

Wyke Regis Medical Practice

Quality Report

Wyke Regis Health Centre
Portland Road
Wyke Regis
Weymouth
Dorset
DT4 9BE

Tel: 01305 782226

Website: www.wykeregishealthcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 17 June 2015

Date of publication: 13/08/2015

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	6
What people who use the service say	8
Areas for improvement	8

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	9
Background to Wyke Regis Medical Practice	9
Why we carried out this inspection	9
How we carried out this inspection	9
Detailed findings	12

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Wyke Regis Health Centre, Portland Road, Wyke Regis, Weymouth, Dorset, DT4 9BE on 17 June 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

Specifically, we found the practice to be good for providing safe, well-led, effective, caring and responsive services. It was also good for providing services for the care of older people, people with long-term conditions, care of families, children and young people, working-age people (including those recently retired and students), care of people whose circumstances may make them vulnerable and people experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia).

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

- Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed.

- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed, with the exception of those relating to recruitment checks.

- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered following best practice guidance. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and planned.

- 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.

Summary of findings

However there were areas of practice where the provider should make improvements:

The practice whistleblowing policy covered how to raise concerns internally and should include how to raise a concern externally and how the whistle blower is protected by law.

The practice policies and information for staff which are held on computers should have a clear indexing or version control system to ensure staff can find the most up to date policy.

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. Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Lessons were learned and communicated widely to support improvement. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed. Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. There were enough staff to keep patients safe.

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 referred to guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence and used it routinely. Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered in line with current legislation. This included assessing capacity and promoting good health. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and appropriate training planned to meet these needs. There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff. Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams.

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. 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.

Good



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

Good



Summary of findings

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.

Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as good for being well-led. It had a clear vision and strategy. 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 were systems in place to monitor and improve quality and identify risk. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group was active. Staff had received inductions, regular performance reviews and attended staff meetings and events.

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. Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients were good for conditions commonly found in older people. The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population and had a range of enhanced services, for example, in dementia and end of life care. It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and rapid access appointments for those with enhanced needs.

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. 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 medicine 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 accident and emergency (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. Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. We saw good examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age people (including those recently retired and students). The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered

Good



Summary of findings

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 reflected the needs for this age group.

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 had carried out annual health checks for people with a learning disability and these patients had received a follow-up. 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). 94.4% of people experiencing poor mental health had received an annual physical health check. The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia. 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 (A&E) where they may have been experiencing poor mental health. Staff had received training on how to care for people with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

We received 11 completed patient comment cards and spoke with five patients at the time of our inspection visit.

Of the 11 people who provided feedback all of the comments were very positive about the practice as a whole and patients reported that all the staff were kind and helpful, and treated patients with dignity and respect. The practice waiting area was comfortable and relaxing and the nurses put the patients at ease.

Patients we spoke with were extremely positive about the care and treatment provided by the GPs and nurses and the assistance provided by other members of the practice team. They told us that they were treated with dignity and respect and some commented that the care provided was excellent.

Feedback placed on the NHS choices website was both positive and negative about the service received by patients. Although there appeared to more positive feedback in the last five months.

There was a patient participation group (PPG) in place and this group supported the practice with their surveys. Requests for volunteers to join the PPG were advertised through the practice website, in a leaflet and on posters displayed in the waiting area.

The latest opening hour's survey showed that 86.36% of patients surveyed were happy with opening times.

Areas for improvement

Action the service SHOULD take to improve

The practice whistleblowing policy covered how to raise concerns internally and should include how to raise a concern externally and how the whistle blower is protected by law.

The practice policies and information for staff which are held on computers should have a clear indexing or version control system to ensure staff can find the most up to date policy.

Wyke Regis Medical 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 and practice manager specialist advisor.

Background to Wyke Regis Medical Practice

Wyke Regis Medical Practice is located in purpose-built premises and provides care and treatment to 7878 patients living in and around Wyke Regis and Weymouth. It is in a seaside resort so additionally provides emergency care and treatment to holidaymakers. On the same site as the practice are a dentist and local library.

The practice consists of six GP partners, three male and three female, who are supported by a nursing team of six, a nurse practitioner, a management team of six and a reception/admin team of nine. The practice has a General Medical Services contract with NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities.

Also supporting the practice to deliver this service is a team of health and social care professionals who are based in the practice building. Over the years by working together as a team the practice has been able to build up good working relationships with these professionals. The staff attached are: district nurses, health visitors, midwives councillors, a diabetic nurse specialist, drug & alcohol advisors, health & social care co-ordinators, chiropodists, anticoagulation nurses, a community matron and a social worker.

Opening Times: Monday to Friday 8.30am - 1pm, 2pm - 6.30pm. Additionally the practice offers late appointments on Monday evenings, finishing at 7:30pm, and also early morning appointments on Tuesday mornings from 7:30am.

The practice offers a range of appointment types such as same day, book one day in advance, book one week in advance and book 2 weeks in advance. The purpose of the different appointment types is to limit the number of appointments available to book at any one time so that entire surgeries are not fully booked weeks in advance.

To obtain an appointment patients telephone, attend the practice or alternatively if they have registered to do so book and cancel appointments online. Pre-bookable appointments can be booked up to eight weeks in advance and same day appointments are available to book from 8.30am on the day.

