

The Ingham Practice

Quality Report

Lincoln Road
Ingham
Lincoln
LN1 2XF

Tel: 01522 730269

Website: www.theinghampractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 26 September 2016

Date of publication: 12/04/2017

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

Ratings

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

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	7
What people who use the service say	10
Areas for improvement	10

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	11
Background to The Ingham Practice	11
Why we carried out this inspection	11
How we carried out this inspection	11
Detailed findings	13

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Ingham Practice on 26 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.
- The practice produced a regular infection prevention and control (IPC) newsletter to ensure all staff were regularly updated regarding related topics.
- 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.
- The practice ensured a system of clinical supervision was in place for all members of the nursing team which included a combination of group supervision and also one to one sessions. We saw examples of clinical supervision records during our inspection.
- 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.

Summary of findings

- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Review process for significant events to include after death patient reviews.

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.
- 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.
- Clinical and dispensary staff received alerts from the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA).

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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.
- The practice had a carers register in place and written information was available to direct carers to the various avenues of support available to them.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services.

- Practice staff reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group to secure improvements to services where these were identified.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.
- The practice provided a minor surgery service in purpose built facilities. Procedures included vasectomy and carpal tunnel surgery, other local practices were able to refer their patients into this service.
- The practice had access to physiotherapy and ultrasound scan services for patients which were provided by external providers who are located in the practice.

Good



Are services well-led?

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

- The practice had a clear vision and strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to it.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings.

Good



Summary of findings

- There was an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This included arrangements to monitor and improve quality and identify risk.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the duty of candour. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The practice had systems in place for notifiable safety incidents and ensured this information was shared with staff to ensure appropriate action was taken.
- The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active.
- The PPG provided support to the practice with arrangements for patients to have access to a scheme whereby they could access a Tuesday lunch club which was a local community based scheme.
- The practice participated in a sponsorship scheme whereby it sponsored book vouchers which were provided to a local primary school for pupils to purchase books. The practice also provided an annual educational school visit at a local primary school.
- The practice supported local open churches and provided healthy snacks and flower displays for the church.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels.

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

Older people

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

- The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening. For example, 75% of female patients aged 50-70 years of age had attended for breast cancer screening within six months of invitation months compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 74%.
- Age Concern primary care navigators attended the practice on a weekly basis to give advice and arranged care and support to patients who required this.

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 99% which was higher than the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 90%. Exception reporting rate was 10% which was comparable to the CCG average of 10% and lower than the national average of 12%.
- 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 multi-disciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

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

Good



Summary of findings

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations.
- Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this.
- The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 90%, which was higher than the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 74%.
- Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies.
- We saw positive examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.
- The practice offered a text reminder service to remind patients of their appointment date and time.

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 appointments on a Tuesday each week until 7pm.

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.
- 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.

Good



Summary of findings

- 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.

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).

- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100% which was the maximum amount of points available compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 93%. Exception reporting rate was 20% which was higher than the CCG average of 15% and the national average of 11%.
- The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of patients experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- The practice carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.
- The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The practice had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency where they may have been experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results were published in July 2016. The results showed the practice was performing higher than local and national averages. 221 survey forms were distributed and 116 were returned. This represented 3.4% of the practice's patient list.

- 97% of patients found it easy to get through to this practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 73%.
- 82% 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 77% and the national average of 76%.
- 91% of patients described the overall experience of this GP practice as good compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 85%.
- 85% 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 85% and the national average of 80%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received six comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

We did not speak with patients during the inspection however, we did speak with three members of the patient participation group. These patients said they were satisfied with the care they received and thought staff were approachable, committed, understanding and caring.

During our inspection, we observed friends and family test feedback which had been collated by the practice, these feedback results were shared with practice staff during team meetings. Results showed 96% of patients who had responded said they would recommend this practice to their friends and family.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

- Review process for significant events to include after death patient reviews.

The Ingham Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector. The team included a GP specialist advisor.

Background to The Ingham Practice

The Ingham Practice provides primary medical services to approximately 3,385 patients and is situated in a rural village in Lincolnshire. The practice is located in a purpose built health centre since 1995, all clinical areas are located on the ground floor and are accessible to patients with disabilities and those who use wheelchairs. An extension to the premises had recently been completed which included a purpose built minor surgery suite. The practice has an on-site dispensary and dispenses to approximately 98% of the patient list. The newly built minor surgery suite includes a new dispensary area however this was not in use at the time of the inspection, it was expected that it would be used in the future dependent upon requirements. The practice is a member of the dispensing services quality scheme (DSQS).

