

Thurleigh Road Practice

Quality Report

88a Thurleigh Road,
London SW12 8TT
Tel: 020 8675 3521
Website: www.thurleighroadpractice.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 30 November 2017
Date of publication: 07/02/2018

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	6
Background to Thurleigh Road Practice	6
Detailed findings	7

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

This practice is rated as Good overall. (Previous inspection February 2016 – Good overall)

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 a comprehensive inspection of Thurleigh Road Practice under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. The inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

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 treated patients with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect and involved them in decisions about their care and treatment.
- 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:

Summary of findings

Review how patients with caring responsibilities are identified and recorded on the clinical system to ensure information, advice and support is made available to them.

Professor Steve Field CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

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

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

Thurleigh Road Practice

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, a practice manager adviser and a second CQC inspector.

Background to Thurleigh Road Practice

Thurleigh Road Practice provides primary medical services in Balham to approximately 13,500 patients and is one of 43 member practices in the NHS Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The practice population is in the second least deprived decile in England with lower than CCG and national average representation of income deprived children and older people. The practice population has a higher than CCG average percentage of children under 15 and working age people, with a lower than CCG average of young people aged 15 to 24 years of age and people aged 50 or older.

The practice operates from a purpose-built property with most patient facilities on the ground and first floors. There are offices for administrative and management staff on the second floor alongside a flexible space used for patient activities such as yoga classes, staff training events and practice meetings. All three floors are accessed via a lift or stairs.

The practice operates under a Personal Medical Services (PMS) contract and provides a number of local and national enhanced services (enhanced services require an increased level of service provision above that which is normally required under the core GP contract).

The practice is operated by six GP partners along with one management partner. There are four salaried GPs and two GP registrars. The doctors provide 68 clinical sessions per week.

The nursing team consists of one part time advanced nurse practitioner, one part time nurse practitioner and one full time practice nurse. Thurleigh Road also employs two part time health care assistants.

There are eight administrative and clerical staff including one full time practice manager. There are 11 reception staff including two reception team leaders.

The practice is open between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments are from 8.00am to 6.30pm daily. Extended surgery hours are offered from 7.30am until 8.00am and 6.30pm until 7.30pm Monday to Friday. The practice does not open at weekends. The practice has opted out of providing out of hours (OOH) services to their own patients when the practice is closed and directs patients to use the NHS111 service.

Thurleigh Road Practice is registered as a partnership with the Care Quality Commission to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening services, family planning, maternity and midwifery services, surgical procedures and the treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

Are services safe?

Our findings

We rated the practice, and all of the population groups, as good for providing safe services.

Safety systems and processes

The practice had clear systems to keep patients safe and safeguarded from abuse.

- The practice conducted safety risk assessments. There were safety policies which were regularly reviewed and communicated to staff. Staff received safety information for the practice as part of their induction and refresher training. The practice had systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. Policies were regularly reviewed and were accessible to all staff. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance.
- The practice worked with other agencies to support patients and protect them from neglect and abuse. Staff took steps to protect patients from abuse, neglect, harassment, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The practice carried out staff checks, including checks of professional registration where relevant, on recruitment and on an ongoing basis. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- All staff received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns. Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a DBS check.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control.
- The practice ensured that facilities and equipment were safe and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions. There were systems for safely managing healthcare waste.

Risks to patients

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

- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed.

- There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies on the premises and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention. Clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections, for example, sepsis.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

- Individual care records were written and managed in a way that kept patients safe. The care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to relevant staff in an accessible way.
- The practice had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- Referral letters included all of the necessary information.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

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

- The systems for managing medicines, including vaccines, medical gases, and emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks. The practice kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use.
- Staff prescribed, administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with legal requirements and current national guidance. The practice had audited antimicrobial prescribing. There was evidence of actions taken to support good antimicrobial stewardship.
- Patients' health was monitored to ensure medicines were being used safely and followed up on appropriately. The practice involved patients in regular reviews of their medicines.

Track record on safety

The practice had a good safety record.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.

