

Dr Affia Okoreaffia

Quality Report

21 Atherden Road, Clapton, London, E5 0QP
Tel: 020 8985 6675
Website: www.athenamedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: To Be Confirmed
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	5
What people who use the service say	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Dr Affia Okoreaffia	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 Dr Affia Okoreaffia on 27 October 2015. 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 generally assessed and well managed. However, the practice did not have oxygen available to respond to medical emergencies, which is contrary to guidance issued by the National Resuscitation Council.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance. Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.

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

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Review patient access/opening times to the surgery in response to patient responses in GP survey

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- There was an effective system in place for reporting and recording significant events
- Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice.
- When there are unintended or unexpected safety incidents, people receive reasonable support, truthful information, a verbal and written apology and are 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 people safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- Risks to patients were generally well managed, with the exception of the provisions in place to deal with medical emergencies. The practice did not have oxygen available to use in an emergency situation, which contravenes guidance issued by the National Resuscitation Council, however rectified this immediately after the inspection.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

- Data showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality.
- 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 multidisciplinary teams to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services.

- Data showed that 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible.
- We also saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

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

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

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs. The practice had a policy of offering routine home visits to all frail and housebound on a quarterly basis.

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.
- Performance for diabetes related indicators was above to the CCG and national averages.
- Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed.
- All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medicines needs were being met. For those people 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.
- The practice offered a weekly walk-in immunisation clinic for children, and immunisation rates were above average 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.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.

Good



Summary of findings

- We saw good examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

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

- The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflects the needs for this age group.
- The practice offered extended hours opening, improving access to this patient group.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

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

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- It offered longer appointments for people with a learning disability.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people.
- It had told vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

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

- The practice was scoring below average on a number of measures relating to the care of patients with poor mental health. The practice had a plan in place to improve the care provided to patients with poor mental health.

Good



Summary of findings

- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice held weekly clinics with a counsellor and a psychotherapist.
- It 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.
- It 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 people with mental health needs and dementia.

Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 2 July 2015. The results showed the practice was performing above local and national averages in a number of areas. 458 survey forms were distributed and 104 were returned.

- 77.7% found it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared to a CCG average of 72.4% and a national average of 73.3%.
- 88.2% found the receptionists at this surgery helpful (CCG average 87.3%, national average 86.8%).
- 86% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried (CCG average 83.5%, national average 85.2%).
- 92.3% said the last appointment they got was convenient (CCG average 88.1%, national average 91.8%).

- 74.1% described their experience of making an appointment as good (CCG average 71.5%, national average 73.3%).
- 38% usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen (CCG average 61.7%, national average 64.8%).

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received 41 comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received, with patients emphasizing the supportive attitude of reception and clinical staff. Seven cards contained less positive comments, with patients reporting that they often had to wait for appointments.

We spoke with six patients during the inspection. All six patients said that they were happy with the care they received and thought that staff were approachable, committed and caring.

Dr Affia Okoreaffia

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 advisor, and an Expert by Experience (someone who has experience of using services).

Background to Dr Affia Okoreaffia

Dr Affia Okoreaffia (also known as Athena Medical Centre) is a practice based in Hackney, London, and serves a population of approximately 5000 patients. The practice is based in an ethnically diverse area (with 53.9% of patients identifying as white, 21.9% as Asian/Asian British, 16.3% as Black/African/Caribbean/Black British, 5.8% as mixed ethnic groups and 2% as other ethnic groups).

There is a principal GP, one salaried GP and two long-term locums at the practice (two male and two female doctors in total). The practice also employs one full-time practice nurse, a practice manager, and a number of administrative and reception staff. In total, the practice offered 25 GP sessions per week.

The practice is open from 9:00am to 1:00pm, Monday to Friday, and from 3:30pm to 6:30pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday. Appointments are available from 9:30am to 1:00pm, every weekday morning, and from 4:00pm to 8:00pm on Mondays, and 4:00pm to 6:30pm on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays.

When the practice is closed, patients are re-directed to a contracted out-of-hours service.

The practice is registered to provide diagnostic and screening procedures, family planning, maternity and midwifery services, surgical procedures and for the treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

Why we carried out this inspection

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

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

This practice had not been inspected before.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information that we hold about the practice. We carried out an announced visit on 27 October 2015. During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff (including GPs, the practice nurse, the practice manager and administrative and reception staff) and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how people were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members

Detailed findings

- Reviewed 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 are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks 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 also a recording form available to all practice staff.
- The practice carried out a thorough analysis of the significant events.
- The practice discussed incidents at monthly practice meetings.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports national patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, there had been an incident in which reception staff had attempted to contact a patient with the results of a blood test, but been unable to get through by telephone. The reception staff had left a voicemail message for the patient to contact the practice, which unfortunately was not received by the patient. The patient therefore did not contact the practice to discuss the test results. The practice reviewed this incident, and introduced a revised procedure for such situations, requiring staff to write to patients who were uncontactable by telephone.

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

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements and policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports

where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role. GPs were trained to Safeguarding Level 3, and non-clinical staff to Level 1.

- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that clinical or reception staff would act as chaperones, if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a disclosure and barring service check (DBS check). (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and all 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 drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Prescription pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. The practice had a system for production of Patient Specific Directions to enable Health Care Assistants to administer vaccinations.
- We reviewed five personnel files and found that 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.

Are services safe?

