L85029 - Vine Surgery Partnership

Inspection report

Vine Surgery
Vine Health Park, Hindhayes Lane
Street
Somerset
BA16 0ET
Tel: 01458 841122
www.vinesurgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 20 Nov to 20 Nov 2018
Date of publication: 21/12/2018

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. (Previous rating 02 2016 – Good)

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 L85029 - Vine Surgery Partnership on 20 November 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.

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

- Evaluate prescription security and implement measures in line with NHS England guidance for the safety of prescriptions.
- Review health and safety risk assessments to ensure they are available on site and overarching documentation of any actions taken recorded.
- Improve overarching document for oversight of clinical revalidation and professional body registration, staff vaccination and significant events.
- Complete annual appraisals for salaried GPs.

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.

Background to L85029 - Vine Surgery Partnership

L85029 - Vine Surgery Partnership is based at Vine Surgery (a purpose-built building built in 1993) Vine Health Park, Hindhayes Lane, Street, Somerset BA16 0ET which we visited as part of our inspection. Further information about the practice can be found at https://www.vinesurgery.nhs.uk.

Since our previous inspection the two practices at Vine Surgery had merged (April 2018) and formed a new leadership team. The Partnership is registered with the CQC in respect of the regulated activities: Diagnostic and screening procedures; Family planning; Maternity and midwifery services; Surgical procedures and Treatment of disease, disorder or injury. They provide primary medical services to approximately 12,844 patients over an area with three acute hospital Trusts. The surgery is co-located with a dentist and pharmacy.

The practice partnership consists of two male and two female GPs, the practice manager and a female nurse practitioner. The four GP partners work alongside four salaried GPs (female) to provide a whole time equivalent (WTE) of 5.7. The practice team includes three nurse practitioners (WTE 2.1), five practice nurses (WTE 3.4), a practice manager and deputy, health care assistants, patient assistants and administrative staff.

The practice is a training practice for medical students and doctors undertaken general practice speciality training. At the time of the inspection, a GP registrar (a trainee GP) was working at the practice.

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 is the official measure of relative deprivation for small areas in England. The deprivation decile for this area is seven with one being the most deprived and 10 the least. The practice age profile is in line with local and national averages.

The practice has opted out of providing Out Of Hours services to their own patients. Patients can access a local Out Of Hours GP service via NHS 111.

Good

Are services safe?

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 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. However, there was no overarching document to demonstrate clinical revalidation and professional body registration.
- 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.
- 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.
- The practice was above national (8.7%) and local averages (4.7%) for the prescribing of certain antibiotics (3.9%).
- Prescriptions awaiting collection including controlled drugs and those stored in locked clinical rooms were not secured out of hours when cleaning contractors had unsupervised access. Following inspection, the practice confirmed they were reviewing prescription security in line with national guidance and had risk assessed prescription paper security within clinical rooms.
- There were effective protocols for verifying the identity of patients during remote consultations.
- 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.

Good

Are services safe?

Track record on safety

The practice had a good track record on safety.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to Care of Substances Harmful to Health (COSHH) however, a health and safety risk assessment including any issues identified was not available. The provider was able to evidence an action list resulting from the external assessment.
- 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.
- Significant events, medicine alerts and complaints were discussed at regular meetings. The practice could demonstrate actions taken although there was not an oversight document demonstrating lessons learnt.
- The practice acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. An overarching document which tracked actions taken was not available although the practice could demonstrate action taken on individual alerts. Following inspection, an overarching completed document was provided.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.

Good

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.
- The practice had a 'patient information room' where patients could self-monitor their blood pressure, height and weight and submit measurements for inclusion on their record.
- Following the merger of two practices using different quality improvement systems the patient record operating system uploaded the practice which had not partaken in the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF). This meant the data for 2017/18 showed negative variations in areas where QOF was not previously required to be recorded. We reviewed the 2017/18 QOF data from the other merged practice and found they had achieved 545 out of the 559 points. The practice had a robust action plan to identify and follow-up on those patients were QOF indicated negative variations in results. (QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice).

Older people:

- Older patients who were 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. They 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.
- The practice visited the two main care homes locally bi-weekly to review all patients.