It is located within the area covered by Lincolnshire West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). It is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of; the treatment of disease, disorder and injury; diagnostic and screening procedures; maternity and midwifery services and surgical procedures.

At the time of our inspection, the practice employed one senior GP partner who had worked at the practice for approximately 25 years, one part-time locum GP, one advanced nurse practitioner and one locum advanced

nurse practitioner, two senior nurses, one practice nurse, one clinical audit nurse, two health care assistants (HCA), one dispensary supervisor, one dispenser and one dispensing assistant, three receptionists and three secretaries. The practice also employed one housekeeper. All staff were supported by a business partner who carries out practice manager duties who is supported by a general manager.

The practice is open from 8am until 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are available between these times. The practice offers extended hours appointments on a Tuesday each week until 7pm.

The practice has General Medical Services (GMS) contract which is a contract between the GP partners and the CCG under delegated responsibilities from NHS England.

The practice has a higher number of patients between the ages of 45 and 74 years of age compared to the England average.

The practice provides on-line services for patients such as to book routine appointments, ordering repeat prescriptions and access to detailed summary care record.

The practice is part of a federation called 'IMP healthcare' which includes a group of practices within NHS Lincolnshire West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) who meet on a regular basis.

When the surgery is closed GP out-of-hours services are provided by Lincolnshire Community Health Services NHS Trust which can be contacted via NHS111.

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

Detailed findings

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 26 September 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with a range of staff including a GP, practice manager, senior practice nurse, a secretary, a receptionist and members of the dispensary team and spoke with patients who used the service.
- Observed how patients were being cared for and talked with carers and/or family members
- Reviewed an anonymised sample of the personal care or treatment records of patients.
- Reviewed six CQC 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.
- During our inspection we reviewed ten significant events which also included events in relation to the dispensary. We looked at other incidents which included a cold chain failure in relation to the vaccination fridge and we noted that this had been dealt with appropriately. We reviewed safety records, incident reports, patient safety alerts and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. We saw evidence that a thorough analysis was carried out of all significant events reported and lessons were shared and action was taken to improve safety in the practice. Significant events were discussed in regular multi-disciplinary team meetings.
- Clinical and dispensary staff received alerts from the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). These alerts were co-ordinated and disseminated to the practice team by the practice manager. The senior dispenser was responsible for co-ordinating alerts received within the dispensary and ensuring they were actioned. We saw evidence of recent alerts received within the dispensary which had been signed by dispensary staff that they had read, understood and actioned alerts where necessary. Staff we spoke with were able to tell us about recent alerts received. We saw numerous examples of these alerts and actions taken as a result during our inspection

which showed that an effective system was in place. The practice held a log of alerts received and detailed any actions taken as a result, we noted that the log contained alerts from July 2015 to September 2016.

Overview of safety systems and processes

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

- Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. These arrangements reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. The GPs attended safeguarding meetings when possible and always provided reports where necessary for other agencies. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults relevant to their role. GPs were trained to child protection or child safeguarding level 3. Advanced nurse practitioners and practice nurses were trained to level 3. The practice ensured regular reviews were carried out of all vulnerable adults and children, we saw meeting minutes dated June 2016 which showed that these patients had been reviewed during a multi-disciplinary meeting.
- A notice in the waiting room advised patients that chaperones were available if required. All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- The practice maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. The senior practice nurse was the infection control clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any

Are services safe?

improvements identified as a result. The last audit had been carried out in July 2016, we saw evidence of an action plan which had been implemented as a result of this audit. The practice produced a regular infection prevention and control (IPC) newsletter to ensure all staff were regularly updated regarding related topics. We observed newsletters which had been produced in May and August 2016 which included updates relating to waste management, use of PPE and an update from the infection control lead nurse following a recent IPC link meeting.