Out of hours cover is provided by South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust.

The practice considered its general patient population as predominantly white, middle class and English. There is a relatively low unemployment rate. The practice has a patient population mix of all ages. There are a lower percentage of patients in the 18 years and younger age group than the England average, and a higher percentage in the 65 years and over age group compared with the Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) area and the England average. Wyke Regis Medical Practice has a higher level of income deprivation affecting older people than the CCG area but lower than the England average. Health care priorities in Dorset include anxiety, depression and dementia care, smoking, type 2 diabetes, circulatory disease, and harm caused by road traffic collisions. Compared to the England population there are more people with a long term health condition or disability living in Dorset.

Detailed findings

The practice was a training practice, doctors who were training to be qualified as GPs were offered extended appointments and had access to a senior GP throughout the day for support. We received positive feedback from the doctor we spoke with.

This practice had been previously inspected on 6 June 2014 as part of the CQC pilot inspections to test our new methodology of inspection. At that inspection the practice was not given a rating and we found one area that we asked the practice to make improvements on.

At this inspection we saw that the practice had addressed the previous essential standards that were not being met. They had taken action to meet the standards required. This was requirements relating to workers in relation to risk assessments for staff considered by the practice to not require a criminal record check.

Wyke Regis Medical Practice provides its services at Wyke Regis Health Centre, Portland Road, Wyke Regis, Weymouth, Dorset DT4 9BE.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our 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. This 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.

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.

How we carried out this inspection

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we held about the practice and asked other organisations to share what they knew about the practice. Organisations included the local Healthwatch, NHS England, and the clinical commissioning group.

We carried out an announced inspection on 17 June 2015.

We asked the practice to send us some information before the inspection took place to enable us to prioritise our areas for inspection. This information included; practice policies, procedures and some audits. We also reviewed the practice website and looked at information posted on the NHS Choices website.

During our visit we spoke with a range of staff which included GPs, nursing and other clinical staff, receptionists, administrators, secretaries and the practice manager. We also spoke with patients who used the practice. We reviewed comment cards and feedback where patients and members of the public shared their views and experiences of the practice before and during our visit.

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

Detailed findings

- People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record

The practice prioritised safety and used a range of information to identify risks and improve patient safety. For example, reported incidents and national patient safety alerts as well as comments and complaints received from patients. The staff we spoke with were aware of their responsibilities to raise concerns, and knew how to report incidents and near misses. For example a recent incident occurred where a patient waiting to be seen misheard a name being called out. The patient was seen and immediately the mistake was identified. The patient did not wish to take the matter further and a learning point was that future patients would always have their name and date of birth checked by the GP before a consultation began.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports and minutes of meetings, where these were discussed, for the last 12 months. This showed the practice had managed these consistently over time and so could show evidence of a safe track record over the long term.

Learning and improvement from safety incidents

The practice had a system in place for reporting, recording and monitoring significant events, incidents and accidents. We reviewed records of eight significant events that had occurred during the last 12 months and saw this system was followed appropriately. Significant events was a standing item on the practice meeting agenda and significant events were discussed at clinical update meetings monthly to review actions from past significant events and complaints. There was evidence that the practice had learned from these and that the findings were shared with relevant staff. Staff, including receptionists, administrators and nursing staff, knew how to raise an issue for consideration at the meetings and they felt encouraged to do so.

Staff used incident forms on the practice intranet and sent completed forms to the practice manager. They showed us the system used to manage and monitor incidents. We saw records were completed in a comprehensive and timely manner. We saw evidence of action taken as a result and that the learning had been shared. We saw a significant events folder. This contained minutes of meetings to discuss the events. Formal reporting forms for each case

and correspondence were included in the folder. Where patients had been affected by something that had gone wrong they were given an apology and informed of the actions taken to prevent the same thing happening again.

National patient safety alerts were disseminated by the practice manager to practice staff. Staff we spoke with were able to give examples of recent alerts that were relevant to the care they were responsible for. They also told us alerts were sent to managers and discussed at meetings to ensure all staff were aware of any that were relevant to the practice and where they needed to take action.

Reliable safety systems and processes including safeguarding

The practice had systems to manage and review risks to vulnerable children, young people and adults. We looked at training records which showed that all staff had received relevant role specific training on safeguarding. We asked members of medical, nursing and administrative staff about their most recent training. Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in older people, vulnerable adults and children. They were also aware of their responsibilities and knew how to share information, properly record any safeguarding concerns and how to contact the relevant agencies in working hours and out of normal hours. Contact details were easily accessible.

The practice had appointed a dedicated GP as lead in safeguarding vulnerable adults and children. They had been trained in both adult and child safeguarding and could demonstrate they had the necessary competency and training to enable them to fulfil this role. All staff we spoke with were aware who the lead was and who to speak with in the practice if they had a safeguarding concern.

There was a system to highlight vulnerable patients on the practice's electronic records. This included information to make staff aware of any relevant issues when patients attended appointments; for example children subject to child protection plans. There was active engagement in local safeguarding procedures and effective working with other relevant organisations including health visitors and the local authority.

