

Kenneth MacRae Medical Centre

Quality Report

32 Church Road
Rainford
St Helens
WA11 8HJ

Tel: 01744 882606

Website: www.kennethmacraemedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 23/01/2018

Date of publication: 08/03/2018

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 six population groups and what we found	4

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	5
Background to Kenneth MacRae Medical Centre	5
Detailed findings	6

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

This practice is rated as Good overall. (Previous inspection 5 March 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 an announced comprehensive inspection at Kenneth MacRae Medical Centre Limited on 23 January 2018 as part of our inspection programme.

At this inspection we found:

- Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns and report incidents.
- Significant events had been investigated and action had been taken as a result of the learning from events.
- Systems were in place to deal with medical emergencies and staff were trained in basic life support.
- There were systems in place to reduce risks to patient safety. For example, infection control practices were carried out appropriately and there were regular checks on the environment and on equipment used.
- Staff assessed patients' needs and delivered care in line with current evidence based guidance and the provider routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided.
- Data showed that outcomes for patients at this practice were similar to outcomes for patients locally and nationally.
- Staff had been trained to provide them with the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

Summary of findings

- Feedback from patients about the care and treatment they received from clinicians was very positive. Patients told us they were treated with dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment and there was good continuity of care. The appointments system was flexible to accommodate the needs of patients.
- The practice had good facilities, including disabled access. It was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership and staff structure and staff understood their roles and responsibilities.
- The staff team had a clear vision to provide a safe and good quality service.
- Patient views were sought and acted upon. This included the practice having and consulting with a patient participation group (PPG).
- There was a focus on learning and improvement at all levels.

We saw areas of outstanding practice:

- The GPs provided a high standard of care to palliative patients. This included providing out of hours visits to patients who were nearing the end of their life to ensure continuity of care.
- The GPs liaised with secondary care upon the admission of patients to hospital and they regularly and proactively visited patients for whom there were continued health concerns following discharge.

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Review the arrangements for storing and checking medicines held for responding to a medical emergency.
- Introduce a system to readily identify carers to ensure they are offered appropriate support.
- Review the information provided about how to make a complaint and the various stages of this.

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

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

We always inspect the quality of care for these six population groups.

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

Kenneth MacRae Medical Centre

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.

Background to Kenneth MacRae Medical Centre

The registered provider for the practice is Kenneth MacRae Medical Centre, 32 Church Road, Rainford, St Helens, Merseyside WA11 8HJ . The provider's website can be reached at; www.kennethmacraemedicalcentre.co.uk

The location from which the regulated activities are provided is Kenneth MacRae Medical Centre at the provider's address as above.

The medical centre is led by two GP partners and the staff team includes a practice manager, a practice nurse and a team of reception and administrative staff. The practice treats patients of all ages and provides a range of medical services.

The practice is open Monday to Friday from 8.15am to 6.00pm. An open access surgery is provided on Mondays when patients can walk in or phone ahead to be given an appointment time for that day and all patients contacting the surgery before 9.30am are accommodated.

Patients can book appointments in person, on-line or via the telephone. The practice provides telephone consultations and home visits to patients who are housebound or too ill to attend the practice.

Outside of practice hours patients can access St Helens Rota for primary medical services by calling the NHS 111 service.

The practice is part of St Helens Clinical Commissioning Group. It is responsible for providing primary care services to approximately 3,821 patients. The practice is situated in an area that has lower than average levels of deprivation. The practice has a higher than average percentage of older patients and lower than average children and younger adult population.

The practice has a General Medical Services (GMS) contract.

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 systems in place to keep patients safe and safeguard them from abuse.

- The practice worked with other agencies to support patients and protect them from neglect and abuse. Arrangements were in place to safeguard children and vulnerable adults that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Safeguarding policies were accessible to all staff. The policies outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns about a patient's welfare. Contact details and process flowcharts for reporting concerns were displayed. Alerts were recorded on the electronic patient records system to identify if a child or adult was at risk. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding. All staff had received safeguarding training relevant to their role.
- We reviewed a sample of staff personnel files in order to assess the staff recruitment practices. Our findings showed that appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, proof of qualifications, proof of registration with the appropriate professional bodies and checks through the (DBS)
- Notices advised patients that staff were available to act as chaperones if required. (A chaperone is a person who acts as a safeguard and witness for a patient and health care professional during a medical examination or procedure). Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had undergone a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check.
- Procedures and practices were in place to ensure appropriate standards of hygiene were maintained and to prevent and control the spread of infection. The practice nurse was the infection control lead. There was an infection control protocol in place and staff had received up to date training. Annual infection control audits were undertaken.
- There were systems for safely managing healthcare waste.

