

Saxena Bowden Saxena

Quality Report

Moorgate Primary Care Centre

22 Derby Way

Bury

Greater Manchester

Tel: 01614478283

Website: www.mindenfamilypractices.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 8 January 2018

Date of publication: 06/02/2018

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 service

Good 

Are services safe?

Good 

Are services effective?

Good 

Are services caring?

Good 

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

	Page
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	4
The six population groups and what we found	5
Areas for improvement	6

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	7
Background to Saxena Bowden Saxena	7
Detailed findings	8

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

This practice is rated as Good overall. (Previous inspection 5 May 2015 – Good)

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 this announced comprehensive inspection at Saxena Bowden Saxena on 8 January 2018 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.
- Patients found the appointment system easy to use and reported that they were able to access care when they needed it.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels of the organisation.
- Staff were well supported and supervised.

Summary of findings

- Patient feedback about the service was overwhelmingly positive.
- A member of the non-clinical staff acted as a cancer and carers champion.

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:






- Emergency medicines should be available in case of meningitis.
- The practice should establish a structure for scheduling meetings with the local children's safeguarding team.

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

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?	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

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	

Summary of findings

Areas for improvement

Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Emergency medicines should be available in case of meningitis.
- The practice should establish a structure for scheduling meetings with the local children's safeguarding team.

Saxena Bowden Saxena

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 GP specialist advisor on induction training with the CQC.

Background to Saxena Bowden Saxena

Saxena Bowden Saxena provides primary care services to its registered list of 5408 patients. The practice delivers commissioned services under the Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract and is a member of NHS Bury Borough Clinical Commissioning Group. The PMS contract is the contract between general practices and NHS England for delivering primary care services to local communities.

The practice offers services including asthma clinics (pharmacist led), child health care, full chronic disease management, ECG, spirometry, clinical research, minor

surgery and contraception. The practice provides services in line with the national screening programmes for bowel, cervical cytology, diabetic retinopathy, NHS health checks and the

nation diabetes prevention programme

Regulated activities are delivered to the patient population from the following address:

Moorgate Primary Care Centre

22 Derby Way

Bury

Greater Manchester

The practice has a website that contains comprehensive information about what they do to support their patient population and the in-house and online services offered.

www.mindenfamilypractices.co.uk

The age profile of the practice population is broadly in line with the CCG averages. Information taken from Public Health England placed the area in which the practice is located in the fourth more deprived decile (from a possible range of between 1 and 10). In general, people living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for 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 received safety information for the practice as part of their induction and refresher training. The practice had systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse, although there were no structured scheduled meetings with the local children's safeguarding team. 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 recruitment and on an ongoing basis. 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 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 effective induction system for 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.
- 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.

- The systems for managing medicines, including vaccines, medical gases, and emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks. No emergency medicines were available for meningitis. 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.

Track record on safety

The practice had a good safety record.

Are services safe?

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.
- 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 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.
- 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, 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' needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing. Staff advised patients what to do if their condition got worse and where to seek further help and support.
- Data held by the CQC showed that the practice's prescribing of hypnotic drugs was in line with the CCG and national averages. (Hypnotic drugs are a group of drugs that reduce anxiety, aid sleep or have a calming effect).
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.

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 identified severely and moderately frail patients. Their risk of falls was reviewed by the pharmacist and practice GP lead.

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.

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% or above.
- The practice had arrangements to identify and review the treatment of newly pregnant women on long-term medicines.

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

- The practice's uptake for cervical screening was 94% which was above the 80% coverage target for the national screening programme.
- 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):

- 96% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the previous 12 months. This is comparable to the CCG and national average.
- 90% 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 and national average.
- The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and those living with dementia. For example the percentage of patients experiencing poor mental health who had received discussion and advice about alcohol consumption was 90%; CCG average – 92%; national

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

average - 89%. The percentage of patients experiencing poor mental health who had received discussion and advice about smoking cessation was 92%; CCG and national average - 95%.

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.

The most recent published Quality Outcome Framework (QOF) results were 100% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 98% and national average of 95%. 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 used information about care and treatment to make improvements.
- The practice was actively involved in quality improvement activity. For example an audit was carried out on the appropriate use of citalopram for patients over 65 years of age.
- Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.

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.
- The practice provided staff with on-going support. This included an induction process, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, clinical supervision and support for 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, 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.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 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 providing caring services.

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.
- All of the 20 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients described the service they received as excellent and very good. They said the staff were professional, caring and friendly. Patients said the reception staff were efficient, friendly and helpful. The results of the NHS Friends and Family Test indicated patients were mostly 'extremely likely' and 'likely' to recommend the practice to their friends and family.

