

Dr Plana & Partners

Inspection report

71 Sherard Road
Eltham
London
SE9 6ER
Branch

115 Tudway Road
Kidbrooke Village
London
SE3 9YX

Tel: 02088502120

www. www.sherardrdmedicalcentre.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:

Date of publication: 17/08/2018

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 inspection 25 April 2017- Requires Improvement)

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

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Plana & Partners on 25 April 2017 to follow up on previously identified breaches of regulations. We inspected the practice's main site at 71 Sherard Road SE9 6ER, and its branch site at 115 Tudway Road SE3 9YX. The overall rating for the practice following that inspection was Requires Improvement. The full comprehensive report on the 25 April 2017 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Dr Plana & Partners on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr Plana & Partners on 27 June 2018 to follow up on breaches of regulation identified in April 2017.

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 had reviewed ways to improve the outcomes for patients with long term conditions. Emergency medicines had been reviewed and risk assessed to ensure all eventualities were considered.
- All working prescribers knew where and how to check that tests results were up to date.
- 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, however reported that they had difficulties accessing appointments when needed.
- Data for 2016/2017 showed several patient outcomes were below local and national averages in relation to the Quality and Outcomes Framework clinical targets. The practice provided evidence for 2017/2018, showing that clinical performance had improved but this data had not been independently verified or published at the time of our inspection.
- 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:

- Continue to monitor satisfaction with appointment availability and explore ways to improve satisfaction.
- Continue to review exploring ways to improve uptake of childhood immunisations and cervical screening.
- Review process for identifying carers and support that is provided for them.
- Review consistency of undertaking fire drills.

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

Population group ratings

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

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by a CQC lead inspector, a second CQC inspector and a GP specialist adviser.

Background to Dr Plana & Partners

The practice operates from two sites in the London Borough of Greenwich. Its main site is located at 71 Sherard Road in Eltham; there is a second branch site at 115 Tudway Road in Kidbrooke. Dr Plana & Partners is one of 41 GP practices in the Greenwich Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) area. There are 12,546 patients registered at the practice.

Dr Plana & Partners is registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures, family planning, maternity and midwifery services, surgical procedures and treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

The practice has a personal medical services (PMS) contract with the NHS and is signed up to a number of enhanced services (enhanced services require an enhanced level of service provision above what is normally required under the core GP contract). These enhanced services include dementia, improving online access, influenza and pneumococcal immunisations, minor surgery, patient participation, risk profiling and case management, rotavirus and shingles immunisation, services for violent patients, and unplanned admissions.

The practice has an above average population of patients aged from five to 59 years. Income deprivation levels affecting children and adults registered at the practice are above the national average. The clinical team includes three male GP partners, a female GP partner,

two male salaried GPs, three female practice nurses, two female health care assistants and a pharmacist. The GPs provide a combined total of 39 fixed sessions per week. The clinical team is supported by a practice manager, three reception supervisors and 23 administrative/reception staff. The practice is a training practice for GP trainees.

The practice's two sites are open from 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Extended hours are only provided at Sherard Road and are from 6.30pm to 7pm on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, and from 9am to 12pm on Saturdays. Appointments with the GPs are available from 9am to 12.30pm and from 1pm to 6.30pm Monday to Friday.

The premises at the two sites are arranged over two floors of purpose-built buildings. At the Sherard Road main site, there is a waiting area, a reception area, seven consulting rooms, a treatment room. There are two toilets on the ground floor. There is off-street car parking available. The practice's entrance and toilet are wheelchair-accessible and there are baby changing facilities. At the Tudway Road branch there is a waiting area, a reception area, a patient toilet, a treatment room and four consulting rooms on the ground floor and are wheelchair accessible. The practice has opted out of providing out-of-hours (OOH) services. Patients needing urgent care out of

normal hours are advised to contact the OOH number 111 which directs patients to a local contracted OOH service or Accident and Emergency, depending on the patient's medical urgency.

Are services safe?

At our previous inspection on 25 April 2017, we rated the practice as Good for providing safe services. We found that the provider was still providing a safe service when we undertook this announced comprehensive inspection on 27 June 2018.

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 had received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns. Reports and learning from safeguarding incidents were available to staff. Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for their role and had received a 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, harassment, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The practice carried out appropriate staff checks at the time of recruitment and on an ongoing basis.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control.
- The practice had arrangements to ensure that facilities and equipment were safe and in good working order.
- Arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.
- The practice needed to review the frequency it undertook fire drills. On the day of the inspection we identified these did not happen often. We discussed with the practice and they informed us they were aware and they would be undertaking them more frequently.

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. There was a documented approach to managing test results.
- 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.

Are services safe?

- The systems for managing and storing medicines, including vaccines, medical gases, emergency medicines and equipment, minimised risks.
- Staff prescribed, administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with current national guidance. The practice had reviewed its antibiotic prescribing and taken action to support good antimicrobial stewardship in line with local and national guidance.
- Patients' health was monitored in relation to the use of medicines and followed up on appropriately. Patients were involved in regular reviews of their medicines.