- The practice ensured that facilities and equipment were safe and that equipment was regularly checked and maintained.

Risks to patients

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

- Health and safety related risk assessments had been carried out and a range of health and safety policies were available to staff.
- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies on the premises and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention.

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.
- Information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to relevant staff.
- Systems were in place for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- Referrals to other services were made promptly.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

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

- There was a system to ensure the safe issue of repeat prescriptions and patients who were prescribed potentially harmful drugs were monitored regularly.
- Regular medicines audits were carried out with the support of the local CCG pharmacy team. There was evidence of actions taken to support antimicrobial stewardship.
- Medicines prescribing data for the practice was comparable to national prescribing data.

Are services safe?

- A system was in place to account for prescriptions and they were stored securely.
- Medicines for use in an emergency were readily available to staff and there was a system in place to check that medicines were in date and fit for use. However, we found some medicines and equipment had not been included in the checks.

Track record on safety

The practice had a good safety record.

- The provider assessed, monitored and reviewed risks and took action to mitigate risks to the safety of patients and staff.
- Risk assessments had been carried out in relation to health and safety related issues. For example, a fire risk assessment and prevention plan was in place and measures were taken to mitigate the risk of fire.

- The practice had a business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage.

Lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- There were systems for identifying and reporting significant events and incidents. Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Staff told us they felt supported to report concerns.
- There were systems for investigating when things went wrong and for sharing any lessons learned from events so as to improve the safety of the service.
- 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

Clinicians assessed needs and delivered care and treatment in line with guidance and supported by clear clinical pathways and protocols.

- The practice monitored its performance data and had systems in place to improve outcomes for patients. Data showed that outcomes for patients at this practice were comparable to those for patients locally and nationally.
- The average daily quantity of hypnotics prescribed per specific therapeutic group was comparable to other practices.
- The number of antibacterial prescription items prescribed per specific therapeutic group was comparable to other practices.
- The percentage of antibiotic items prescribed that are Cephalosporins or Quinolones was 7.1% which was higher than but comparable to the national average of 4.7%.

Older people:

- The practice kept up to date registers of patients with a range of health conditions (including conditions common in older people) and used this information to plan reviews of health care and to offer services such as vaccinations for flu.
- Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients with conditions commonly found in older people were comparable to outcomes for patients locally and nationally.
- The GPs worked in conjunction with community services and secondary care to support the palliative care of patients who were nearing the end of their life.
- Feedback from patients and from a health professional outside of the service indicated that the level of care and treatment provided to palliative care patients was very high.

- The GPs visited patients in two local care homes and they had introduced a system for sharing information about treatment plans and follow up plans with these services.

People with long-term conditions:

- The practice held information about the prevalence of specific long term conditions within its patient population. This included conditions such as diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), cardiovascular disease and hypertension. The information was used to target service provision, for example to ensure patients who required immunisations received these.
- The practice used a system of coding and alerts within the clinical record system to ensure that patients with specific needs were highlighted to staff on opening their clinical record.
- Patients with long-term conditions had a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met.
- Clinical staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long term conditions had received training appropriate to their role.
- Data from 2016 to 2017 showed that the practice was performing comparably with other practices locally and nationally for the care and treatment of people with chronic health conditions.

Families, children and young people:

- There were systems in place to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and those who were at risk.
- Staff we spoke with had appropriate knowledge about child protection and they had ready access to safeguarding policies and procedures.
- Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given were largely in line with the target percentage of 90% or above. Parents or guardian were contacted when a child had not attended for the recommended vaccines under the national immunisation programme.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The practice did not provide family planning services. Patients requiring this were signposted to relevant services.