There was a chaperone policy, which was visible on the waiting room noticeboard and in consulting rooms and on the practice web site. (A chaperone is a person who acts as a safeguard and witness for a patient and health care professional during a medical examination or procedure).

Are services safe?

All nursing staff, including health care assistants, had been trained to be a chaperone. Some of the receptionists had also undertaken training and understood their responsibilities when acting as chaperones, including where to stand to be able to observe the examination. Reception staff were only used for chaperoning if no other staff were available and the patient was unable to make another appointment. All staff undertaking chaperone duties had Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. (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).

Medicines management

We checked medicines stored in the treatment rooms and medicine refrigerators and found they were stored securely and were only accessible to authorised staff. There was a policy for ensuring that medicines were kept at the required temperatures, which described the action to take in the event of a potential failure. Records showed fridge temperature checks were carried out which ensured medication was stored at the appropriate temperature.

Processes were in place to check medicines were within their expiry date and suitable for use. All the medicines we checked were within their expiry dates. Expired and unwanted medicines were disposed of in line with waste regulations.

All prescriptions were reviewed and signed by a GP before they were given to the patient. Both blank prescription forms for use in printers and those for hand written prescriptions were handled in accordance with national guidance as these were tracked through the practice and kept securely at all times.

We saw records of practice meetings that noted the actions taken in response to a review of prescribing data. For example, several cases had been reported in Dorset of serious consequences of prescribing two specific medicines together. The practice had created a system alert protocol that challenged anyone who attempted to prescribe one of the medicines to a patient already taking the other.

The practice had clear systems in place to monitor the prescribing of controlled drugs (medicines that require extra checks and special storage arrangements because of

their potential for misuse). They carried out regular audits of the prescribing of controlled drugs. Staff were aware of how to raise concerns around controlled drugs with the controlled drugs accountable officer in their area.

We saw a positive culture in the practice for reporting and learning from medicines incidents and errors. Incidents were logged efficiently and then reviewed promptly. This helped make sure appropriate actions were taken to minimise the chance of similar errors occurring again.

The practice had established a service for patients to pick up their dispensed prescriptions at two pharmacies and had systems in place to monitor how these medicines were collected. They also had arrangements in place to ensure that patients collecting medicines from these locations were given all the relevant information they required.

Cleanliness and infection control

We observed the premises to be clean and tidy. We saw there were cleaning schedules in place and cleaning records were kept. Patients we spoke with told us they always found the practice clean and had no concerns about cleanliness or infection control.

An infection control policy and supporting procedures were available for staff to refer to, which enabled them to plan and implement measures to control infection. For example, personal protective equipment including disposable gloves, aprons and coverings were available for staff to use and staff were able to describe how they would use these to comply with the practice's infection control policy. An example seen was a personal protective equipment audit completed in March 2015 and an infection control audit completed in March 2015.

The practice had a lead for infection control who had undertaken further training to enable them to provide advice on the practice infection control policy and carry out staff training. All staff received induction training about infection control specific to their role and received annual updates. We saw evidence that the lead had carried out audits for each of the last three years and that any improvements identified for action were completed on time. Minutes of practice meetings showed that the findings of the audits were discussed.

Notices about hand hygiene techniques were displayed in staff and patient toilets. Hand washing sinks with hand soap, hand gel and hand towel dispensers were available in treatment rooms.

Are services safe?

The practice had a policy for the management, testing and investigation of legionella (a bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings). We saw records that confirmed the practice was carrying out regular checks in line with this policy to reduce the risk of infection to staff and patients.

Equipment

Staff we spoke with told us they had equipment to enable them to carry out diagnostic examinations, assessments and treatments. They told us that all equipment was tested and maintained regularly and we saw equipment maintenance logs and other records that confirmed this. A schedule of testing was in place. We saw evidence of calibration of relevant equipment; for example weighing scales, spirometers, blood pressure measuring devices and the fridge thermometer. The practice had a contract with an outside company to deal with equipment checking annually.

Staffing and recruitment

The practice had a recruitment policy that set out the standards it followed when recruiting clinical and non-clinical staff. Records we looked at contained evidence 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 DBS.

Staff told us about the arrangements for planning and monitoring the number of staff and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs. We saw there was a rota system in place for all the different staffing groups to ensure that enough staff were on duty. There was also an arrangement in place for members of staff, including nursing and administrative staff, to cover each other's annual leave.

Staff told us there were usually enough staff to maintain the smooth running of the practice and there were always enough staff on duty to keep patients safe. We saw records to demonstrate that actual staffing levels and skill mix met planned staffing requirements.

Monitoring safety and responding to risk

The practice had systems, processes and policies in place to manage and monitor risks to patients, staff and visitors to the practice. These included regular checks of the building, the environment, medicines management,

staffing, dealing with emergencies and equipment. The practice also had a health and safety policy. Health and safety information was displayed for staff to see and there was an identified health and safety representative.

Identified risks were monitored and discussed. Each risk was assessed and rated and mitigating actions recorded to reduce and manage the risk. Risks associated with service and staffing changes (both planned and unplanned) were evaluated. We saw an example of this where a member of staff was on sick leave and that person's duties were being covered by two nominated staff members. The meeting minutes we reviewed showed risks were discussed at managers' meetings and within team meetings.

