

271a Southend Road

Inspection report

271A Southend Road
Stanford Le Hope
Essex
SS17 8HD

Tel: 01375679316

Website: <https://southendroadsurgery.co.uk>

Date of inspection visit: 28/11/2018

Date of publication: 08/01/2019

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 location

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Overall summary

This practice is rated as Good overall. (Previous rating October 2017 – Requires improvement overall particularly safe, effective and well-led.)

The key questions at this inspection are rated as:

Are services safe? – Good

Are services effective? – Good

Are services caring? – Good

Are services responsive? – Good

Are services well-led? – Good

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at 271a Southend Road on 28 November 2018 as part of our inspection programme to follow up on concerns found at the previous inspection.

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.
- The practice had implemented an effective system to monitor patients being prescribed high risk medicines.
- The practice had completed actions required from the infection control audit. We found there was a proactive approach to risk assessments however one action had not been completed from the fire risk assessment. Since the inspection the practice had implemented a system to ensure alarm checks were documented.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies on the premises. Clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections including sepsis. However, we found that non-clinical staff members were unable to recognise patients with suspected sepsis. The practice did not have the appropriate medicine or equipment to deal with sepsis or other potential medical emergencies.

- We generally found that care plans were completed appropriately however we found that in some cases mental health and dementia care plans were incomplete.
- QOF data published in 2017/18 found the practices clinical performance indicators for patients with long term conditions and mental health were below local and national averages. The practice was aware of their clinical performance and had implemented a process that had improved their performance indicators to a satisfactory level.
- We found there was an ineffective system to review patients with gestational diabetes in line with NICE guidance.
- Staff involved and treated patients with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.
- The practice had acted on patient feedback they had received. They had changed the appointment system and patients reported greater satisfaction since the change.
- The practice had a strong focus on implementing technology to improve treatment and to support patients' independence.
- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels of the organisation. Staff were encouraged to share responsibilities and develop their roles.

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

- Continue to develop systems to monitor clinical performance and patient outcomes for patients with long-term conditions and those suffering with poor mental health.
- Strengthen the system to review patients with gestational diabetes in line with NICE guidance.
- Improve systems and process to manage medical emergencies such as sepsis.

Professor Steve Field CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP
Chief Inspector of General Practice

Please refer to the detailed report and the evidence tables for further information.

Population group ratings

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	

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by a Care Quality Commission (CQC) lead inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser and a second CQC inspector.

Background to 271a Southend Road

271a Southend Road, run by Dr Anand Manohar Deshpande is located in Stanford Le Hope, Essex. The practice is situated in a residential house that has been adapted to meet the needs of the patients. The practice has a general medical services (GMS) contract with the NHS.

- There are approximately 2355 patients registered at the practice.
- The practice provides services from 271a Southend Road, Stanford Le Hope, Essex.
- The practice is registered to provide the following regulated activities: treatment of disease, disorder or injury; diagnostic and screening procedures; family planning, surgical procedures and Maternity and midwifery services.
- The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission as a sole provider. The lead GP is supported two locum GPs, a practice nurse, practice manager and a team of reception and administrative staff.

- The practice is open from Monday to Friday between the hours of 8am and 6.30pm. Extended hours are available until 7pm on Wednesday and Fridays.
- Unscheduled out-of-hours care is provided by IC24 and patients who contact the surgery outside of opening hours are provided with information on how to contact the service.
- Weekend appointments are available via 'Health Hubs,' a service set up by the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).
- National data indicates that people living in the area are in the fourth least deprived decile of the deprivation scoring in comparison to England.
- The practice has a comprehensive website providing a wealth of information for patients to understand and access services, including useful links to specialist support services.

Are services safe?

What we found at our October 2017 inspection

We previously rated the practice requires improvement for providing safe services. We found that annual infection control audits were undertaken however there was no action plan to evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result. We also found that the process for monitoring high risk medicines was not effective.

What we found at this inspection

We rated the practice as good for providing safe services.

Safety systems and processes

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

- The practice had appropriate systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. All staff received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns. Learning from safeguarding incidents was available to staff. Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for their role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable.)
- Staff took steps, including working with other agencies, to protect patients from abuse, neglect, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The practice carried out appropriate staff checks at the time of recruitment and on an ongoing basis.
- Previously we found there was an ineffective system to ensure areas highlighted in the infection control audit were actioned. At this inspection we found there was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control.
- The practice had arrangements to ensure that facilities and equipment were safe and in good working order.
- Arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.