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

- The practice's encouraged cancer screening uptake for patients in this age group.
- Uptake for cervical screening was 92%, which was higher than the 80% target for the national screening programme.
- The GPs were flexible in accommodating working people and provided later appointments when requested. This also included some weekend appointments.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances in order to provide the services patients required. For example, a register of people who had a learning disability was maintained.
- The practice worked with other health and social care professionals in the case management of vulnerable people.
- Information and advice was available about how patients could access a range of support groups and voluntary organisations.

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

- The practice held a register of patients experiencing poor mental health and these patients were offered an annual review of their physical and mental health.
- Data about how people with mental health needs were supported showed that outcomes for patients using this practice were comparable to local and national averages.
- A system was in place to prompt patients for medicines reviews at intervals suitable to the medication they were prescribed.
- The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care had been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months was 79% (national average 83%).

- The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who had a comprehensive, agreed care plan in the preceding 12 months was 85% (national average of 90%).
- Staff had been provided with training in dementia awareness.

Monitoring care and treatment

The provider routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided.

- Information about outcomes for patients was used to make improvements. We looked at the processes in place for clinical audit. Clinical audit is a way to find out if the care and treatment being provided is in line with best practice and it enables providers to know if the service is doing well and where they could make improvements. The aim is to promote improvements to the quality of outcomes for patients. We viewed a sample of audits that demonstrated that the provider has assessed and made improvements to the treatment provided to patients.
- The most recently published Quality Outcome Framework (QOF) results showed that the practice had achieved 95% of the total number of points available. This compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 98% and national average of 96%. The overall exception reporting rate was 9.6%. This was the same as the national average. (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.)

Data from the QOF from April 2016 to March 2017 showed performance in outcomes for patients was comparable to those of the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and national average. For example;

- The percentage of patients on the diabetes register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5mmol/l or less was 77% compared to a Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 80% and a national average of 80%.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- The percentage of patients with diabetes in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c was 64mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 79% (CCG average 83%, national average 79%).
- The percentage of patients with atrial fibrillation with a record of CHAD2DS2-VASc score of 2 or more treated with anti-coagulation was 85% (CCG average 87%, national average 88%).
- The percentage of patients with COPD who had a review undertaken including an assessment of breathlessness using the Medical Research Council dyspnoea scale in the preceding 12 months was 92% (CCG average 91%, national average of 90%).

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 provider had assessed 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.
- Staff were provided with

Coordinating care and treatment

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

- The information needed to plan and deliver care and treatment was available to relevant staff in a timely and accessible way through the practice's patient record system and intranet system.

- 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.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

Staff were 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 and patients at risk of developing a long-term condition.
- The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health, for example, by referring patients for smoking cessation or dietary advice.
- Health promotion information was available in the reception area and on the provider's website.
- Information and advice was available about how patients could access a range of support groups and voluntary organisations.
- Cancer screening uptake rates were higher than local and national averages. Patients who had not taken up bowel screening had been written to and this had resulted in a significant increase in uptake.

Consent to care and treatment

Staff sought patients' consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

- Staff understood the relevant consent and decision-making requirements of legislation and guidance, including the Mental Capacity Act 2005 in line with their roles and responsibilities.
- Clinical staff were aware of their responsibility to carry out assessments of capacity to consent for children and young people in line with relevant guidance.

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.

- We observed that members of staff were courteous and helpful to patients and treated them with dignity and respect.
- We made patient comment cards available at the practice prior to our inspection visit. All of the 41 comment cards we received were highly positive and complimentary about the caring nature of the service provided. One in four comment cards referred to the service as 'excellent' and other comments included 'magnificent', 'amazing', and 'exceptional'. Comments such as 'amazing practice', 'they go above and beyond the call of duty' were also received.
- GPs provided details of when they had proactively and regularly visited patients for whom there were continued health concerns following discharge from hospital.
- One of the patients we spoke with told us that a member of their family had received 'excellent' end of life care from one of the GPs. They told us the GP had visited regularly and that they had direct contact for support at all times. Another patient told us in a comment card that the end of life care provided to their family member was 'second to none'.
- When families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them and in some cases attended funerals. This had been the case on eight occasions in the past 12 months.
- The practice was working alongside the PPG on a project to try to encourage and support people who are lonely to be involved in local community groups. This was initiated after the practice was made aware of an incident with a patient in the community.
- The practice had been provided with an award by the local Healthwatch for being a 'Patient friendly practice' in November 2016.

