

Market Cross Surgery

Quality Report

Bourne Road,
Corby Glen ,
Grantham,
Lincolnshire,
NG33 4BB
Tel: 01476 550056
Website: www.marketcrosssurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 6 February 2018
Date of publication: This is auto-populated when the report is published

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

Ratings

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

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice	2
The six population groups and what we found	4

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	5
Background to Market Cross Surgery	5
Detailed findings	6

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

This practice is rated as Good overall.

The key questions are rated as:

Are services safe? – Good

Are services effective? – Good

Are services caring? – Good

Are services responsive? – Good

Are services well-led? – Good

As part of our inspection process, we also look at the quality of care for specific population groups. The population groups are rated as:

Older People – Good

People with long-term conditions – Good

Families, children and young people – Good

Working age people (including those recently retired and students) – Good

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable – Good

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia) – Good

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Market Cross Surgery on 6 February 2018. This inspection was carried out as part of our inspection programme.

At this inspection we found:

- The practice had clear systems to manage risk so that safety incidents were less likely to happen. When incidents did happen, the practice learned from them and improved their processes.
- The practice routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care it provided. It ensured that care and treatment was delivered according to evidence-based guidelines.
- Staff involved and treated patients with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.
- The practice had high levels of patient satisfaction in all areas.
- The appointment system was easy to use and patients told us if needed they were able to get same day appointments.
- Patients who commented on their care described the service as excellent and said they never felt rushed during consultations and treatments were explained to them.
- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels of the organisation.
- There was a system in place to manage and learn from complaints.

Summary of findings

- The practice had arrangements for dispensing medicines at the practice which kept patients safe. The practice dispensed to approximately 95% of its patients.

The areas where the provider **should** make improvements are:

- Ensure all staff files have the appropriate recruitment documents as per the practice policy.
- Review clinical meetings to ensure that those not present are informed of discussions held.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)

Chief Inspector of General Practice

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	Good 
People with long term conditions	Good 
Families, children and young people	Good 
Working age people (including those recently retired and students)	Good 
People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable	Good 
People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)	Good 

Market Cross Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC lead inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser, and a second CQC inspector.

Background to Market Cross Surgery

Market Cross Surgery is a small practice which provides primary medical services to approximately 4,700 patients.

- The surgery was originally located in the Market Place and relocated to the current purpose built premises in March 2012. The practice dispenses medicines to 95% of patients who are registered with the surgery.
- The provider is a partnership of three GP's (2 male and one female), a Practice Manager, Assistant Practice Manager, three practice nurses, one health care assistant, a dispensary manager, five dispensers, reception manager, five reception staff and two secretarial/administration staff.
- The practice has a General Medical Services Contract (GMS). The GMS contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities.
- The practice has one location registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) which is Market Cross Surgery, Bourne Road, Corby Glen, Grantham, Lincs. NG33 4BB.
- Market Cross Surgery is open from Monday 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Patients can book appointments by phone, online or in person. The practice has bookable appointments from 8.30 to 10.50am and 4pm to 6pm. There is also a 'sit and wait' system if an urgent appointment is required on the day. The practice also provides a minor injury treatment and assessment service during opening hours. Telephone advice is also available each morning and afternoon by a GP or practice nurse.
- Appointments can be booked up to four weeks in advance.
- Extended hours are available on alternate Monday evenings between 6.30pm and 8.30pm and on alternate Saturday mornings 9am to 10.30am. These appointments are particularly useful to patients with work commitments.
- The practice is located within the area covered by NHS SouthWest Lincolnshire Clinical Commissioning Group (SWLCCG). The CCG is responsible for commissioning services from the practice. A CCG is an organisation that brings together local GP's and experience health professionals to take on commissioning responsibilities for local health services.

Are services safe?

Our findings

We rated the practice, and all of the population groups, as good for providing safe services.

Safety systems and processes

The practice had clear systems to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.

