**PRIORY ROAD SURGERY**

**PATIENT PARTICIPATION GROUP (PPG)**

**MEETING ON 13 DECEMBER 2023**

**Date:** Wednesday 13 December 2023

**Meeting Commenced:** 5.30 pm

**Members Present:** LV

HW

BW

GM

Dr RP

**Introduction:** LV chaired the meeting. He asked, and it was agreed, that the minutes of the last meeting should be accepted. GM gave apologies from JM and then gave a brief resume of the previous meeting; matters then proceeded to hear an update from Dr RP.

**Building work:** Dr RP was pleased he was able to report significant progress in obtaining the approval the surgery required from the ICB to allow work to go ahead to create the long sought after additional ground floor consulting room. A second quote for the work had now been sent to the ICB. He was optimistic that approval would be given and that work would start in January, or at least before the end of this financial year.

**Surgery telephone system:** Dr RP said the surgery telephone system was still not working properly. A key feature of the system, as it was intended to operate, was that reception staff would be able to identify queuing callers. That would enable reception staff to prioritise callers they knew to be urgent, pull up digital records in advance of the call, divert callers to a mobile held by reception staff and so on. All of that would save callers time waiting in the queue and save time and effort for the hard pressed reception staff. However, that aspect of the system had never worked consistently. The provider would send out a technician, matters would appear to be rectified only to fail again a few days later. Dr RP said the contract with the provider – Louiscom - was expensive – and tied the surgery for two years. There were only a small number of providers who were able to offer the sort of service which the surgery required.

LV suggested that the surgery needed to consider whether what the provider was delivering was 'fit for purpose' and whether the provider had fulfilled their contractual obligations to the surgery. He offered to look at matters in more detail with Dr RP.

**Complaint:** Dr RP said the surgery had received a complaint from a care home in respect of an adult with learning disabilities who was also diabetic. Following his review of blood sugar test results for the individual, Dr RP had concluded that the individual's medication needed to be revised as an urgency. He adjusted the individual's prescription and recorded that and the reasons for the change in the individual's digital notes. However, Dr RP said he could not recall whether or not he had rang the care home to tell them of the change. The next day Dr RP went on annual leave. The care home complained that they had had no advice about the change in medication and that it had taken them two hours to sort the matter out with Laycocks' pharmacy.

Dr RP said there had been an email from the care home to which the reception staff had responded within approximately two and a half hours, saying that Dr RP's notes had been reviewed and confirming that that the individual's prescription had been changed correctly. Dr RP said when he had returned from annual leave he had apologised to the care home for not being able to say whether or not he had contacted them to advise of the medication change, as would be his normal practice.Some days later the care home indicated they would make a formal complaint to the Local Authority.

Members noted that there seemed to be no suggestion that Dr RP had acted in any way incorrectly in changing the individual's medication as an urgency and recording that in the digital notes. That was the important matter, The complaint therefore appeared to be about what might have been a failure to communicate the change to the care home and a claimed delay in the surgery responding to an email for clarification.

Of course it would be for the Local Authority to determine the complaint as they saw fit. However, members noted that Dr RP had apologised as soon as he was able on return from leave and that reception staff had responded with clarity within hours to an email. Members suggested that the surgery should await whatever might come from the Local Authority.

**Patient satisfaction survey:**

Dr RP said the results of the national Patient Satisfaction Survey showed the surgery was achieving a very good level of patient satisfaction across a range of measures. On all measures the surgery scored higher than the national average. On satisfaction with their overall experience of the surgery, our surgery scored 85% against a national average score of 71%. (The full results of the survey can be viewed on the surgery's website.) Members were very pleased to hear of these excellent and deserved results.

**Next Meeting:** The next meeting was agreed for Wednesday 13th March at 5.30 pm at the surgery.

The meeting concluded at approximately 6.05