Results from the July 2017 annual national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. A total of 216 surveys were sent out and 96 were returned. This represents about 2.5% of the practice population. The practice received scores that were consistently higher than local and national averages for patient satisfaction on consultations with clinical staff. For example:

- 98% of respondents said that the last time they saw or spoke to a GP, the GP was good or very good at treating them with care and concern. This compared to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average 89% national average 85%).
- 97% said that the last time they saw or spoke to a nurse, they were good or very good at treating them with care and concern (CCG average 93%, national average 90%).
- 98% said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw (CCG average 96%, national average 95%).
- 98% said they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (CCG average 78% national average 78%).

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients be involved in decisions about their care.

- Patients told us they felt listened to and included in decisions about their care and treatment and that the GPs ensured they were well informed about their health and the treatment options available to them.
- Staff demonstrated a patient centred approach to their work during our discussions with them. The majority of the staff team were long term members of staff and felt they knew patients and their individual communication needs.
- The practice manager was 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). New patients were asked to confirm if they had any preferred communication methods in line with their needs.
- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. A hearing loop

Are services caring?

system was in place to support people who wear hearing aids. Clinical staff had access to white boards to communicate with patients who were deaf or hard of hearing.

- Staff had been trained in dementia awareness to support them in supporting patients with dementia care needs.

The practice had coded patients who they knew were carers on the patient record system. However, there was no alert to identify carers during consultations and no register of carers. A designated member of staff was a 'Carer's champion' and there was a range of information available to inform carers of the local support services.

Results from the national GP patient survey for questions about patient involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment were consistently higher than local and national averages. For example;

- 98% of respondents said the last GP they saw was good or very good at listening to them compared to the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and the national average of 88%.
- 98% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments (CCG) average 89%, national average of 86%).

- 94% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG average 85%, national average 82%).
- 96% said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments (CCG average 92%, national average 89%).
- 96% said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care (CCG 88%, national average 85%).

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff recognised the importance of patients' dignity and respect and they told us how they worked to ensure they maintained patient confidentiality.
- Reception staff told us they could offer patients a private area if they wanted to discuss sensitive issues or if they appeared uncomfortable or distressed.
- 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 took account of patient's needs and preferences and organised and delivered services to meet these.

- The practice understood the needs of its population and tailored services in response to those needs. For example the appointments system was flexible, advice for managing common ailments was made available to patients and online services such as repeat prescription requests and appointment requests were provided. Almost half of all patients were registered for online services.
- The practice improved services in response to feedback from patients. There was an active and engaged Patient Participation Group (PPG) and they gave us very positive feedback about the level of consultation from the provider, information sharing and how the provider acted on their feedback.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered. Reasonable adjustments had been made to accommodate the needs of patients.
- Care and treatment for patients with multiple long-term conditions and patients approaching the end of life was well co-ordinated with other services.
- The GPs provided a high number of home visits ranging between 59 and 113 per month over the previous 12 months. Totalling in excess of 1,000 home visits throughout 2017.
- The GPs produce a monthly newsletter that included updates for patients on national, local and practice issues.

Older people:

- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.
- Palliative patients were given direct contact numbers for the GPs who provided treatment to these patients inside and outside of hours including weekends and bank holidays.

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. Patients with multiple health conditions were reviewed at one appointment.
- The practice worked with other health and social care professionals in a coordinated way to support patients with complex needs and patients receiving end of life care.

Families, children and young people:

- Systems were in place to identify and follow up children who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency (A&E) attendances.
- Parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child were offered a same day appointment when necessary and appointments were available outside of school hours.

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.
- Appointments were provided outside of core hours to accommodate patient need. The provider was in the process of joining up with four other practices to provide an extended hours service.
- Telephone consultations were available which supported patients who were unable to attend the practice during normal working hours.
- The practice was proactive in offering online services.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- The way in which same day appointments could be provided supported patients whose circumstances made them vulnerable.
- Staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding information sharing, documentation of safeguarding concerns and how to contact relevant agencies in normal working hours and out of hours.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

- The practice provided appropriate access and facilities for people who were disabled.
- Longer appointments were available for patients with enhanced needs.
- The practice was working alongside the PPG and a local church to try to encourage and support people who may be lonely to be involved in local community groups.