- The practice conducted safety risk assessments. It had a suite of safety policies which were regularly reviewed and communicated to staff. Staff had access to safety information for the practice and was given information as part of their induction.
- The practice had systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. Policies were regularly reviewed and were accessible to all staff. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance.
- The practice worked with other agencies to support patients and protect them from neglect and abuse. Staff took steps to protect patients from abuse, neglect, harassment, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The practice carried out staff checks, including checks of professional registration where relevant. On the day of the inspection the practice could not provide evidence of references for two most recent staff recruited. However, the practice obtained verbal references immediately after the inspection. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required (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).
- All staff received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns. Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a DBS check.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control. The lead nurse was the infection control lead and attended link meetings with infection control colleagues within the CCG. The infection control audit was completed in August 2017 and the actions from this had been completed.

- The premises was visibly clean and tidy and treatment rooms surfaces were totally clear.
- The practice ensured that facilities and equipment were safe and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions. There were systems for safely managing healthcare waste.

Risks to patients

There were systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed.
- There was an induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies on the premises and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention. Clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections, for example, sepsis.
- The practice reception staff had requested more in depth training on basic life support and one of the partners was planning to deliver this for the team.
- When there were changes to services or staff the practice assessed and monitored the impact on safety.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

- Individual care records were written and managed in a way that kept patients safe. The care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to relevant staff in an accessible way.
- The practice had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- Referral letters included all of the necessary information.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

The practice had reliable systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

Are services safe?

- The systems for managing medicines, including vaccines, medical gases, and emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks. The practice kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use.
- Staff prescribed, administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with legal requirements and current national guidance. The practice had audited antimicrobial prescribing. There was evidence of actions taken to support good antimicrobial stewardship.
- Patients' health was monitored to ensure medicines were being used safely and followed up on appropriately. The practice involved patients in regular reviews of their medicines.
- Arrangements for dispensing medicines at the practice kept patients safe. The practice dispensed to approximately 95% of its patients. The practice had a designated GP lead for the dispensary. The dispensary had documented processes which they referred to as standard operating procedures (SOPs). All staff involved in the procedure had signed, read and understood the SOPs and agreed to act in accordance with its requirements. SOPs covered all aspects of work undertaken in the dispensary and had been reviewed and updated in the last 12 months.
- The practice held stocks of controlled drugs (medicines that required extra checks and special storage arrangements because of their potential for misuse) and had in place standard procedures that set out how they were managed. These were being followed by practice and dispensary staff. For example, controlled drugs were stored in a controlled drugs cupboard and access to them was restricted and the keys held securely.

Track record on safety

The practice had a good safety record.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.
- The business continuity plan had rated risks and described the measures in place.
- The practice monitored and reviewed activity. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture that led to safety improvements.

Lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- There was a system for recording and acting on significant events and incidents. Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so. There was a clear no blame culture which was evident in the incidents that had been recorded.
- There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The practice learned and shared lessons, identified themes and took action to improve safety in the practice. For example, new systems implemented and extra training for staff.
- We viewed a significant event which had been raised following the inadvertent prescribing of too high a dose of ranitidine (a medicine to help with reflux symptoms) for a baby following a miscalculation by the GP. The medicine had been recommended by a consultant. No harm to the patient occurred. Following this significant event a decision was made by the practice that any paediatric drug prescribed off licence should be double checked by a second GP prior to issuing. A standard operating procedure was created as a result.
- There was a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. The practice learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

We rated the practice as good for providing effective services overall and across all population groups.

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

The practice had systems to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence-based practice. We saw that clinicians assessed needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance supported by clear clinical pathways and protocols.

- Patients' needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- The practice used a tele-dermatology service to enable the patients to be assessed quicker and without the need to wait for a referral.
- Guidance was discussed clinically in regular conversations. However these meetings were informal and not minuted.
- Staff advised patients what to do if their condition got worse and where to seek further help and support.

Older people:

- Older patients who are frail or may be vulnerable received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs. Those identified as being frail had a clinical review including a review of medication.
- The practice had active engagement with their local Neighborhood team and had identified the lead nurse to be the care Co-ordinator to support patients.
- Patients aged over 75 were invited for a health check. If necessary they were referred to other services such as voluntary services and supported by an appropriate care plan.
- The practice completed pulse checks for the over 65's throughout the year to identify possible atrial fibrillation.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital. It ensured that their care plans and prescriptions were updated to reflect any extra or changed needs.