We saw that staff were able to identify and respond to changing risks to patients including deteriorating health and well-being or medical emergencies. For example: the practice had a carers lead who attended all the locality carers meetings and kept a carers corner and carers register to ensure that carers and patients were supported and monitored and made aware of all the services that were available to them.

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

The practice had arrangements in place to manage emergencies. Records showed that all staff had received training in basic life support or were booked to attend a course. Emergency equipment was available including access to oxygen and an automated external defibrillator (used in cardiac emergencies). When we asked members of staff, they all knew the location of this equipment and records confirmed that it was checked regularly. We checked that the pads for the automated external defibrillator were within their expiry date. The notes of the practice's significant event meetings showed that staff had discussed a medical emergency concerning a patient and that the practice had learned from this appropriately.

Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. These included those for the treatment of cardiac arrest, anaphylaxis and hypoglycaemia. Processes were also in place to check whether emergency medicines were within their expiry date and suitable for use. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.

A business continuity plan was in place to deal with a range of emergencies that may impact on the daily operation of

Are services safe?

the practice. Each risk was rated and mitigating actions recorded to reduce and manage the risk. Risks identified included power failure, adverse weather, unplanned sickness and access to the building. The document also contained relevant contact details for staff to refer to. For example, contact details of a heating company to contact if the heating system failed. The plan was last reviewed in 2015.

The practice had carried out a fire risk assessment in 2013 that included actions required to maintain fire safety. Records showed that staff were up to date with fire training and that they practised regular fire drills.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The GPs and nursing staff we spoke with could clearly outline the rationale for their approaches to treatment. They were familiar with current best practice guidance, and accessed guidelines from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and from local commissioners. We saw that guidance from local commissioners was readily accessible in all the clinical and consulting rooms.

We discussed with the GPs and nurse(s) how NICE guidance was received into the practice. They told us this was downloaded from the website and disseminated to staff. We saw minutes of clinical meetings which showed this was then discussed and implications for the practice's performance and patients were identified and required actions agreed. Staff we spoke with all demonstrated a good level of understanding and knowledge of NICE guidance and local guidelines.

Staff described how they carried out comprehensive assessments which covered all health needs and was in line with these national and local guidelines. They explained how care was planned to meet identified needs and how patients were reviewed at required intervals to ensure their treatment remained effective. For example, patients with diabetes were having regular health checks and were being referred to other services when required. Feedback from patients confirmed they were referred to other services or hospital when required.

The GPs told us they led in specialist clinical areas such as diabetes, heart disease and asthma and the practice nurses supported this work, which allowed the practice to focus on specific conditions. Clinical staff we spoke with were open about asking for and providing colleagues with advice and support. GPs told us this supported all staff to review and discuss new best practice guidelines, for example, for the management of respiratory disorders. Our review of the clinical meeting minutes confirmed that this happened.

The practice used computerised tools to identify patients who were at high risk of admission to hospital. These patients were reviewed regularly to ensure multidisciplinary care plans were documented in their records and that their needs were being met to assist in

reducing the need for them to go into hospital. We saw that after patients were discharged from hospital they were followed up to ensure that all their needs were continuing to be met.

Discrimination was avoided when making care and treatment decisions. Interviews with GPs showed that the culture in the practice was that patients were cared for and treated based on need and the practice took account of patient's age, gender, race and culture as appropriate.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

Information about patients' care and treatment, and their outcomes, was routinely collected and monitored and this information used to improve care. Staff across the practice had key roles in monitoring and improving outcomes for patients. These roles included data input, scheduling clinical reviews, and managing child protection alerts and medicines management. The information staff collected was then collated by the practice manager and deputy practice manager to support the practice to carry out clinical audits.

The practice showed us eight clinical audits that had been undertaken in the last four years. These were completed audits where the practice was able to demonstrate the changes resulting since the initial audit. An example being a re audit of the splenectomy pathway. All patients that had a splenectomy were coded as a major active problem so that they were not overlooked. The audit showed that a high percentage of patients who had been appropriately immunised had greatly improved. All patients had been sent information about having an emergency supply of antibiotics. The audit had highlighted two patients who required a follow up for the flu/pneumovc vaccinations. Other examples included audits of Gestational Diabetes, Impaired Glucose Tolerance, Cancer Screening and referrals.

The GPs told us clinical audits were often linked to medicines management information, safety alerts or as a result of information from the quality and outcomes framework (QOF). (QOF is a voluntary incentive scheme for GP practices in the UK. The scheme financially rewards practices for managing some of the most common long-term conditions and for the implementation of preventative measures). For example, we saw an audit regarding the prescribing improvement work undertaken in the last year. Following the audit, the GPs carried out

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

medication reviews for patients who were prescribed various medicines and altered their prescribing practice to ensure it aligned with national guidelines. GPs maintained records showing how they had evaluated the service and documented the success of any changes and shared this with all prescribers in the practice.

The practice also used the information collected for the QOF and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets, It achieved 98.6% of the total QOF target in 2014, which was above the national average of 94.2%. Specific examples to demonstrate this included:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was better compared to the national average.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was better than the national average.
- Performance for mental health related and hypertension QOF indicators were better than the national average.
- The dementia diagnosis rate was comparable to the national average.