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

- The practice identified patients who experienced poor mental health in order to be responsive to their needs, for example by the provision of regular health checks.
- Patients experiencing poor mental health were referred to appropriate services such as psychiatry and counselling services.
- Patients experiencing poor mental health were informed about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations.
- The GPs provided examples of how they had supported patients experiencing poor mental health. This included remaining with patients outside of hours until psychiatric services were available.

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.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- Patients told us the appointment system was easy to use and flexible to accommodate their needs.
- Open access surgery was provided every Monday morning.

Results from the July 2017 annual national GP patient survey showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was higher than local and national averages. For example;

- 90% of respondents were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 79% and the national average of 80%.
- 91% said they could get through easily to the practice by phone (CCG average 62%, national average 70%).
- 75% said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment (CCG average 71%, national average 75%).
- 88% responded positively about their overall experience of making an appointment (CCG average 68%, national average 72%).

This high level of patient satisfaction was also supported during discussion with patients on the day of inspection and in completed comment cards.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

Systems were in place to ensure complaints and concerns were investigated and responded to.

- A complaints policy and procedure was in place.
- Information was available to help patients understand the complaints procedure and how they could expect their complaint to be dealt with. This did not include accurate information about the different stages of a complaint. The practice manager confirmed following the inspection that they had updated this.
- We found there had been no written complaints received in the last 12 months. The last written complaint had been investigated and responded to.
- Complaints were discussed at practice meetings as they arose and a periodic review of complaints was carried out to identify any trends or themes.

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 a well-led service.

Leadership capacity and capability

Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver good 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.
- Staff told us that leaders were visible and approachable.
- There was a clear leadership and staffing structure and staff were aware of their roles and responsibilities.
- There were processes to support staff development. Staff in all roles felt supported and appropriately trained and experienced to meet their responsibilities. All staff received regular annual appraisals in the last year. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary

• Vision and strategy

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

- The practice had a statement of purpose which outlined its aims and objectives.
- 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.

Culture

The provider promoted a culture that supported high-quality, sustainable care.

- Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued. They told us they were proud to work in the practice. They described good team working and collaborative working.
- 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.

Governance arrangements

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

- Arrangements were in place to monitor the effectiveness of the service and ensure good outcomes were provided for patients.
- Clinical staff used evidence based guidance in the treatment of patients.
- Audits were carried out to evaluate the operation of the service and the care and treatment provided and to improve outcomes for patients.
- The clinical system was used effectively to ensure patients received the care and treatment they required.
- The provider had a clear understanding of the performance of the practice. The Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) and other performance indicators were used to measure performance. The QOF data showed that the practice achieved results comparable to other practices locally and nationally for the indicators measured.
- The system for reporting and managing significant events was effective and learning gained from the investigation of events was used to drive improvements.
- There were clear methods of communication across the staff team. Records showed that regular meetings were carried out to improve the service and patient care.
- Practice specific policies and standard operating procedures were available to all staff. Staff we spoke with knew how to access these and any other information they required in their role.

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks.

- There were effective processes to identify, understand, monitor and address current and future risks including risks to patient safety.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was evidence of action having been taken to change practice and improve quality.
- A business continuity plan was in place to deal with unforeseen emergencies.

Appropriate and accurate information

The practice acted on information appropriately.

- Quality and operational information was used to improve performance.
- The practice used information technology systems to monitor and improve the quality of care.
- 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, staff and external partners to support a good quality sustainable service.

- The practice actively encouraged and valued feedback from patients and acted upon this.
- There was an active and engaged patient participation group (PPG). We met with four members of the PPG and they gave us very positive feedback about their

engagement with the practice. They told us they met with both GPs and the practice manager on a regular basis and were consulted with about the service provision and were regularly asked to give feedback on their experiences of the practice.

- The provider had knowledge of and incorporated local and national objectives. They worked alongside commissioners, partner agencies and other practices to improve and develop the primary care provided to patients in the locality.

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were systems and processes for learning and continuous improvement.

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice.
- Staff were involved in discussions about how to develop the service and encouraged to provide feedback about the service through a system of regular staff meetings and appraisals.
- The practice made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints and the learning from these was used to make improvements.
- The provider was intending to develop the team through employing a pharmacist and training up a member of staff to become a health care assistant.