People with long-term conditions:

- The practice had a clinical lead champion for all major conditions.
- The nursing team provided home visits for chronic disease management for those patients that could not access the surgery.
- Patients with long-term conditions had a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For patients with the most complex needs, the GP worked with other health and care professionals to deliver a coordinated package of care.
- Staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long term conditions had received specific training.
- The practice provided health checks for early identification of chronic diseases.
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) was 140/80mmHg or less was 78% (CCG 78%, National 78%).
- The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5mmol/l or less was 76% (CCG 83%, National 80%).

Families, children and young people:

- Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given were in line with the target percentage of 90%.
- The practice had arrangements to identify and review the treatment of newly pregnant women on long-term medicines.
- The practice had a midwife that was based in the practice one day per week.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students):

- The practice's uptake for cervical screening was 82%, which was in line with the 80% coverage target for the national screening programme.
- The staff were self auditing their screening results to monitor their performance and to prevent errors for patients.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice had systems to inform eligible patients to have the meningitis vaccine, for example before attending university for the first time.
- Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks including NHS checks for patients aged 40-74. There was appropriate follow-up on the outcome of health assessments and checks where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.

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

- 95% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the previous 12 months. This was higher compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 84%.
- 95% of patients diagnosed with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the previous 12 months. This was comparable to the CCG average of 92% and the national average of 90%.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice had a comprehensive programme of quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided.

- For example numerous audits of clinical practice were undertaken.
- Examples of audits included audits of hormone replacement monitoring, high risk medicines prescribing and antibiotic prescribing for sore throats. The audits showed and we discussed with GPs the changes that had been made to practice where this was appropriate. We reviewed and discussed a two cycle audit of treatment of sore throat symptoms. The initial audit demonstrated 42.5% compliance with The

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines, which increased to 75.7% on re-audit following discussion of the initial findings within the practice.

- Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives. The practice had meetings with other stakeholders and worked benchmarking against local practices in the area.

The most recent published Quality Outcome Framework (QOF) results were 99% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 98% and national average of 96%. The overall exception reporting rate was 5% compared with a national average of 10%. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice. Exception reporting is the removal of patients from QOF calculations where, for example, the patients decline or do not respond to invitations to attend a review of their condition or when a medicine is not appropriate.) The practice was not an outlier for any indicators.

- Staff worked with other health and social care services to meet patients' needs. The practice attended multi-disciplinary meetings to discuss the needs of patients with complex and palliative care needs. The practice also took the lead and hosted the Neighbourhood Development Team Meetings.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles. For example, staff whose role included immunisation and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training and could demonstrate how they stayed up to date.

- The practice understood the learning needs of staff and provided protected time and training to meet them. Up to date records of skills, qualifications and training were maintained. Staff were encouraged and given opportunities to develop.
- Clinical and non-clinical staff were provided with specific training dependent on their roles.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding adults and children, fire procedures, basic life support, infection control, Equality and Diversity and information governance awareness.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice provided staff with ongoing support. This included an induction process, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching, clinical supervision and support for revalidation. The practice ensured the competence of staff employed in advanced roles by audit of their clinical decision making, including non-medical prescribing and the dispensing staff.
- There procedures in place for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.

Coordinating care and treatment

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to deliver effective care and treatment.

- We saw records that showed that all appropriate staff, including those in different teams, services and organisations, were involved in assessing, planning and delivering care and treatment.
- Patients received coordinated and person-centred care. This included when they moved between services, when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. The practice worked with patients to develop personal care plans that were shared with relevant agencies.
- The practice ensured that end of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of different patients, including those who may be vulnerable because of their circumstances.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

Staff were consistent and proactive in helping patients to live healthier lives.

