

The Enterprise Practice

Inspection report

Belmont Health Centre
516 Kenton Lane
Harrow
Middlesex
HA3 7LT
Tel: 02089012892
www.enterprisepractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 31 July 2018
Date of publication: 07/09/2018

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.

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 a previous comprehensive inspection on 25 October 2017 under the previous CQC registration. The practice was rated as requires improvement overall. The previous partnership was dissolved and the principal GP registered as an individual provider in February 2018.

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Enterprise Practice on 31 July 2018. We carried out this inspection 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 Enterprise Practice was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

At this inspection we found:

- The practice had made significant improvements since our previous inspection in October 2017.
- 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.
- Patients found the appointment system easy to use and reported that they were able to access care when they needed it.
- Information about services and how to complain was available. Improvements were made to the quality of care as a result of complaints and concerns.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels of the organisation.
- The practice was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.
- The practice demonstrated improvement in governance arrangements.

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 CQC lead inspector.
The team included two GP specialist advisers.

Background to The Enterprise Practice

- The Enterprise Practice is situated in Harrow in North West London and is part of the Harrow Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The practice is located within the purpose built premises, with car parking for patients and staff. These premises are shared with three other GP services including a GP walk-in clinic which offers appointments from 8am to 8pm. All patient services are offered on the ground floor. The practice comprises two consulting rooms, a shared treatment room, a shared patient waiting area, a reception area, and administrative and management offices.
- Services are provided from: Belmont Health Centre, 516 Kenton Lane, Harrow, Middlesex, HA3 7LT.
- Online services can be accessed from the practice website: .
- Out of hours (OOH) service is provided by Care UK.
- There is one principal GP, a salaried GP and three locum GPs. Three GPs are female and two male, who work a total of 14 clinical sessions. The practice employs a shared practice nurse and two locum practice nurses. The practice manager is supported by a team of administrative and reception staff.
- The practice provides primary medical services through a General Medical Services (GMS) contract to approximately 4,050 patients in the local area (GMS is one of the three contracting routes that have been made available to enable commissioning of primary medical services).
- The practice population of patients aged between 25 to 44 years old is higher than the national average and there is a lower number of patients aged between 10 to 24 and 45 to 59 years old compared to national average.
- Ethnicity based on demographics collected in the 2011 census shows the patient population is ethnically diverse and 59% of the population is composed of patients with an Asian, Black, mixed or other non-white background.
- The service is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures, treatment of disease, disorder and injury, surgical procedures, family planning and maternity and midwifery services.

Are services safe?

We rated the practice as good for providing safe services.

When we inspected the practice in October 2017, we rated provision of safe services as requires improvement. Specifically, we found:

- The practice was unable to demonstrate that all appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment.
- The practice was unable to demonstrate that they always followed national guidance on the management of blank prescription forms.
- The practice did not have all the emergency medicines usually found in a GP practice and there was no risk assessment as to why they were not in the stock. Not all staff we spoke with knew of their location.
- The practice was unable to provide records to demonstrate that regular water temperature checks had been carried out and whether remedial actions had been undertaken to address the number of risks identified during previous legionella risk assessment in December 2015.

At this inspection in July 2018, we noted significant improvements had been made.

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 were 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.
- 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 effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.
- The practice was equipped to deal with medical emergencies and 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. Clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections including sepsis.
- 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.

- The care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to staff.
- 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.
- The practice had all the emergency medicines usually found in the GP practice. All the staff we spoke with knew of their location.

Are services safe?

- The practice had an effective system in place to monitor the use of blank prescription forms.
- 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.
- 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.
- The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a range of sources.
- Legionella (a bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings) risk assessment was carried out by the contractor on 19 December 2017. This risk assessment had identified a number of risks and the practice had provided an action plan which demonstrated that some actions had been completed

and other actions were planned. The practice was renting a space in shared premises and they were working closely with the contractor responsible for managing the premises to ensure all outstanding actions were completed in a timely manner. We noted regular monthly water temperature checks had been undertaken by the contractor.

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?

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

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.
- 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 the 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:

- 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.
- GPs followed up patients who had received treatment in the hospital or through out of hours services.
- Adults with the 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.

- The practice was able to demonstrate how it identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), atrial fibrillation and hypertension.
- The practice's performance on quality indicators for long term conditions was in line with the local and national averages.

Families, children and young people:

- Childhood immunisation uptake rates were slightly below the target percentage of 90% and were ranged from 85% to 88%, for children under two years of age. The practice had a small patient list size and had low denominator populations including 29 eligible children, which impacted on the percentages. The practice had advertised in the practice newsletter and displayed a poster in the waiting area to encourage its patients to attend an appointment for childhood immunisation.
- 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 63%, which was below the 72% coverage target for the national screening programme. The practice had taken steps to promote the benefits of cervical screening in order to increase patient uptake. The practice had advertised the relevant information on their website and displayed on the notice boards in the waiting area encouraging patients to take part in the national cancer screening programme. According to the unverified Quality Outcome Framework (QOF) results for 2017/18 the practice had achieved 17 (85%) out of 20 points available for cervical screening. There was a policy to offer text message reminders for patients about appointments. There were failsafe systems to ensure results were received for all samples sent for the cervical screening programme and the practice followed up women who were referred as a result of abnormal results.
- The practices' uptake for breast and bowel cancer screening was in line with the national average. In total

Are services effective?

50% of patients eligible had undertaken bowel cancer screening and 71% of patients eligible had been screened for breast cancer, compared to the national averages of 55% and 70% respectively.

- 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 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 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.
- When patients were assessed to be at risk of suicide or self-harm the practice had arrangements in place to help them to remain safe.
- 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's performance on quality indicators for mental health was above average in most areas compared to local and national averages with the exception of patients diagnosed with dementia.