Track record on safety

The practice had a good track record on safety.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.
- The practice monitored and reviewed activity. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture of safety that led to safety improvements.

Lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.
- There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The practice learned and shared lessons, identified themes and took action to improve safety in the practice.
- The practice acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts.

Please refer to the Evidence Tables for further information.

Are services effective?

At our previous inspection on 25 April 2017, we rated the practice as Requires Improvement for providing effective services due to Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) performance. We issued a requirement notice in respect of this issue and found arrangements had improved when we undertook a comprehensive follow up inspection of the service on 27 June 2018. On the day of inspection, the practice showed us unverified data relating to the QOF year 2017/2018 results which showed a significant improvement on the current published 2016/2017 results.

We rated the practice, and all population groups, as Good for providing effective services.

(Please note: Any Quality Outcomes (QOF) data relates to 2016/17 unless stated otherwise. QOF is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice.)

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 used appropriate tools to assess the level of pain in patients.
- Staff advised patients what to do if their condition got worse and where to seek further help and support.

Older people:

- Older patients who are frail or may be vulnerable received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs. The practice used an appropriate tool to identify patients aged 65 and over who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified as being frail had a clinical review including a review of medication.
- Patients aged over 75 were invited for a health check. If necessary they were referred to other services such as voluntary services and supported by an appropriate care plan.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital. It ensured that their care plans and prescriptions were updated to reflect any extra or changed needs.
- Staff had appropriate knowledge of treating older people including their psychological, mental and communication needs.
- Quarterly MDT meetings were undertaken with representatives from palliative care and other community health service professionals.

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.
- The practice had arrangements for adults with newly diagnosed cardiovascular disease including the offer of high-intensity 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 they identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), atrial fibrillation and hypertension)

Are services effective?

- The practice was an outlier for some long-term conditions for example, asthma, COPD, and hypertension, however the practice showed us unverified data relating to the QOF year 2017/2018 which showed a significant improvement on the current published 2016/2017 data to be comparable to with local and national averages.
- 63% of patients with asthma, on the register, had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months (local average 73%, national average of 76%). (Unverified data 2017/2018 70%).
- 68% 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 (local average 87%, national average of 90%). (Unverified data 2017/2018 90%).
- 73% of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90 mmHg or less (local average 79% national average 83%). (Unverified data 2017/2018 90%).

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 below the target percentage of 90%. The practice was aware of this provided us with unverified data which demonstrated up take was in line with the national uptake. For example, we saw that three out of the four national target rates were 90% or above. This had improved from last year's data which were all under 90%.
- The practice had arrangements to identify and review the treatment of newly pregnant women on long-term medicines. These patients were provided with advice and post-natal support in accordance with best practice guidance.
- The practice had arrangements for following up failed attendance of children's appointments following an appointment in secondary care or for immunisation.

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

- The practice's uptake for cervical screening was 66%, which was in line with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) average of 69% and national average of 72% for the national screening programme. coverage target
- The practices' uptake for breast and bowel cancer screening was in line 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):

Are services effective?

- 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.
- 85% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the previous 12 months. This is comparable to local and national averages.
- 68% of patients diagnosed with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the previous 12 months. (Unverified data 2017/2018 86%).
- The practice considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and those living with dementia. For example, 69% of patients experiencing poor mental health had received discussion and advice about alcohol consumption. (Unverified data 2017/2018 86%).
- 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.

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. For example, the practice Carried out a Warfarin audit to ensure patients were receiving warfarin care in line with guidelines. At time of re-audit 100% of patients had diagnosis recorded, stop date or indefinite treatment length recorded, INR recorded in past 12 weeks and next appointment date documented.

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was comparable to the local and national averages. For example, 76% of patients had well-controlled diabetes, indicated by specific blood test results, compared to the local average of 74% and the national average of 79% (exception reporting of 12%; local 10% national 12%).
- 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.

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. This included an induction process, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and support for revalidation. The induction process for healthcare assistants included the requirements of the Care Certificate. The practice ensured the competence of staff employed in advanced roles by audit of their clinical decision making, including non-medical prescribing.
- There was a clear approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.

Coordinating care and treatment

Are services effective?

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 deciding 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.
- Staff discussed changes to care or treatment with patients and their carers as necessary.
- The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health, for example, stop smoking campaigns, tackling obesity.

Consent to care and treatment

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

- Clinicians understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making.
- Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.
- The practice monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.

Please refer to the Evidence Tables for further information.

Are services caring?