- The practice identified patients who may be in need of extra support and directed them to relevant services. This included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, patients at risk of developing a long-term condition and carers.
- Staff encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their health.
- Staff discussed changes to care or treatment with patients and their carers as necessary.
- The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health, for example, stop smoking campaigns and tackling obesity.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

- Clinicians understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making.
- Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.
- The practice monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.

Are services caring?

Our findings

We rated the practice, and all of the population groups, as good for caring.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs.
- The practice gave patients timely support and information.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs. This was advertised at the reception desk.
- All of the 50 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. This is in line with the results of the NHS Friends and Family Test and other feedback received by the practice.

Results from the July 2017 annual national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. 219 surveys were sent out and 112 were returned. This represented about 2.6 % of the practice population. The practice was above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 96% of patients who responded said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 90% and the national average of 89%.
- 99% of patients who responded said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 96% and the national average of 96%.
- 96% of patients who responded said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 85% and the national average of 86%.

- 99% of patients who responded said the nurse was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 87% and the national average of 85%.
- 99% of patients who responded said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and the national average of 91%.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients be involved in decisions about their care and were aware of the Accessible Information Standard (a requirement to make sure that patients and their carers can access and understand the information they are given):

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas, including in languages other than English, informing patients this service was available.
- Staff communicated with patients in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids and easy read materials were available.
- Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services.

The practice proactively identified patients who were carers. This was at new patient registrations or adhoc at appointments. The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 132 patients as carers (3% of the practice list).

- A member of staff acted as a carers' champion to help ensure that the various services supporting carers were coordinated and effective. Reception staff explained that patients would be booked for an appointment with the staff member to discuss any services and needs that they had.
- Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or visited them. This was also flagged on the system so that other staff were made aware. The practice could signpost to give them advice on how to find a support service.

Are services caring?

- There was no carers information displayed in the reception area of the practice for patients to obtain support.

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

- 96% of patients who responded said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 88% and the national average of 86%.
- 93% of patients who responded said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 82% and the national average of 82%.

- 99% of patients who responded said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and the national average of 90%.
- 99% of patients who responded said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 87% and the national average of 85%.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff recognised the importance of patients' dignity and respect.

The practice complied with the Data Protection Act 1998

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

We rated the practice, and all of the population groups, as good for providing responsive services across all population groups.

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.

- The practice understood the needs of its population and tailored services in response to those needs. (For example extended opening hours, online services such as repeat prescription requests, advanced booking of appointments, advice services for common ailments).
- There were longer appointments available for patients if required.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered and were accessible to people who had limited mobility or used a wheelchair.
- The practice made reasonable adjustments when patients found it hard to access services. For example, home visits could be made to patients who were housebound or too ill to attend the practice and telephone consultations were available.
- The practice improved services where possible in response to unmet needs.
- Care and treatment for patients with multiple long-term conditions and patients approaching the end of life was coordinated with other services.

Older people:

- All patients had a named GP who supported them in whatever setting they lived.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs. The GP's also accommodated home visits for those who had difficulties getting to the practice due to limited local public transport availability.

People with long-term conditions:

- The practice had effective recall procedures for these patients and those that did not attend were contacted.

- Patients with a long-term condition received an annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being appropriately met. Multiple conditions were reviewed at one appointment, and consultation times were flexible to meet each patient's specific needs.
- The practice held regular meetings with the local district nursing team to discuss and manage the needs of patients with complex medical issues.

Families, children and young people:

- We found there were systems 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. Records we looked at confirmed this.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students):

- The needs of this population group had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care. For example, extended opening hours and Saturday appointments.
- Telephone consultations were available which supported patients who were unable to attend the practice during normal working hours.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.
- An alert system was in place to identify patients who were vulnerable so that their needs could be appropriately responded to.

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

- The practice told us how they worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and those patients living with dementia.

Timely access to the service

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Patients were able to access care and treatment from the practice within an acceptable timescale for their needs.

- Patients had timely access to initial assessment, test results, diagnosis and treatment.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- The appointment system was easy to use. Each morning the practice had a sit and wait clinic for those that needed an appointment that day.