- The practice held evidence of Hepatitis B status and other immunisation records for clinical staff members who had direct contact with patients' blood for example through use of sharps.
- The practice carried out regular checks to ensure that members of the nursing team were registered with the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC).
- The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and vaccines, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing, security and disposal). Processes were in place for handling repeat prescriptions which included the review of high risk medicines. The practice carried out regular medicines audits, with the support of the local CCG pharmacy teams, to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing. Blank prescription forms and pads were securely stored and there were systems in place to monitor their use.
- One of the nurses had qualified and was competent to prescribe medicines and deal with patients' clinical needs. This nurse had received mentorship and support from the medical staff for this extended role. Patient Group Directions had been adopted by the practice to allow nurses to administer medicines in line with legislation. Health Care Assistants were trained to administer vaccines and medicines against a patient specific prescription or direction from a prescriber.
- The practice ensured a system of clinical supervision was in place for all members of the nursing team which included a combination of group supervision and also one to one sessions. We saw examples of clinical supervision records during our inspection.
- 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 or 'near misses' were recorded for learning and the practice had a system in place to monitor the quality of the dispensing process. 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.
- There were a range of standard operating procedures (SOPs) for the staff responsible for dispensing medicines. SOPs are documents that explain a procedure for staff to follow. (These help to ensure all staff members work in a consistent and safe way. All SOPs had been reviewed on a regular basis). We observed that the practice held 48 SOPs during our inspection which had been signed and dated by all dispensary staff.
- Processes were in place to check that all medicines in the dispensary were within their expiry date and suitable for use. We saw evidence of regular checks being undertaken. We checked numerous medicines during our inspection within the dispensary and all were within their expiry date.
- Expired and unwanted medicines were disposed of in accordance with waste regulations, and there was a procedure in place to ensure dispensary stock was within expiry date, all stock we checked was in date. Dispensary staff told us about procedures for monitoring prescriptions that had not been collected. There was a system in place for the management of repeat prescriptions.
- There was an effective barcode scanning system in place within the dispensary for use when receiving and dispensing medicines. This system also provided a second check when dispensing medicines and reduced the risk of errors when handling medicines.

Are services safe?

- During our inspection, we observed that all vaccinations and immunisations were stored appropriately. We saw that there was a process in place to check and record vaccination fridge temperatures on a daily basis. We saw evidence of a cold chain policy in place which had been reviewed regularly, (cold chain is the maintenance of refrigerated temperatures for vaccines). We observed that vaccination fridges also had a temperature data logger device installed to supplement the minimum/maximum temperature thermometers used by dispensary staff to record temperatures on a daily basis.
- We reviewed five 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. The practice had a process in place to ensure that all staff had a new DBS check carried out periodically.

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 which had been carried out by an external specialist and there was a poster in the reception area which identified local health and safety representatives. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments in place which had last been carried out in June 2016 by an external specialist and the practice carried out regular fire drills, we saw fire drill records and noted that the last drill had taken place in April 2016. 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 risk register in place which included 13 risk assessments which had been implemented 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. We saw examples of these rotas during our inspection.

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 and copies of the plan were held off site by key members of 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 had a 'NICE theme of the month' to communicate NICE guidance to clinical staff.
- The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice used the information collected for the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The most recent published results were 99.5% of the total number of points available. Overall exception reporting rate was 9% (Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients are unable to attend a review meeting or certain medicines cannot be prescribed because of side effects).

This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets. Data from 2015-16 showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was 99% which was higher than the CCG average of 91% and the national average of 90%. Exception reporting rate was 10% which was comparable to the CCG average of 10% and lower than the national average of 12%.
- Performance for mental health related indicators was 100% which was the maximum amount of points available compared to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 93%. Exception reporting rate was 20% which was higher than the CCG average of 15% and the national average of 11%.

There was evidence of quality improvement including clinical audit.

The practice had an ongoing clinical audit programme in place. We looked at four clinical audits which included two full cycle audits which had been carried out. For example, one audit we looked at was an audit of patients prescribed anticoagulant therapy which included a review of their clinical records to ensure that these patients remain within their therapeutic target range within the previous 12 months. The first cycle audit showed that 36% of these patients had not remained within their therapeutic range. These patients were reviewed and re-audited over a three month period using new monitoring software implemented by the practice to monitor these levels, the outcome of a further audit showed that 97% of patients were within their therapeutic range.

- The practice participated in local audits, national benchmarking, accreditation, peer review and research.
- The practice held regular audit review meetings to discuss outcomes of clinical audits carried out.

Effective staffing

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

- The practice had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff. This covered such topics as safeguarding, infection prevention and control, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The practice could demonstrate how they ensured role-specific training and updating for relevant staff. For example, for those reviewing patients with long-term conditions. Three members of the nursing team were trained in cervical smear taking. Members of the nursing team received support from the practice in relation to their revalidation requirements. A senior practice nurse was trained in the management of 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet their learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support, one-to-one meetings, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for revalidating GPs. Not all staff had received an appraisal within the last 12 months however, we were informed that all staff were due to have an appraisal in October 2016.
- 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. Staff members had also completed dementia awareness training and members of the reception team were working towards an NVQ in customer service.

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 monthly basis when care plans were routinely reviewed and updated for patients with complex needs.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

When providing care and treatment for children and young people, staff carried out assessments of capacity to consent in line with relevant guidance.