Risks to patients

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

- Arrangements were in place for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed to meet patients' needs, including planning for holidays, sickness, busy periods and epidemics.
- There was an induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.
- The practice had equipment to deal with medical emergencies however they did not have access to one of the recommended emergency medicines. Since the inspection the practice had stocked this medicine. We found staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies on the premises and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention. Although clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections including sepsis, we found that the non-clinical members of staff were not aware of sepsis and had not received training. The practice did not have all the relevant equipment to deal with sepsis. Since the inspection the practice had ordered all relevant equipment, displayed sepsis symptoms posters in the waiting room and reception area and scheduled sepsis training for their non-clinical staff.
- 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.

- In most cases the care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to staff. However, we found that some mental health and dementia care records were incomplete.
- The practice had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- Clinicians made timely referrals in line with protocols.

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

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

- The systems for managing and storing medicines, including vaccines, medical gases, emergency medicines and equipment, minimised risks.

Are services safe?

- Staff prescribed and administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with current national guidance. The practice had reviewed its antibiotic prescribing and taken action to support good antimicrobial stewardship in line with local and national guidance.
- We found there was an effective process to monitor patients being prescribed high risk medicines. Records we looked at supported this.
- The practice had an effective system to ensure prescriptions were collected. Once scripts were collected it was documented in the patients notes.
- Patients' health was monitored in relation to the use of medicines and followed up on appropriately. Patients were involved in regular reviews of their medicines.

Track record on safety

The practice had a good track record on safety.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues. However, we found the practice had not completed one action from the fire risk assessment. Since the inspection the practice had implemented a new monitoring system for smoke alarm checks.

- The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a range of sources.

Lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.
- 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.
- The practice acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.

Are services effective?

What we found at our October 2017 inspection

We previously rated the practice as requires improvement for providing effective services as data from the Quality and Outcomes Framework showed patient outcomes were lower than CCG and national averages for the year 2016/17.

What we found at this inspection

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

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' immediate and ongoing 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 actively promoted the use of technology to improve treatment and to support patients' independence. For example, they used online systems to monitor patient's safety alerts, they were due to introduce a system to improve patients experience of making and cancelling appointments.
- 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. The practice used an appropriate tool to identify patients aged 65 and over who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified as being frail had a clinical review including a review of medication.
- 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.
- Staff had appropriate knowledge of treating older people including their psychological, mental and communication needs.

People with long-term conditions:

This population group was rated requires improvement for effective because:

- The practice's performance on quality indicators for long term conditions for the year 2017/18 was below local and national averages. Such as for patients with diabetes, asthma, hypertension and COPD. (please refer to data highlighted in the evidence table). We reviewed unverified data for the practice for the first seven months of the current year and found that performance indicators had improved for all indicators. We were satisfied that sufficient improvements had been made.
- 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.
- GPs followed up patients who had received treatment in hospital or through out of hours services for an acute exacerbation of asthma.
- Adults with newly diagnosed cardiovascular disease were offered statins for secondary prevention. People with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring and patients with atrial fibrillation were assessed for stroke risk and treated as appropriate.

Families, children and young people:

- Childhood immunisation uptake rates were in line with the target percentage of 90% or above.
- The practice had arrangements for following up failed attendance of children's appointments following an appointment in secondary care or for immunisation.

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

- The practice's uptake for cervical screening was 69%, which was below the 80% coverage target for the national screening programme.
- The practice's uptake for breast and bowel cancer screening was comparable with the national average.
- The practice had systems to inform eligible patients to have the meningitis vaccine, for example before attending university for the first time.

Are services effective?

- 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 homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- The practice had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule.

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

- The practice's performance on quality indicators for mental health was below local and national averages for the year 2017/18. For example;
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months was 25% compared with the local average of 87% and the national average of 90%.
- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months was 42% compared with the local average of 91% and the national average of 90%.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care plan has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 48% compared with the local average of 86% and the national average of 83%.
- Unverified data we reviewed from the first seven months of the current year showed the practice had made improvements for reviewing patients with poor mental health.
- The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental illness, and personality disorder by providing access to health checks, interventions for physical activity,

obesity, diabetes, heart disease, cancer and access to 'stop smoking' services. There was a system for following up patients who failed to attend for administration of long term medication.

- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment to detect possible signs of dementia. When dementia was suspected there was an appropriate referral for diagnosis.
- The practice offered annual health checks to patients with a learning disability. The practice had completed 90% of the reviews for their patients with learning disabilities.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice had a programme of quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.

- The practice's QOF achievements were significantly worse than local and national averages for the year 2017/18, particularly for patients with long-term conditions and patients experiencing poor mental health. We reviewed unverified data from the first seven months of the current year and found that clinical outcomes had improved for patients with long term conditions and patients experiencing poor mental health.
- The overall exception rates for any indicators was in line with local and national averages.
- The practice used information about care and treatment to make improvements.
- The practice was actively involved in quality improvement activity. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives. We found that some aspects of NICE guidance had not been reviewed. For example, patients with gestational diabetes had not been followed up in line with national guidance.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.