The practice was aware of all the areas where performance was not in line with national or clinical commissioning group (CCG) figures and we saw action plans setting out how these were being addressed.

The practice was making use of clinical audit tools, clinical supervision and staff meetings to assess the performance of clinical staff. The staff we spoke with discussed how, as a group, they reflected on the outcomes being achieved and areas where this could be improved. Staff spoke positively about the culture in the practice around audit and quality improvement, noting that there was an expectation that all clinical staff should undertake at least one audit a year.

The practice's prescribing rates were also similar to national figures. There was a protocol for repeat prescribing which followed national guidance. This required staff to regularly check patients receiving repeat prescriptions had been reviewed by the GP. They also checked all routine health checks were completed for long-term conditions such as diabetes and that the latest prescribing guidance was being used. The IT system flagged up relevant medicines alerts when the GP was

prescribing medicines. We saw evidence that after receiving an alert, the GPs had reviewed the use of the medicine in question and, where they continued to prescribe it, outlined the reason why they decided this was necessary.

The practice had made use of the gold standards framework for end of life care. It had a palliative care register and had regular internal as well as multidisciplinary meetings to discuss the care and support needs of patients and their families.

The practice also kept a register of patients identified as being at high risk of admission to hospital and of those in various vulnerable groups. Structured annual reviews were also undertaken for people with long term conditions (e.g. diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary and disease heart failure).

The practice participated in local benchmarking run by the CCG. This is a process of evaluating performance data from the practice and comparing it to similar practices in the area. This benchmarking data showed the practice had outcomes that were comparable to other services in the area. For example the practice worked closely with Dorset CCG and any incidents identified relating to the hospital or services provided by secondary care were reported via an information gathering system.

Effective staffing

Practice staffing included medical, nursing, managerial and administrative staff. We reviewed staff training records and saw that all staff were up to date with attending courses such as annual basic life support. We noted a good skill mix among the GPs with a number having additional training in female health and dermatology, musculoskeletal interests, interest in frail elderly, dementia, complex needs patients and palliative care. All GPs were up to date with their yearly continuing professional development requirements and all either had been revalidated or had a date for revalidation. (Every GP is appraised annually, and undertakes a fuller assessment called revalidation every five years. Only when revalidation has been confirmed by the General Medical Council can the GP continue to practise and remain on the performers list with NHS England).

All staff undertook annual appraisals that identified learning needs from which action plans were documented. Our interviews with staff confirmed that the practice was proactive in providing training and funding for relevant courses, for example reception staff who were trained to

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

chaperone patients. As the practice was a training practice, doctors who were training to be qualified as GPs were offered extended appointments and had access to a senior GP throughout the day for support. We received positive feedback from the GP we spoke with.

Practice nurses and health care assistants had job descriptions outlining their roles and responsibilities and provided evidence that they were trained appropriately to fulfil these duties. For example, on administration of vaccines. Those with extended roles seeing patients with long-term conditions such as asthma, COPD, diabetes and coronary heart disease were also able to demonstrate that they had appropriate training to fulfil these roles.

Working with colleagues and other services

The practice worked with other service providers to meet patients' needs and manage those of patients with complex needs. It received blood test results, and letters from the local hospital including discharge summaries, out-of-hours GP services and the 111 service both electronically and by post. The practice had a policy outlining the responsibilities of all relevant staff in passing on, reading and acting on any issues arising these communications. Out-of-hour's reports, 111 reports and pathology results were all seen and actioned by a GP on the day they were received. Discharge summaries and letters from outpatients were usually seen and actioned on the day of receipt and all within five days of receipt. The GP who saw these documents and results was responsible for the action required. All staff we spoke with understood their roles and felt the system in place worked well. There were no instances identified within the last year of any results or discharge summaries that were not followed up.

Emergency hospital admission rates for the practice were relatively low at 12.3% compared to the national average of 13.6%. The practice was commissioned for the unplanned admissions enhanced service and had a process in place to follow up patients discharged from hospital. (Enhanced services require an enhanced level of service provision above what is normally required under the core GP contract). We saw that the policy for actioning hospital communications was working well in this respect. The practice monitored patient follow-ups to ensure inappropriate follow-ups were documented and that no follow-ups were missed.

The practice held multidisciplinary team meetings every month to discuss patients with complex needs. For

example, those with multiple long term conditions, mental health problems, people from vulnerable groups, those with end of life care needs or children on the at risk register. These meetings were attended by district nurses, social workers and palliative care nurses decisions about care planning were documented in a shared care record. Staff felt this system worked well. Care plans were in place for patients with complex needs and shared with other health and social care workers as appropriate.

Information sharing

Every practice in Weymouth and Portland was federated. All the practices were using System One and all the local community services used System One.

The practice used this electronic system to communicate with other providers. For example, there was a shared system with the local GP out-of-hours provider to enable patient data to be shared in a secure and timely manner. We saw evidence there was a system for sharing appropriate information for patients with complex needs with the ambulance and out-of-hours services.