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

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 90%, which was higher than the CCG average of 77% and the national average of 74%. 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. For example, 75% of female patients aged 50-70 years of age had attended for breast cancer screening within six months of invitation months compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 74%. 59% of patients aged 60-69 years of age had been screened for bowel cancer within six months of invitation compared to the CCG average of 61% and the national average of 56%. 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.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG/national averages. For example, childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under two year olds ranged from 97.5% to 100% and five year olds 93.5%.

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, dignity, respect and compassion

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

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

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

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

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

- 90% 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%.
- 91% of patients said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 90% and the national average of 87%.
- 94% of patients said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 93% and the national average of 92%.

- 90% of patients said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 89% and the national average of 85%.
- 96% 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 the 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 in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 84% 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%.
- 84% 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 the national average of 82%.
- 93% of patients said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 85%.

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

- Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.

Are services caring?

- Sign language services were provided via a service called 'Deaf Links'.
- 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 74 patients as carers (1.6% of the practice list). 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 by telephone call to give advice on how to find a support service.

Patients who were at end of life were provided with the senior GPs personal mobile telephone number for use in an emergency.

Age Concern primary care navigators attended the practice on a weekly basis to give advice and arranged care and support to patients who required this. During our inspection, we saw a positive example of a case study where the primary care navigator had encouraged a patient to accept a referral into a local falls service for assessment which had seen positive improvements for this patient following intervention.

The practice provided information folders in the patients waiting area to give patients advice which included carers support, bereavement services the Alzheimer's society and Age UK.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

- The practice offered extended hours appointments each on a Tuesday evening until 7pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- There were longer appointments available for patients with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients and patients who had clinical needs which resulted in difficulty attending the practice.
- Same day appointments were available for children and those patients with medical problems that require same day consultation.
- Patients were able to receive travel vaccinations available on the NHS as well as those only available privately.
- There were disabled facilities, a hearing loop and translation services available.
- The practice provided a minor surgery service in purpose built facilities. Procedures included vasectomy and carpal tunnel surgery, other local practices were able to refer their patients into this service.
- The practice had access to physiotherapy and ultrasound scan services for patients which were provided by external providers who were located in the practice.
- The practice is one of four GP practices in Lincolnshire which has been providing a 'violent patient scheme' enhanced service for approximately three years. This service was in place to accommodate patients with challenging behaviour.

Access to the service

The practice was open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments were available from 8.30am until 9.30am each day with the exception of a Wednesday when appointments were available from 7.30am. From 9.30am onwards the practice offered an open access clinic which gave patients the opportunity to access an appointment on a walk in basis. Pre-bookable appointments were available each afternoon. Extended hours appointments were

offered on a Tuesday evening until 7pm. In addition to pre-bookable appointments that could be booked up to two weeks in advance, telephone consultations and 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 higher than local and national averages.

- 85% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 76%.
- 97% of patients said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 78% and the national average of 73%.

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

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.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

We looked at 13 complaints received since August 2015 months and found that these were satisfactorily handled, dealt with in a timely way and that there was openness and transparency in dealing with the complaint. All complaints we looked at had been received verbally, there had been no written complaints received within the past 12 months at the time of our inspection however, the practice held a detailed record of all complaints received either verbally or written and a record was held of all actions taken which included lessons learned as a result and any discussion or review of the complaint which may have taken place during a clinical governance meeting.

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 which was detailed in the practice charter to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. The practice charter and practice team ethos was clearly displayed within the practice leaflet. Staff we spoke with knew and understood the vision and values of the practice.

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. During our inspection, we looked at numerous clinical and non-clinical policies which included safeguarding, consent, health and safety, business continuity and chaperone. All policies we looked at had been reviewed on a regular basis, all staff had access to these policies and procedures.
- A comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice was maintained
- A programme of continuous clinical and internal audit was used to monitor quality and to make improvements.
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions.

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

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

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

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, the PPG provided support to the practice in the running of a scheme of which the practice had established and contributed approximately £1000 per year towards the running costs for the past 25 years whereby patients could access a

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Tuesday lunch club which was a local community based scheme. This scheme enabled patients to pay five pounds which provided the patient with a three course meal and social activities. This scheme helped to improve social isolation for patients. The practice also held an annual Christmas social event which included a raffle for patients and staff.

- The practice participated in a sponsorship scheme whereby it sponsored book vouchers which were provided to a local primary school for pupils to purchase books. The practice also provided an annual educational school visit at a local primary school.
- The practice supported local open churches and provided healthy snacks and flower displays for the church.

- The practice had gathered feedback from staff generally 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.