Are services safe?

- The practice monitored and reviewed activity. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture that led to safety improvements.

Lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- There was a system for recording and acting on significant events and incidents. Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.
- There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The practice learned and shared lessons, identified themes and took action to improve safety in the practice. For example,

the practice identified that four sets of patient specimens had been incorrectly filed. Immediately on notification of this error, the nursing team contacted the patients concerned to apologise and request new samples to be taken. The incident was investigated with the reception team and shared at the next reception monthly meeting. Action taken included the review of the reception area operating environment and workflow processes and introducing a regular check by the reception team leaders of all storage areas to avoid the same thing happening again. This significant event was also shared at the next clinical meeting.

- There was a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. The practice learned from external safety events as well as patient, medical devices and medicines safety alerts.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

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

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

The practice had systems to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence-based practice. We saw that clinicians assessed needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance supported by clear clinical pathways and protocols.

- Patients' needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- The practice were above average users in the local area for electronic prescriptions and had been awarded a local award for achieving a 54% increase in active user accounts for online services such as appointment booking.
- The practice actively used the Kinesis computer system for conferring with specialists in real time to provide information and support for patient's conditions and referral pathway options. The practice told us this system saved time and resources and also ensured patients were referred correctly and in a timely way.
- 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. Those identified as being frail had a clinical review including a review of medication. The practice had reviewed 81% of older patients in 2016/17.
- 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 and used a virtual ward system with other health and social care providers. It ensured that their care plans and prescriptions were updated to reflect any extra or changed needs.
- The practice offered two sessions weekly of free yoga classes for patients aged 65 and over. The sessions were

used to improve patient wellbeing where mobility and social isolation issues were identified. The number of sessions had been increased from one to two per week due to demand.

People with long-term conditions:

- Patients with long-term conditions had a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For patients with the most complex needs, the GP worked with other health and care professionals to deliver a coordinated package of care.
- Staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long term conditions had received specific training.

Families, children and young people:

- Childhood immunisations were carried out in line with the national childhood vaccination programme. Uptake rates for the vaccines given were in line with the target percentage of 90% of children aged one, aged two and aged five having a full course of recommended vaccines.
- The practice had arrangements to identify and review the treatment of newly pregnant women on long-term medicines.

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

- The practice's uptake for cervical screening was 81%, which was in line with the 80% coverage target for the national screening programme.
- The practice had systems to inform eligible patients to have relevant vaccines, screenings and health checks.
- 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.

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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

- 81% of patients diagnosed with dementia had their care reviewed in a face to face meeting in the previous 12 months. This is comparable to the national average of 84% and the local average of 84%.
- 99% of patients diagnosed with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses had a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the previous 12 months. (CCG 92%, national 90%).
- The practice specifically considered the physical health needs of patients with poor mental health and those living with dementia. For example the percentage of patients experiencing poor mental health who had received discussion and advice about alcohol consumption was 99% (CCG 92%, national 91%).

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. For example the practice took part in audits, service reviews, CCG led reviews including prescribing audits and reviews under the local pathology improvement programme.

- The practice recognised their high paediatric patient population and carried out an audit to ensure prescribing of specialist baby milk was in line with local prescribing guidelines. The first audit cycle showed that of 20 patients identified as prescribed specialist milks, 15 were prescribed in line with guidelines and 5 patients had their prescription stopped after review from a GP or dietician. The results and findings were shared with clinicians and discussed at a clinical meeting. The second audit cycle showed that of the 16 patients identified, all patients had complete notes, appropriate prescription for their diagnosis and had seen a dietician where indicated.
- The practice carried out an audit to determine if updated guidelines on the treatment of osteoporosis was being adhered to. The first cycle demonstrated that only 20% (1 out of 5) patients prescribed a medicine for the treatment of osteoporosis and who had been taking the medicine for 3-5 years had their ongoing treatment reviewed. The results were discussed at a clinical meeting and the guidelines were shared. The next review six months later showed that all five patients had their treatment reviewed in line with guidelines.