The practice had systems to provide staff with the information they needed. Staff used an electronic patient record to coordinate, document and manage patients' care. All staff were fully trained on the system. This software enabled scanned paper communications, such as those from hospital, to be saved in the system for future reference. We saw evidence that audits had been carried out to assess the completeness of these records and that action had been taken to address any shortcomings identified.

Consent to care and treatment

We found that staff were aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and their duties in fulfilling it. All the clinical staff we spoke with understood the key parts of the legislation and were able to describe how they implemented it. For some specific scenarios where capacity to make decisions was an issue for a patient, the practice had drawn up a policy to help staff. For example, with making do not attempt resuscitation orders. The policy also highlighted how patients should be supported to make their own decisions and how these should be documented in the medical notes.

Patients with a learning disability and those with dementia were supported to make decisions through the use of care plans, which they were involved in agreeing. These care

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

plans were reviewed annually (or more frequently if changes in clinical circumstances dictated it) and had a section stating the patient's preferences for treatment and decisions. When interviewed, staff gave examples of how a patient's best interests were taken into account if a patient did not have capacity to make a decision. All clinical staff demonstrated a clear understanding of the Gillick competency test. (These are used to help assess whether a child under the age of 16 has the maturity to make their own decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions).

There was a practice policy for documenting consent for specific interventions. For example, for all minor surgical procedures, a patient's verbal consent was documented in the electronic patient notes with a record of the discussion about the relevant risks, benefits and possible complications of the procedure. In addition, the practice obtained written consent for significant minor procedures and all staff were clear about when to obtain written consent. We were shown an audit that confirmed the consent process for minor surgery had been followed in 90% of cases 10% had no procedure.

Health promotion and prevention

It was practice policy to offer a health check to all new patients registering with the practice. The GP was informed of all health concerns detected and these were followed up

in a timely way. We noted a culture among the GPs to use their contact with patients to help maintain or improve mental, physical health and wellbeing. For example, by offering opportunistic chlamydia screening to patients aged 18 to 25 years and offering smoking cessation advice to smokers.

The practice's performance for the cervical screening programme was 83.3%, which was above the national average of 81.8%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. A practice nurse had responsibility for following up patients who did not attend. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel cancer and breast cancer screening.

The practice offered a full range of immunisations for children, travel vaccines and flu vaccinations in line with current national guidance. Last year's performance was above average for the majority of immunisations where comparative data was available. For example:

- Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were 72.6%, and at risk groups 47.5%. These were similar to national averages.
- Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given to under twos ranged from 95.5% to 98.7% and five year olds from 94.3% to 100%. These were comparable to CCG averages.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We reviewed the most recent data available for the practice on patient satisfaction. This included information from the national patient survey 2015, a 2014/2015 Patient Participation Enhanced Service Report undertaken by the practice's patient participation group (PPG) and patient satisfaction questionnaires sent out to patients by the practice. (A PPG is a group of patients registered with a practice who work with the practice to improve services and the quality of care).

The evidence from all these sources showed patients were satisfied with how they were treated and that this was with compassion, dignity and respect. For example, data from the national patient survey showed the practice was rated 'among the best' for patients who rated the practice as good or very good. The practice was also above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 75% said the GP was very good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 57%.
- 96% said the GP gave them enough time compared to the CCG average of 88%.
- 97% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared to the CCG average of 94%.

Patients completed CQC comment cards to tell us what they thought about the practice. We received 11 completed cards and all were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were efficient, helpful and caring. They said staff treated them with dignity and respect. We also spoke with five patients on the day of our inspection. All told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

Staff and patients told us that all consultations and treatments were carried out in the privacy of a consulting room. Disposable curtains were provided in consulting rooms and treatment rooms so that patients' privacy and dignity was maintained 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.

We saw that staff were careful to follow the practice's confidentiality policy when discussing patients' treatments so that confidential information was kept private. The practice switchboard was located behind a glass partition next the reception desk and was shielded by further glass partitions which helped keep patient information private. In response to patient and staff suggestions, a system had been introduced to allow only one patient at a time to approach the reception desk. This prevented patients overhearing potentially private conversations between patients and reception staff. We saw this system in operation during our inspection and noted that it enabled confidentiality to be maintained. In the latest patient survey 66% said they found the receptionists at the practice very helpful compared to the CCG average of 49%.

Staff told us that if they had any concerns or observed any instances of discriminatory behaviour or where patients' privacy and dignity was not being respected, they would raise these with the practice manager. These would be investigated by the practice manager and any learning identified would be shared with staff. We were shown an example of a report on a recent incident that showed appropriate actions had been taken and learning identified.

There was a clearly visible notice in the patient reception area stating the practice's zero tolerance for abusive behaviour. Receptionists told us that referring to this had helped them diffuse potentially difficult situations.

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The national patient survey 2015 showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment and generally rated the practice well in these areas. For example:

- 93% said the last GP they saw was good or very good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 84%.
- 83% said the last GP they saw was good or very good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 77%.

Are services caring?

We saw six examples of care plans for the elderly frail vulnerable patients, over 75 years of age. These were very thorough. Complex care assessments and care planning were completed at a patient's home, a care home or in the practice if the patient was mobile.

