. When the practice was closed during core hours, calls were diverted to a call handling service (Message Link), who would divert any urgent calls to a designated member of staff at the practice. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks 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 above local and national averages.

- 90% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 79% and national average of 79%.
- 91% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 83% and national average of 73%.

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

The practice had a system in place to assess:

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

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.

- 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 in the practice's waiting area and on their website.

We looked at six complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way with openness and transparency. Lessons were learnt from individual concerns and complaints. Trends were analysed and action was taken to improve the quality of care. For example, when a patient received a letter from the practice alerting them that their high risk medicine dose would be changed due to an alert advice, the patient complained as they had already had a change in their medicine's dose. The practice investigated this and found that the computer search for affected patients did not narrow the search enough to account for patients who recently had their medicine's dose changed. The practice wrote to the patients and all other affected patients to apologise and reassure them that the letter did not apply to them. This error was also discussed with the dispensary manager and the dispensary lead GP. The practice also agreed that letters relating to medicine changes following alert advice would be authorised by a GP before being sent to patients.

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 which was displayed in the waiting areas 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.
- We saw that the attitude and communication between staff and patients supported the practice's ethos, of delivering a caring and compassionate service to ensure that the patient experience was positive.

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 arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

Leadership and culture

On the day of inspection the partners in the practice demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They told us they prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care. Staff told us the partners were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff.

The provider was aware of and had systems 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 patients 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. We noted team away days were held every three to five years.
- 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. The PPG met regularly, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, following feedback from the PPG and patients about waiting times after patient's appointment times, the practice had decided

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

to change their appointment times from 10 minutes to 15 minutes to reduce waiting time and to ensure the GPs have enough time with patients during consultation.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.

Continuous improvement

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

- The practice took part in a local social prescribing initiative whereby patients with non-medical issues, such as debt or loneliness could be referred by a GP to a single hub for assessment as to which alternative service might be of most benefit.
- The practice participated in a Gloucestershire scheme called 'Choice Plus', which provides additional GP appointments for patients with acute on the day problems at various locations in the county.
- The practice participated in the winter resilience program. They provided additional appointments between January and March primarily for patients diagnosed with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease to avoid unnecessary hospital admissions.
- The practice was planning to introduce extended hours on one Saturday every eight weeks.