- For example, data from 2016/17 showed performance for dementia face to face reviews was below the CCG average and national average. The practice had achieved 72% of the total number of points available, compared to 89% locally and 84% nationally. Exception reporting was 3%, compared to the CCG average of 5% and the national average of 7%.
- However, the practice had demonstrated improvements and according to the unverified Quality Outcome Framework (QOF) results for 2017/18, the practice had achieved 100% of the total number of points available for patients diagnosed with dementia.

Monitoring care and treatment

The most recent published Quality Outcome Framework (QOF) results for the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017 were 98% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 96% and the national average of 97%. The overall exception reporting rate was 5% compared with a national average of 6%. (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 actively involved in quality improvement activity. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.
- There had been eight clinical audits commenced in the last two years, two of these were completed audits, where the improvements made were implemented and monitored.
- The practice used information about care and treatment to make improvements. For example, we saw evidence of repeated audit cycle of patients who were at risk of diabetes. The aim of the audit was to correctly code all patients not already diagnosed with diabetes who had HbA1c (blood test reading used to measure blood sugar levels) recorded reading between 43-47 mmol/L (pre-diabetes range). The practice had offered a combination of services to support patients within the pre-diabetes range which included: encouraging healthy eating habits and improve well-being through

Are services effective?

education programmes, referral to a dietician and various exercise programmes and regular monitoring of blood pressure, waist circumference and cholesterol levels.

- The audit in April 2016 demonstrated that 5% of patients within the pre-diabetes range were correctly coded. The practice reviewed their protocol and implemented necessary actions to improve in this area. We saw the practice had carried out a follow up audit in October 2016 which demonstrated improvements in patient outcomes and found 68% of patients within the pre-diabetes range were correctly coded. The practice had carried out a second follow up audit in October 2017 which demonstrated continuous improvements in patient outcomes and found 100% of patients within the pre-diabetes range were correctly coded.

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.
- 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 the 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 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.

Are services effective?

- 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?

We rated the practice as good for caring.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- Feedback from patients was positive about the way staff treat people.
- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs.
- The practice gave patients timely support and information.
- The practice's GP patient survey results were in line with the local and national averages for questions relating to kindness, respect and compassion.
- All of the 39 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. A patient and a member of the patient participation group (PPG) we spoke with were also happy with the service. Patients providing positive feedback said they felt the practice offered an excellent service and staff were helpful, caring and treated them with dignity and respect.
- The practice shared the NHS friends and family test (FFT) results for last six months (covering the period January 2018 to June 2018) and 89% patients were likely or extremely likely recommending this practice.

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.
- The practice proactively identified carers and supported them.
- The practice's GP patient survey results were in line with the 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?

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. For example, the practice was proactive in offering online services, which included online appointment booking; an electronic prescription service and online registration.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.
- The practice made reasonable adjustments when patients found it hard to access services. For example, there were accessible facilities, which included a disabled toilet, baby changing facility and interpretation services available.
- 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.
- The practice sent text message reminders of appointments and test results.
- The practice website was well designed, clear and simple to use featuring regularly updated information.
- The practice had installed a multilingual touch screen check-in facility to reduce the queue at the reception desk.

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 accommodated home visits for those who had difficulties getting to the practice due to limited local public transport availability.

- An in-house phlebotomy service was offered onsite, resulting in patients who required this service not having to travel to local hospitals.

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. 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.
- An electrocardiogram (ECG) service was offered onsite. An electrocardiogram (ECG) is a simple test that can be used to check the heart's rhythm and electrical activity. Sensors attached to the skin are used to detect the electrical signals produced by the heart each time it beats.

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 the 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, the practice offered extended hours on a Monday evening until 7.30pm for working patients who could not attend during normal opening hours.
- 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 homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

- 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 held GP led dedicated monthly mental health and dementia clinics. Patients who failed to attend were proactively followed up by a phone call from a GP.

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.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- Patients reported that the appointment system was easy to use.
- Pre-bookable appointments could be booked up to six weeks in advance.
- The practice was encouraging patients to register for online services and 15% of patients were registered to use online services.

- We checked the online appointment records and noted that the next pre-bookable appointments with GPs was available within one to two weeks.
- Feedback from patients was positive and reflected that patients were satisfied with the appointment booking system and were able to get appointments when they needed them. A member of the patient participation group (PPG) we spoke with was also happy with the access to the service.
- The practice's GP patient survey results were in line with the local and national averages for questions relating to access to care and treatment.

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?

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

When we inspected the practice in October 2017, we rated provision of well-led service as requires improvement. Specifically, we found:

- The practice was unable to demonstrate good governance in accordance with the fundamental standards of care.
- The practice was renting a space in shared premises but the practice was unable to demonstrate that they had an effective monitoring system to ensure that regular health and safety checks had been undertaken and action plans had been followed up by the contractor who was responsible for managing the premises.
- The practice was unable to demonstrate that the nursing staff had attended the team meeting or received the team meeting minutes.

At this inspection in July 2018, we noted improvements had been made.

Leadership capacity and capability

The principal GP had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.

- The principal GP was 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. The practice informed us that a new salaried GP would be joining the practice in September 2018.

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.
- The principal GP 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.

Are services well-led?

- 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

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 was renting a space in shared premises and developed an effective monitoring system to ensure that regular health and safety checks had been undertaken and action plans had been followed up by the contractor who was responsible for managing the premises.
- The practice had processes to manage current and future performance. 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 nursing staff we spoke with informed us they were invited for the team meetings and if they were unable to attend then the team meeting minutes were always shared with them.

- 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. There was an active patient participation group.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were evidence of 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.