- Staff had appropriate knowledge for their role, for example, to carry out reviews for people with long term conditions, older people and people requiring contraceptive reviews.

Are services effective?

- 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.
- The practice provided staff with ongoing support. There was an induction programme for new staff. This included one to one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and revalidation.
- There was a clear approach 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 and organisations, were involved in assessing, planning and delivering care and treatment.
- The practice shared clear and accurate information with relevant professionals when discussing care delivery for people with long term conditions and when coordinating healthcare for care home residents. They shared information with, and liaised, with community services, social services and carers for housebound patients and with health visitors and community services for children who have relocated into the local area.
- 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.

However, we found that some mental health and dementia care plans were incomplete. The practice was not aware of this as they had not monitored the care plans that a locum doctor had been completing.

- 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 own health, for example through social prescribing schemes.
- 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, 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.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.

Are services caring?

What we found at our October 2017 inspection

We previously rated the practice good for providing responsive services.

What we found at this inspection

We rated the practice as good for caring.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- The majority of feedback from patients was positive about the way staff treat people. We received one negative comment from a patient regarding the attitude of a doctor.
- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs.
- The practice gave patients timely support and information.
- The practice's GP patient survey results, published in July 2018, were above local and national averages for questions relating to kindness, respect and compassion.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

- Staff communicated with people 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. They helped them ask questions about their care and treatment.
- One member of the administration team had carried out care navigation training which enabled them to signpost patients to the correct services.
- The practice proactively identified carers and supported them.
- The practice's GP national patient survey results, published in July 2018, were in line with local and national averages for questions relating to involvement in decisions about care and treatment.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected patients' privacy and dignity.

- When patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues, or appeared distressed reception staff offered them a private room to discuss their needs.
- Staff recognised the importance of people's dignity and respect. They challenged behaviour that fell short of this.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

What we found at our October 2017 inspection

We previously rated the practice good for providing responsive services.

What we found at this inspection

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

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.
- Telephone consultations were available which supported patients who were unable to attend the practice during normal working hours.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered. The practice had ensured there was arrangements for patients using wheelchairs to have access to the building.
- The practice made reasonable adjustments when patients found it hard to access services.
- The practice provided effective care coordination for patients who are more vulnerable or who have complex needs. They supported them to access services both within and outside the practice.
- 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, whether it was at home or in a care home or supported living scheme.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs. The GP also accommodated home visits for those who had difficulties getting to the practice due to limited local public transport availability.
- The practice hosted a toe nail cutting service for patients that required that service.

People with long-term conditions:

- Patients with a long-term condition received an annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being appropriately met. The practice had implemented a plan to ensure patients with long term conditions were recalled for an annual review.
- 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.
- All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child under the age of 18 were offered a same day appointment when necessary.

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.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.
- People in vulnerable circumstances were easily able to register with the practice, including those with no fixed abode.

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

- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and those patients living with dementia.
- The practice had strong professional relationships with external organisation where they could sign post patients experiencing poor mental health.
- Patients who failed to attend were proactively followed up by a phone call from a GP.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Timely access to care and treatment

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. The practice had changed their appointment system to ensure patients had timely access.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised. Children were prioritised and were given an appointment on the same day.
- Patients reported that the appointment system was easy to use.
- The practice's GP patient survey results, published in July 2018, were in line with local and national averages

for questions relating to access to care and treatment.

The practice was aware of one area of improvement that the survey had highlighted and had taken actions to improve patient satisfaction.

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. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.
- The complaint policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance. 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.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.

Are services well-led?

What we found at our October 2017 inspection

In October 2017 the practice was rated as requires improvement for providing well-led services. Previously we found, the practice had an overarching governance framework to support the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. However, there was an inconsistent system for identifying, capturing and managing issues and risks. We also found that the practice did not have a patient participation group.

What we found at this inspection

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 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, sustainable care.

- 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 strategy was in line with health and social care priorities across the region. The practice planned its services to meet the needs of the practice population.
- The practice monitored progress against delivery of the strategy.

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. 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.
- 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 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.
- We found the practice had implemented an effective system for identifying, capturing and managing issues and risks. For example, for monitoring patients being prescribed high risk medicines.

Managing risks, issues and performance

Are services well-led?

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. The practice was aware of their challenges regarding clinical performance and had implemented a plan to improve it.
- Practice leaders had oversight of safety 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 considered and understood the impact on the quality of care of service changes or developments.

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 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.
- The practice did not previously have a patient participation group. The practice told us they had found it challenging to encourage patients to join however they had recently formed a PPG with one member and was actively encouraging others to join.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance. The leader attended meeting with the clinical commissioning group to share relevant information and promote good practice.

Continuous improvement and innovation

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

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement.
- 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.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.