Results from the July 2017 annual national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. 289 surveys were sent out and 104 were returned. This represented about 2% of the practice population. The practice was above average for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 93.6% 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%.
- 93% of patients who responded said the GP gave them enough time; CCG average - 90%; national average - 89%.
- 90% of patients who responded said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw; CCG average - 93%; national average - 92%.

- 92% of patients who responded said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern; CCG average - 87%; national average - 85%.
- 97% of patients who responded said the nurse was good at listening to them; CCG average - 93%; national average - 91%.
- 96% of patients who responded said the nurse gave them enough time; CCG average - 93%; national average - 92%.
- 100% of patients who responded said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw; CCG average - 98%; national average - 97%.
- 99% of patients who responded said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern; CCG average - 92%; national average - 91%.
- 99% of patients who responded said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful; CCG average - 92%; national average - 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. None of the health care notices in the reception areas were in any other language than English.
- 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 patients who were carers. The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 52 patients as carers (1% of the practice list).

- A member of staff acted as a champion for carers and patients with a learning disability to help ensure that the various services supporting carers were coordinated and effective.

Are services caring?

- Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

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 87% and the national average of 86%.
- 87% of patients who responded said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care; CCG and national average - 82%.
- 97% of patients who responded said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments; CCG average - 91%; national average - 90%.
- 98% of patients who responded said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care; CCG average - 86%; national average - 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.

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.
- The practice improved services where possible in response to unmet needs.
- 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, longer appointments were available for patients with a learning disability.
- 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 and practice nurse 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:

- 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 palliative care team to discuss and manage the needs of patients with complex medical issues.
- Self-management plans were available for patients with asthma and diabetes to encourage them to effectively manage their conditions.

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 12 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 the option of a telephone consultation at a flexible time.
- Influenza vaccination clinics were held at weekends to maximise accessibility.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability. All of these patients were invited for an annual review organised by the non-clinical champion.
- Patients requiring an interpreter were given a 20 minute appointment as standard.

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.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- Patients on the mental health register were invited for an annual review of their physical and mental health. Their care plan was reviewed to ensure that it remained up to date.

Timely access to the service

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.

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. 289 surveys were sent out and 104 were returned. This represented about 2% of the practice population.

- 83% of patients who responded were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 78% and the national average of 76%.
- 69% of patients who responded said they could get through easily to the practice by phone; CCG average – 68%; national average - 73%.
- 81% 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; CCG and national average - 76%.

- 94% of patients who responded said their last appointment was convenient; CCG average – 93%; national average - 92%.
- 73% of patients who responded described their experience of making an appointment as good; CCG average - 74%; national average - 73%.
- 41% of patients who responded said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen; CCG average - 56%; national average - 58%.

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. Six complaints were received in the last year. We reviewed all of these 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. The review of one complaint highlighted the need for clinical staff to ensure safety advice about a patient's condition is clearly understood by the patient/carer and the reason for giving the advice.

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, and all of the population groups, as good for providing well led services.

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.
- The practice developed its vision, values and strategy jointly with patients, staff and external partners.
- 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 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.
- All staff 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. It identified and addressed the causes of any workforce inequality. 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

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- Practice leaders had established proper 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 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. For example, one clinical audit looked to check that patients prescribed with sodium valproate had received appropriate contraceptive advice. Where it was identified that this advice had not been given, patients were contacted and offered an appointment with their GP to discuss this issue further.
- 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 range of patients and staff views and concerns were encouraged, heard and acted on to shape services and culture. For example, regular staff team meetings were held so they had an opportunity to talk about the things that were important to them.
- There was an active Patient Participation Group (PPG) which met with staff regularly to discuss issues relating the running of the practice and patient care. We spoke with two members of the PPG who told us they received good support from the practice staff.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.
- The practice used technology and equipment to improve treatment and to support patients' independence. For example, the practice used Facebook to inform patients about the proposed merger of the practice with other practices within the Bury area.
-

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. The

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

practice held regular learning events and a member of the nursing staff told us they were supported to attend individual training to support and advance them in their role.

- 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.
- The practice was in the process of merging with a number of other practices in the Bury area. Staff and patients had been informed of ongoing developments through meetings and newsletters. This gave them an opportunity to ask questions about the way the newly formed service would be provided.
- The practice employed administration staff on an apprentice scheme. These staff were offered full time employment at the end of their apprenticeship and further training so they could develop in their role.