At our previous inspection on 25 April 2017, we rated the practice as Requires Improvement for providing caring services as results from the GP Patient Survey were lower than the previous inspection. We issued a requirement notice in respect of this issue. When we undertook the comprehensive follow up inspection of the service on 27 June 2018, we identified the GP patient results (data collected in the first quarter of 2017) survey still reflected some lower scores. The practice was aware of the lower scores. On the day of inspection, the practice showed us their own survey they had undertaken which replicated the questions on the GP patient survey. It was undertaken in February 2018. The number of responses was 55 out of 200, a rate of 28% as a comparison the 2017 GP Survey response rate was 29%. Compared to the 2017 GP survey the results show that the practice had improved in all areas.

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.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

- Staff communicated with people in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids and easy read materials were available.
- Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services. They helped them ask questions about their care and treatment.
- The practice had less than one percent of carers on their register. We raised this with the practice they told us they were aware and they had plans to start proactively identifying carers and support them.
- Patients reported that the GPs were caring, responsive to their needs and always took the time to listen to all issues the patients had. All patients we spoke with were happy with the services the clinicians provided.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected patients' privacy and dignity.

- 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.
- Staff recognised the importance of people's dignity and respect. They challenged behaviour that fell short of this.

Please refer to the Evidence Tables for further information.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

At our previous inspection on 25 April 2017, we rated the practice as Requires Improvement for providing responsive services as results from the GP Patient Survey were lower than the last inspection. We issued a requirement notice in respect of this issue. When we undertook the comprehensive follow up inspection of the service on 27 June 2018, we identified the GP patient results survey still reflected some lower scores. The practice was aware of the lower scores. On the day of inspection, the practice showed us their own survey they had undertaken which replicated the questions on the GP patient survey. It was undertaken in February 2018. The number of responses was 55 out of 200, a rate of 28% comparable to the 2017 GP Survey response rate of 29%. Compared to the 2017 GP Survey the results showed that the practice had improved in all areas, however they still needed to improve satisfaction with availability of appointments.

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.
- The practice provided effective care coordination for patients who are more vulnerable or who have complex needs. They supported them to access services both within and outside the practice.
- Care and treatment for patients with multiple long-term conditions and patients approaching the end of life was coordinated with other services.

Older people:

- All patients had a named GP who supported them in whatever setting they lived, whether it was at home or in a care home or supported living scheme.
- The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients, and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs. The GP and practice nurse also accommodated home visits for those who had difficulties getting to the practice due to limited local public transport availability.
- There was a medicines delivery service for housebound patients.

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.

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.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

- The needs of this population group had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care. For example, extended opening hours and Saturday appointments.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

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

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

- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and those patients living with dementia.
- The practice held GP led dedicated monthly mental health and dementia clinics. Patients who failed to attend were proactively followed up by a phone call from a GP.

Timely access to care and treatment

Patients were able to access care and treatment from the practice within an acceptable timescale for their needs.

- Patients had timely access to initial assessment, test results, diagnosis and treatment.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- Patients reported that the appointment system was easy to use, however they found it difficult getting appointments.

The practice was aware of the data from the GP survey which reflected lower scores with access compared to local and national averages. Subsequently the practice had undertaken their own survey, although there was improvement in the data the practice attributed lower scores to accessing appointments to the phone system. They told us they were in the process of upgrading the phone system, and had got more reception staff to cover the phones during busy periods of the day.

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 from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care. Our review of the three out of eleven complaints received in the last year showed the complaints process was being followed effectively.

Please refer to the Evidence Tables for further information.

Are services well-led?

At our previous inspection on 25 April 2017, we rated the practice as Good for providing well-led services. We found that the provider was still providing a well-led service when we undertook this announced comprehensive inspection on 27 June 2018.

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 high-quality, sustainable care.

- Leaders were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.
- The practice had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the practice.
- Leaders acted on concerns raised at the last inspection and had been proactive at acting on them.

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. 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 had a strategy and supporting business plans that reflected the vision and values and were regularly monitored.
- Since the last inspection the practice had developed effective strategies to support the delivery of this, for example changing the structure of staffing, developing processes and systems, to ensure high quality care for patients.

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.
- Clinical 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. 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.

- The practice addressed concerns raised at the last inspection, they recruited new nursing staff to address the nurse access concerns, they undertook their own survey to improve patient satisfaction, they restructured staffing arrangements.
- 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.

Are services well-led?

- Staff were clear on their roles and accountabilities including in respect of safeguarding and infection prevention and control
- Practice leaders had established proper policies, procedures and activities to ensure safety and assured themselves that they were operating as intended.
- Regular meetings were undertaken by the practice including weekly clinical meetings, quarterly safeguarding and palliative care meetings.

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 national and local safety alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was clear evidence of action to change practice to improve quality.
- The practice had plans in place and had trained staff for major incidents.
- The practice 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 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. For example the practice undertook its own patient survey to address the access concerns highlighted in the GP patient survey.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.

Continuous improvement and innovation

There was evidence of systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement.
- Staff knew about improvement methods and had the skills to use them.
- The practice made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints. Learning was shared and used to make improvements.
- Leaders and managers encouraged staff to take time out to review individual and team objectives, processes and performance.

Please refer to the Evidence Tables for further information.