- The findings of these audits prompted the practice to assess the medication review process and as a result the practice made changes including automatically booking in patients for medication reviews at the time of repeat prescription requests being made and before they were processed, where necessary escalating time critical requests to the duty GP.

The most recent published Quality Outcome Framework (QOF) results were 99% of the total number of points available compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 92% and national average of 95%. The overall exception reporting rate was 7% compared with a national average of 10%. (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.)

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles. For example, staff whose role included immunisation and taking samples for the cervical screening programme had received specific training and could demonstrate how they stayed up to date.

- The practice understood the learning needs of staff and provided protected time and training to meet them. Up to date records of skills, qualifications and training were maintained. Staff were encouraged and given opportunities to develop.
- The practice provided staff with 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 reviewed the clinical decision making, including non-medical prescribing, of staff employed in advanced roles.

Coordinating care and treatment

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

- We saw records that showed that all appropriate staff, including those in different teams, services and organisations, were involved in assessing, planning and delivering care and treatment.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

Consent to care and treatment

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

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.
- 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.

Are services caring?

Our findings

We rated the practice, and all of the population groups, as good for caring.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs.
- The practice gave patients timely support and information.
- Reception staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.
- All of the 22 patient Care Quality Commission comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. This is in line with the results of the NHS Friends and Family Test and other feedback received by the practice.

Results from the July 2017 annual national GP patient survey showed patients felt they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect. Two hundred and eighty three surveys were sent out and 98 were returned. This represented about 1% of the practice population. The practice was above or in line with other practices locally and nationally for its satisfaction scores on consultations with GPs and nurses. For example:

- 98% of patients who responded said the GP was good at listening to them compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 91% and the national average of 89%.
- 97% of patients who responded said the GP gave them enough time; CCG - 86%; national average - 86%.
- 99% of patients who responded said they had confidence and trust in the last GP they saw; CCG - 96%; national average - 95%.
- 95% of patients who responded said the last GP they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern; CCG - 86%; national average - 86%.
- 99% of patients who responded said the nurse was good at listening to them; (CCG) - 88%; national average - 91%.
- 100% of patients who responded said the nurse gave them enough time; CCG - 89%; national average - 92%.

- 100% of patients who responded said they had confidence and trust in the last nurse they saw; CCG - 96%; national average - 97%.
- 100% of patients who responded said the last nurse they spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern; CCG - 96%; national average - 97%.
- 82% of patients who responded said they found the receptionists at the practice helpful; CCG - 86%; national average - 87%.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas, including in languages other than English, informing patients this service was available. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.
- Staff communicated with patients 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 patients who were carers through registration forms, practice information leaflets and posters, and opportunistically through consultations. The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. The practice had identified 106 patients as carers (0.8% of the practice list).

- The practice prioritised appointments for carers, offered longer appointments, provided annual health and social care reviews, influenza vaccinations and signposted carers to local support services using a range of media. The practice also used social media to promote support services for, and to help identify, young carers.
- A member of staff acted as a carers' champion liaising with local carers' agencies to coordinate support services.
- Staff told us that if families had experienced bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent

Are services caring?

them a sympathy card. This call was either followed by a patient consultation at a flexible time and location to meet the family's needs and/or by giving them advice on how to find a support service.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed patients responded positively to questions about their involvement in planning and making decisions about their care and treatment. Results were in line with or above local and national averages:

- 87% of patients who responded said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 87% and the national average of 86%.
- 94% of patients who responded said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care; CCG - 84%; national average - 82%.

- 98% of patients who responded said the last nurse they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments; CCG - 88%; national average - 90%.
- 94% of patients who responded said the last nurse they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care; CCG - 83%; national average - 85%.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff recognised the importance of patients' dignity and respect.
- The practice told us they complied with the Data Protection Act 1998 and we saw evidence to support this.

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 across all population groups.

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.

- The practice understood the needs of its population and tailored services in response to those needs. For example, the practice provided extended opening hours, online services such as repeat prescription requests and advanced booking of appointments and provided further advice and guidance for common ailments.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.
- 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 or who had difficulties getting to the practice.