Results from the July 2017 annual national GP patient survey showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was comparable to local and national averages. This was supported by observations on the day of inspection and completed comment cards. 219 surveys were sent out and 112 were returned. This represented about 2.6% of the practice population.

- 95% of patients who responded were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 84% and the national average of 80%.
- 100% of patients who responded said they could get through easily to the practice by phone compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 76% and the national average of 71%.

- 92% of patients who responded said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 81% and the national average of 76%.
- 96% of patients who responded described their experience of making an appointment as good compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 75% and the national average of 73%.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

- Information about how to make a complaint or raise concerns was available and it was easy to do. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.
- The complaint policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance. Three complaints were received in the last year. We reviewed all three complaints and found that they were satisfactorily handled in a timely way.
- The practice learned lessons from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, a process for the dispensing of some medicines for children had been created following a review of a prescribing error that had been received as a complaint.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

We rated the practice as good for providing a well-led service.

Leadership capacity and capability

Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.

- Leaders had the experience, capacity and skills to deliver the practice strategy and address risks to it.
- They were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.
- The practice had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the practice.

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision and credible strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

- There was a clear vision and set of values. The practice had a realistic strategy and supporting business plans to achieve priorities.
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.
- The practice planned its services to meet the needs of the practice population.

Culture

The practice had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.

- Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work in the practice.
- The practice focused on the needs of patients.
- Leaders and managers acted on behaviour and performance inconsistent with the vision and values.
- Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. We reviewed complaints that had been

investigated as significant events to ensure themes and learning was captured and actioned. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.

- Staff we spoke with told us they were able to raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.
- There were processes for providing all staff with the development they need. This included appraisal and career development conversations. All staff received regular annual appraisals in the last year. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary.
- Clinical staff, including nurses, were considered valued members of the practice team. They were given protected time for professional development and evaluation of their clinical work.
- There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of all staff.
- The practice actively promoted equality and diversity. Staff had received equality and diversity training. Staff felt they were treated equally.
- There were positive relationships between staff and teams.

Governance arrangements

There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

- Structures, processes and systems to support good governance and management were clearly set out, understood and effective. The governance and management of partnerships, joint working arrangements and shared services promoted interactive and co-ordinated person-centred care.
- Staff were clear on their roles and accountabilities including in respect of safeguarding and infection prevention and control.
- Practice leaders had established policies, procedures and activities to ensure safety and assured themselves that they were operating as intended.

Managing risks, issues and performance

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

- There was an effective process to identify, understand, monitor and address current and future risks including risks to patient safety.
- The practice had processes to manage current and future performance. Performance of employed clinical staff could be demonstrated through audit of their consultations, prescribing and referral decisions. Practice leaders had oversight of MHRA alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was clear evidence of action to change practice to improve quality.
- The practice had plans in place and had trained staff for major incidents.
- The practice implemented service developments and where efficiency changes were made this was with input from clinicians to understand their impact on the quality of care.

Appropriate and accurate information

The practice acted on appropriate and accurate information.

- Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.
- Quality and sustainability were discussed in relevant meetings where all staff had sufficient access to information.
- The practice used performance information which was reported and monitored and management and staff were held to account.
- The information used to monitor performance and the delivery of quality care was accurate and useful. There were plans to address any identified weaknesses.
- The practice used information technology systems to monitor and improve the quality of care.
- The practice submitted data or notifications to external organisations as required.

- There were robust arrangements in line with data security standards for the availability, integrity and confidentiality of patient identifiable data, records and data management systems.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The practice involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

- A full and diverse range of patients', staff and external partners' views and concerns were encouraged, heard and acted on to shape services and culture. Chairs for the reception had been purchased using patient donations following feedback from patients and discussion with the PPG that they were not comfortable.
- There was a patient participation group. However this had recently been reformed following a change in personnel. A meeting had been set up to develop and plan their engagement with the practice.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice. For example, staff were encouraged to undertake training to enhance their skills and knowledge to meet the needs of patients.
- Staff knew about improvement methods and had the skills to use them.
- The practice made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints. Learning was shared and used to make improvements.
- Leaders and managers encouraged staff to take time out to review individual and team objectives, processes and performance.