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 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.
- 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 most long-term conditions was comparable to local and national averages. Those areas where data indicated a negative variation were reviewed on inspection. The practice demonstrated improvements and an action plan was in place. We were not concerned with the practices performance.
- The practice worked with the clinical commissioning groups House of Care approach for managing patients with diabetes and asthma. (House of Care addresses the needs of people with long term conditions which has at its heart personalised care and support planning).
- The practice had identified 150 patients for management under the Mendip Symphony project. The approach had reduced unplanned hospital admissions. The project focused on a patient centered approach including individualised care plans and lifestyle measures. (Mendip Symphony is a project within local

Good

Are services effective?

GP practices to improve care for patients with long-term conditions, risk of unplanned and avoidable hospital admissions and integration of health and social care and voluntary agencies).

Families, children and young people:

- Childhood immunisation uptake rates were above the target percentage of 90% and in line with World Health Organisations targets.
- The practice had arrangements for following up failed attendance of children's appointments following an appointment in secondary care or for immunisation.
- GPs met with health visitors six weekly to discuss vulnerable children.

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

- The practice's uptake for cervical screening was 73%, which was below the 80% coverage target for the national screening programme. During inspection we reviewed current data which showed the uptake rate had increased to 77%. The practice used a text messaging service to remind patients to book an appointment for a cervical smear.
- The practice's uptake for breast and bowel cancer screening was above 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.
- 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 or mental health. These patients had a care plan in place.
- The practices performance for some quality indicators for mental health was below national averages. We reviewed this as part of our inspection and found the practice had an action plan in place to ensure all patients received an annual review and ongoing monitoring. Current data for 2018/19 demonstrated an improvement.

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. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.

- 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.
- Those patients most at risk of an unplanned hospital admission were referred to Mendip Symphony (a local GP federation led, multi-disciplinary team model of enhanced primary care to prevent unplanned admissions into hospital and provide holistic support to patients with long-term conditions).
- The practice had low exception reporting, where patients were excluded from the scheme due to a variety of clinical factors. Practice policy required all exception reporting to be reviewed by the lead GP.

Good

Are services effective?

- Where QOF results were significantly worse than national averages, the practice could demonstrate how the merger of two practices (one not within QOF) had impacted on results. During inspection we saw robust actions to improve the reporting on these indicators and that patients care and treatment was 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.
- 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, clinical supervision and revalidation. At the time of the inspection, following the practice merger, not all salaried GPs had not received an annual appraisal.
- The practice had a staff screening and immunisation policy although the practice had not adopted the policy in terms of evidence to demonstrate staff were vaccinated against Measles, Mumps and Rubella or Chicken Pox. Following inspection, the practice confirmed they were updating staff records for immunisation. 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.
- 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 and Health Connectors.
- 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.
- They had a patient information centre which contained a well–resourced lending library with books on general health matters, equipment for health checks, touch screens with access to a variety of health-related websites and various health information leaflets.

Consent to care and treatment

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

Good

Are services effective?

- 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.

Good

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 practices GP patient survey results (2018) were in line with local and national averages for questions relating to kindness, respect and compassion. One question led to a response above local and national averages: during their last GP appointment patients had confidence and trust in the healthcare professional they saw or spoke to. (Practice 100%, local 97%, national 96%).

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 were 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 practices GP patient survey results (2018) were above 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.

Good

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.
- 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 made reasonable adjustments when patients found it hard to access services. For example, patients could complete a form with preferences on how to be contacted such as braille or larger font letters.
- 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 used a text messaging service to remind patients about booked appointments and the need for reviews such as a medicines review.
- The practice referred patients to Health Connectors who undertook social prescribing and signposting, they supported the clinical team with non-medical patient contact.

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.
- GPs undertook weekly care home visits.

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.
- Patients who did not attend routine appointments received contact from clinical staff.

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.
- Family planning services such as the fitting of intrauterine coils and contraceptive implants were available.

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 two evenings per week, Saturday appointments and weekend flu vaccination clinics.

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.
- Patients who failed to attend routine appointments were proactively followed up by a phone call.

Good

Are services responsive to people's needs?

- The practice worked with a local service to host trainee counsellors. GPs were able to refer patients who then had a reduced waiting time until support was available.
- Same day access was available for patients with an acute mental health issue.

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.
- The practices GP patient survey results (2018) were above 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. They acted as a result to improve the quality of care.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.

Good

Are services well-led?

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. For example, the merger of two practices and merger of two quality improvement patient record systems.
- 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 with the exception of some salaried GPs 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.

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. 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.

Good

Are services well-led?

- 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 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.
- The practice was a research practice with a dedicated nurse to run research projects.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.