Patients we spoke with on the day of our inspection told us that health issues were discussed with them and 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 they wished to receive. Patient feedback on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

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/carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

The same patient survey information we reviewed showed patients were positive about the emotional support provided by the practice and rated it well in this area. For example:

- 92% said the last GP they spoke to was good or very good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 86%.
- 81% said the last nurse they spoke to was good or very good at treating them with care and concern compared to the CCG average of 79%.

The patients we spoke with on the day of our inspection and the comment cards we received were also consistent with this survey information. For example, these highlighted that staff responded compassionately when they needed help and provided support when required.

Notices in the patient waiting room and patient website also told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations. The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. We were shown the written information available for carers to ensure they understood the various avenues of support available to them.

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

The practice had an administration lead for carers and multi-disciplinary meetings. The lead signposted carers and looked after a register. There were prompts at meetings to ensure issues were recognised. The practice had a designated carers' corner in the reception area with a dedicated noticeboard. They encouraged carers to attend for a health checks. There were regular carers meetings at a hotel in Weymouth, a member of the practice sometimes attended (about once a year). The practice Carers Corner was located near the entrance to the practice and gave helpful information on upcoming events. Carers were asked to complete a carer's identification form and return it to the practice. On receiving the completed form a carer's pack was sent out which contained relevant information signposting access to support groups and organisations.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

We found the practice was responsive to patients' needs and had systems in place to maintain the level of service provided. The needs of the practice population were understood and systems were in place to address identified needs in the way services were delivered. An example seen was a weekly leg ulcer clinic provided for patients. The practice had a highly skilled nurse and health care assistant running these clinics. The practice had positive feedback about these clinics from patients.

The NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) told us that the practice engaged regularly with them and other practices to discuss local needs and service improvements that needed to be prioritised. We saw minutes of meetings where this had been discussed and actions agreed to implement service improvements to better meet the needs of its population. For example with regards to the leg ulcer service the practice has recently approached Dorset Health Care as to whether they can expand their contract and provide the service for patients registered at other local surgeries.

The practice had met with the Public Health team from the local authority and the CCG to discuss the implications and share information about the needs of the practice population identified by the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). The JSNA pulls together information about the health and social care needs of the population in the local area. This information was used to help focus services offered by the practice.

The practice had also implemented suggestions for improvements and made changes to the way it delivered services in response to feedback from the patient participation group (PPG). The practice had recently decided to restructure the entire reception and administration area of the practice and were consulting with PPG about a children's area.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had recognised the needs of different groups in the planning of its services. For example, longer appointment times were available for patients with

learning disabilities. The majority of the practice population were English speaking patients but access to online and telephone translation services were available if they were needed.

The premises and services had been designed to meet the needs of people with disabilities. The practice was accessible to patients with mobility difficulties as facilities were all on one level. The consulting rooms were also accessible for patients with mobility difficulties and there were access enabled toilets and baby changing facilities. There was a large waiting area with plenty of space for wheelchairs and prams. This made movement around the practice easier and helped to maintain patients' independence.

Staff told us that there were two patients registered who were of "no fixed abode" and the practice would be happy to see someone if they came to the practice asking to be seen and would register the patient so they could access services. The practice also kept registered patients who, having moved to another part of Weymouth, wished to remain a patient at the practice. There was a system for flagging vulnerability in individual patient records.

There were male and female GPs in the practice; therefore patients could choose to see a male or female doctor.

The practice provided equality and diversity training through e-learning. Staff we spoke with confirmed that they had completed the equality and diversity training in the last 12 months and that equality and diversity was regularly discussed at staff appraisals and team events.

Access to the service

The practice opening times were Monday to Friday 8.30am - 1pm, 2pm - 6.30pm. This practice offered a range of appointment types such as same day, book one day in advance, book one week in advance and book up to eight weeks in advance. The purpose of the different appointment types was to limit the number of appointments available to book at any one time so that entire surgeries are not fully booked weeks in advance.

To obtain an appointment patients telephoned, attended the practice or alternatively if they had registered, they could book and cancel appointments online. Pre-bookable appointments could be booked up to eight weeks in advance and same day appointments were available to book from 8.30am on the day.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

The practice offered late appointments on Monday evenings, finishing at 7:30pm, and also early morning appointments on Tuesday mornings from 7:30am.

Out of hour's cover was provided by South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust.

Comprehensive information was available to patients about appointments on the practice website. This included how to arrange urgent appointments and home visits and how to book appointments through the website. There were also arrangements to ensure patients received urgent medical assistance when the practice was closed. If patients called the practice when it was closed, an answerphone message gave the telephone number they should ring depending on the circumstances. Information on the out-of-hours service was provided to patients.

Longer appointments were also available for older patients, those experiencing poor mental health, patients with learning disabilities and those with long-term conditions. This also included appointments with a named GP or nurse. Visits were made to local care homes by a named GP for those patients who were unable to attend the practice.

The patient survey information we reviewed showed patients responded positively to questions about access to appointments and generally rated the practice well in these areas. For example:

- 94% were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 88%.
- 95% described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 93%.
- 83% said they usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time compared to the CCG average of 71%.
- 94% said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 82%.