- There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. There was a health and safety policy available. 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 also 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.
- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. There was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty, and staff were offered additional hours during busy periods or to cover annual leave.
- 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. However, the practice did not hold oxygen for use in emergencies. The practice had not considered the guidance in place or risk assessed this decision. Once the practice were alerted to this, they immediately purchased oxygen for use in medical emergencies.
- Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.
- The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

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

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

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality 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 91.2% of the total number of points available, with 9.8% exception reporting. 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 above to the CCG and national averages. For example, the percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less was 87%, compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 78%. The practice had referred 100% of new patients on the diabetes register to a structured education programme within nine months of diagnosis, compared to the CCG average of 96.5% and the national average of 90.3%.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was better than the CCG and national average. For example, the percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90 mmHg or less was 90.7%, compared to the CCG average of 87.9% and national average of 83.6%

- Performance for mental health related indicators was below the CCG and national averages. For example, 83.6% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months, compared to a CCG average of 85.4% and a national average of 88.3%. In addition, 80% of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a record of blood pressure in the preceding 12 months compared to the CCG average of 91.1% and the national average of 89.5%.
- The number of patients at the practice diagnosed with dementia was 0.28%, below the CCG average of 0.31% and national average of 0.74%.
- The practice were aware that they were below average for a number of mental health related indicators, and were considering how they could improve on this performance, for example, by reiterating guidelines amongst clinical staff, and taking a proactive approach to offering services.

Clinical audits demonstrated quality improvement.

- There had been 11 clinical audits in the last two years; three of these were completed audits where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice participated in applicable local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- Findings were used by the practice to improve services. For example, the practice had undertaken an audit on Accident and Emergency (A&E) attendances. The practice had identified above average attendance at A&E in the year 2013-2014, and reviewed a number of contributory factors. In response, the practice had highlighted frequent A&E attenders, and implemented management plans. The practice had also focussed on patient education. The following year, the practice re-audited emergency admissions, and found that the rates had reduced from 168 patients per 1000 to 151.5 patients per 1000. This meant that they were below the CCG average.

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 newly appointed non-clinical members of staff that 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 e.g. for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions, administering vaccinations and taking samples for the cervical screening programme.
- 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 these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for the revalidation of doctors. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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

- This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and investigation and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets were also available.
- The practice shared relevant information with other services in a timely way, for example when referring people to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they are discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.
- Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or practice nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment.
- The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits to ensure it met the practices responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Health promotion and prevention

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

- These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service.
- A dietician was available on the premises and smoking cessation advice was available from a local support group.

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 83.61%, which was above the national average of 81.88%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 89.1% to 100% and five year olds from 90% to 97.1%. Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 70.82%, and at risk groups 51.55%. These were also comparable to CCG and national averages.

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

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

NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups on the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We observed that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients and treated people 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 and that 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 41 patient CQC 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. Seven comments cards reported that patients were occasionally kept waiting for their appointments.

The practice was aware that patients could experience delays in being seen by the GPs or practice nurse, and had discussed this issue with the patient participation group. They were in the process of reviewing their appointments system, and had introduced a system to keep patients updated on waiting times.

We also spoke with one member of the patient participation group. They 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 doctors and nurses. For example:

- 90.8% said the GP was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 86% and national average of 88.6%.

- 91.9% said the GP gave them enough time (CCG average 83.1%, national average 86.6%).
- 96% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 93.3%, national average 95.2%)
- 87.2% said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 83%, national average 85.1%).
- 91.5% said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 85.9%, national average 90.4%).
- 88.2% said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful (CCG average 87.3%, national average 86.8%)

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

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

- 86.5% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 83.3% and national average of 86%.
- 85.2% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 78.2%, national average 81.4%)

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.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

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

Are services caring?

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 17.3% of the practice list as 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 had identified that improvements could be made with regards to the support available for patients suffering from poor mental health, and had secured funding for a counsellor to attend weekly clinics at the practice.

- The practice offered extended hours appointments, for example until 8:00pm on Mondays, and 6:30pm on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays.
- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability, and for patients who would benefit from these.
- Home visits were available for older and housebound patients. The practice visited all housebound and frail patients quarterly for a routine check-up.
- The practice offered an open access system every weekday morning, allowing patients access to appointments without the need to book. The practice also offered pre-bookable appointments.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- The practice held a weekly baby and child clinic, with walk-in appointments for all childhood immunisations.
- The practice offered weekly clinics with a counsellor, and with a psychotherapist.
- There were disabled facilities, translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice is open from 9:00am to 1:00pm, Monday to Friday, and from 3:30pm to 6:30pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday. Appointments are available from 9:30am to 1:00pm, every weekday morning, and from 4:00pm to 8:00pm on Mondays, and 4:00pm to 6:30pm on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to six weeks in advance, walk-in appointments were available every morning, and urgent appointments were 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. People told us on the day that they were able to get appointments when they needed them.

- 69.7% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 77.8% and national average of 74.9%.
- 77.7% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone (CCG average 72.4%, national average 73.3%).
- 74.1% patients described their experience of making an appointment as good (CCG average 71.5%, national average 73.3%).

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, including a poster in the waiting area, and a complaints form available at reception.

We looked at seven complaints received in the last 12 months and found that these were dealt with in a timely way, and in accordance with the practice's policy. Lessons were learnt from concerns and complaints and action was taken to as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, the practice had received a complaint about the attitude of a locum GP. The practice investigated this complaint, and decided not to re-employ that particular locum in the future. The practice also took action to employ only two regular locums who had received positive feedback from 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 clear 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.
- Staff had a comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice.
- 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.

Leadership, openness and transparency

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

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The management team encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The practice gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology
- They 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 that the practice held monthly practice meetings, and weekly clinical meetings.
- Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and confident in doing so and felt supported if they did.
- Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

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

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

- It had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met on a regular basis, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, the practice had open access morning appointment, which patients queued for. The PPG suggested that the practice implemented a ticket system, whereby patients were given a ticket corresponding with their place in the queue. This was implemented, and meant that patients were able to sit and wait for their appointment rather than maintain a place in a queue.
- The practice had also gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, discussions and 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.