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.
- All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child under the age of 18 were offered a same day appointment when necessary.

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

- The needs of this population group had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care. For example, by offering extended opening hours daily.
- Telephone GP consultations were available which supported patients who were unable to attend the practice during normal working hours.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, travellers and those with a learning disability. Patients with learning difficulties were offered a range of support services including an annual health check. The practice had carried out health checks for 97% of patients in this population group in the last 12 months.

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 regular mental health and dementia reviews. Patients who failed to attend were proactively followed up by a phone call from a GP.
- In October 2017 the practice began a pilot in conjunction with the local clinical commissioning group for a new local role of a dementia clinical nurse specialist.
- The practice offered specialised mental health care for serious mental illness and followed up patients with longer appointments and close liaison with local mental health partners and support organisations.

Timely access to the service

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

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

- Patients had timely access to initial assessment, test results, diagnosis and treatment.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- The appointment system was easy to use.

Results from the July 2017 annual national GP patient survey showed that patients' satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was above or in line with local and national averages. This was supported by observations on the day of inspection and completed comment cards. A total of 283 surveys were sent out and 98 were returned. This represented less than 1% of the practice population.

- 82% of patients who responded were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared with the clinical commissioning group (CCG) average of 81% and the national average of 76%.
- 79% of patients who responded said they could get through easily to the practice by phone; CCG - 75%; national average - 71%.
- 93% of patients who responded said that the last time they wanted to speak to a GP or nurse they were able to get an appointment; CCG - 85%; national average - 84%.
- 90% of patients who responded said their last appointment was convenient; CCG - 81%; national average - 81%.
- 73% of patients who responded described their experience of making an appointment as good; CCG - 74%; national average - 73%.

- 72% of patients who responded said they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen; CCG - 61%; national average - 58%.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

- Information about how to make a complaint or raise concerns was available and it was easy to do so. Staff told us they treated patients who made complaints compassionately and we saw evidence in written correspondence demonstrating this.
- The complaint policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance. Nine complaints were received in the last year. We reviewed a sample of these complaints and found that they were satisfactorily handled in a timely way.
- The practice learned lessons from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care provided. For example, the practice received a complaint from a patient after they had not heard about results of their tests. The practice investigated the complaint and responded to the patient directly and with a written apology. Following the complaint, internal processes were reviewed with regards to the follow up of laboratory results and the need to inform patients in a timely manner of any issues. The results process was changed to daily monitoring and follow up daily by the reception team leaders directly with patients where appropriate or with their GP. Patients were also asked to call the practice for results after five days if they had not been received.

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 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 had the experience, capacity and skills to deliver the practice strategy and address risks to it.
- They were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.
- The practice had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the practice.

Vision and strategy

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

- There was a clear vision and set of values. The practice had a realistic strategy and supporting business plans to achieve priorities.
- The practice developed its vision, values and strategy jointly with staff and patients.
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.
- The strategy was in line with health and social priorities across the region. The practice planned its services to meet the needs of the practice population.
- The practice monitored progress against delivery of the strategy.

Culture

The practice had a culture of providing high-quality sustainable care.

- Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued, especially by the practice manager.
- The practice focused on the needs of patients.
- Leaders and managers told us they would act 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 needed. 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, including nurses, 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 managers.

Governance arrangements

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

- Structures, processes and systems to support good governance and management were clearly set out, understood and effective. The governance and management of partnerships, joint working arrangements and shared services promoted interactive and co-ordinated person-centred care.
- Staff were clear on their roles and accountabilities including in respect of safeguarding and infection prevention and control.
- Practice leaders had established proper policies, procedures and activities to ensure safety and assured themselves that they were operating as intended.

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

- 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 MHRA alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was evidence of action to change practice to improve quality.
- The practice had plans in place and had trained staff for how to respond to major incidents.

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 systems and processes for learning and continuous improvement.

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels within the practice.
- 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 and facilitated staff to take time out to review individual and team objectives, processes and performance.