Patients we spoke with were satisfied with the appointments system and said it was easy to use. They confirmed that they could see a doctor on the same day if they felt their need was urgent although this might not be their GP of choice. They also said they could see another GP if there was a wait to see the GP of their choice. Routine

appointments were available for booking up to two weeks in advance. Comments received from patients also showed that patients in urgent need of treatment had often been able to make appointments on the same day of contacting the practice. For example, a patient we spoke with had phoned the practice that morning and had obtained a non urgent appointment for that day.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a 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, for example we saw posters displayed and a summary leaflet available and information was available on the website. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint. None of the patients we spoke with had ever needed to make a complaint about the practice.

We looked at seven complaints received in the last 12 months and found these were satisfactorily handled and dealt with in a timely way. We saw the practice showed openness and transparency in with dealing with the compliant.

The practice reviewed complaints annually to detect themes or trends. We looked at the report for the last review and no themes had been identified. However, lessons learned from individual complaints had been acted on and improvements made to the quality of care as a result.

Minutes of team meetings showed that complaints were discussed to ensure all staff were able to learn and contribute to determining any improvement action that might be required.

We saw a whistle blowing policy that had been reviewed in March 2015. The policy should contain details of how to raise a concern externally and how the whistle blower is protected by law. The policy only covered how to raise concerns internally.

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. We found details of the vision and practice values were part of the practice's strategy and 2015 year plan. We saw evidence the strategy and business plan were regularly reviewed by the practice and also saw the practice values were clearly displayed in the waiting areas and in the staff room. The practice vision and values included providing a high quality NHS medical and nursing service tailored to the needs of the local community.

The practice being a GP training practice placed a strong emphasis on education and training as a route to continually improving their work and developing the skills of new GPs.

We spoke with eight members of staff and they all knew and understood the vision and values and knew what their responsibilities were in relation to these and had been involved in developing them.

Governance arrangements

The practice had a number of policies and procedures in place to govern activity and these were available to staff on the desktop on any computer within the practice. We looked at 10 of these policies and procedures and most staff had confirmed that they had read the policy. All the policies and procedures we looked at had been reviewed annually and were up to date.

The practice had placed all policies and information the staff may need to access on the practice computers. There was no apparent indexing or version control system for policies which made it difficult for staff to know where to find policies and the most up to date and correct version.

There was a clear leadership structure with named members of staff in lead roles. For example, there was a lead nurse for infection control and the senior partner was the lead for safeguarding. We spoke with eight members of staff and they were all clear about their own roles and responsibilities. They all told us they felt valued, well supported and knew who to go to in the practice with any concerns.

The GPs and practice manager took an active leadership role for overseeing that the systems in place to monitor the

quality of the service were consistently being used and were effective. The included using the Quality and Outcomes Framework to measure its performance. The QOF data for this practice showed it was performing in line with national standards. We saw that QOF data was regularly discussed at monthly team meetings and action plans were produced to maintain or improve outcomes.

The practice also had an on-going programme of clinical audits which it used to monitor quality and systems to identify where action should be taken. Evidence from other data sources, including incidents and complaints was used to identify areas where improvements could be made. Additionally, there were processes in place to review patient satisfaction and that action had been taken, when appropriate, in response to feedback from patients or staff. The practice regularly submitted governance and performance data to the clinical commissioning group.

The practice identified, recorded and managed risks. It had carried out risk assessments where risks had been identified and action plans had been produced and implemented, for example a statement of general policy had been completed with specific action for members of staff to complete. The practice monitored risks on an on-going basis to identify any areas that needed addressing.

The practice held monthly staff meetings where governance issues were discussed. We looked at minutes from these meetings and found that performance, quality and risks had been discussed.

The practice manager was responsible for human resource policies and procedures. We reviewed a number of policies, for example equality and diversity policy which were in place to support staff. Staff we spoke with knew where to find these policies if required.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The partners in the practice were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run the practice and how to develop the practice: the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service delivered by the practice.

We saw from minutes that team meetings were held every month. Staff told us that there was an open culture within

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

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.

Seeking and acting on feedback from patients, public and staff

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients. It had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG), surveys and complaints received. It had an active PPG which included representatives from various population groups but mainly older patients. The PPG had carried out surveys and met every three months. We saw the analysis of the last patient survey, which was considered in conjunction with the PPG. The results and actions agreed from these surveys are available on the practice website. We spoke with one member of the PPG and they were very positive about the role they played and told us they felt engaged with the practice.

We also saw evidence that the practice had reviewed it's results from the national GP survey to see if there were any areas that needed addressing. The practice actively encouraged patients to be involved in shaping the service delivered at the practice.

The practice had also gathered feedback from staff generally through staff meetings, appraisals and discussions. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management.

Management lead through learning and improvement

Staff told us that the practice supported them to maintain their clinical professional development through training and mentoring. We looked at several staff files and saw that regular appraisals took place which included a personal development plan. Staff told us that the practice was very supportive of training and that they had staff days where guest speakers and trainers attended.

The practice was a GP training practice. The practice had a GP trainer who was completing PGCE in Medical Education at Winchester University. The Registrar had a day release course and protected private study time. The Registrar could ask the trainer for help and support at any time but had a 20 minute slot at end of every surgery to discuss any issues. There was a training practice welcome pack and induction agenda.