

Albert House Clinic

Quality Report

Low Grange Health Clinic. Normanby Road
Middlesbrough TS6 6TD
Tel: 01642 466766
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 12/08/2015
Date of publication: 10/12/2015

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	3
The six population groups and what we found	5
What people who use the service say	7

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	8
Background to Albert House Clinic	8
Why we carried out this inspection	8
How we carried out this inspection	8
Detailed findings	10

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Albert House Clinic on 12 August 2015. Overall the practice is rated as good.

Our key findings across all the areas we inspected were as follows: [

- Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed.
- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed.
- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered following best practice guidance. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and planned.

- Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in their care and decisions about their treatment.
- Information about services and how to complain was available and easy to understand.
- Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day.
- The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on.

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?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services. Staff understood and fulfilled their responsibilities to raise concerns, and to report incidents and near misses. Lessons were learned and communicated widely to support improvement. Information about safety was recorded, monitored, appropriately reviewed and addressed. Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. There were sufficient numbers of staff with an appropriate skill mix to keep patients safe. Appropriate recruitment checks had been carried out on staff.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services. Data showed patient outcomes were at or above average for the locality. Staff referred to guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence and used it routinely. Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned and delivered in line with current legislation. This included assessing capacity and promoting good health. Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and any further training needs had been identified and appropriate training planned to meet these needs. There was evidence of appraisals and personal development plans for all staff. Staff worked with multidisciplinary teams.

Good



Are services caring?

The practice is rated as good for providing caring services. Data from the National GP Patient Survey showed that patients rated the practice as slightly above others for several aspects of care compared to local and national averages. Patients said they were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment. Information for patients about the services available was easy to understand and accessible. We also saw that staff treated patients with kindness and respect, and maintained confidentiality.

Good



Are services responsive to people's needs?

The practice is rated as good for providing responsive services. It reviewed the needs of its local population and engaged with the NHS England Area Team and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to secure improvements to services where these were identified. Patients said they found it easy to make an appointment with a named GP and that there was continuity of care, with urgent appointments available the same day. The practice had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their

Good



Summary of findings

needs. Information about how to complain was available and easy to understand and evidence showed that the practice responded quickly to issues raised. Learning from complaints was shared with staff and other stakeholders.

Are services well-led?

The practice is rated as good for being well-led. It had a clear vision and strategy. Staff were clear about the vision and their responsibilities in relation to this. There was a clear leadership structure and staff felt supported by management. The practice had a number of policies and procedures to govern activity and held regular governance meetings. There were systems in place to monitor and improve quality and identify risk. The practice proactively sought feedback from staff and patients, which it acted on. The patient participation group (PPG) was active. Staff had received inductions, regular performance reviews and attended staff meetings and events.

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

The practice is rated as good for the care of older people. Nationally reported data showed that outcomes for patients were good for conditions commonly found in older people. The practice offered proactive, personalised care to meet the needs of the older people in its population and had a range of enhanced services, for example, in dementia and end of life care. It was responsive to the needs of older people, and offered home visits and rapid access appointments for those with enhanced needs.

Good



People with long term conditions

The practice is rated as good for the care of people with long-term conditions. Nursing staff had lead roles in chronic disease management and patients at risk of hospital admission were identified as a priority. Longer appointments and home visits were available when needed. All these patients had a named GP and a structured annual review to check that their health and medication needs were being met. For those people with the most complex needs, the named GP worked with relevant health and care professionals to deliver a multidisciplinary package of care.

Good



Families, children and young people

The practice is rated as good for the care of families, children and young people. There were systems in place 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 A&E attendances. Immunisation rates were relatively high for all standard childhood immunisations. Patients told us that children and young people were treated in an age-appropriate way and were recognised as individuals, and we saw evidence to confirm this. Appointments were available outside of school hours and the premises were suitable for children and babies. We saw good examples of joint working with midwives, health visitors and school nurses.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The practice is rated as good for the care of working-age people (including those recently retired and students). The needs of the working age population, those recently retired and students had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered

Good



Summary of findings

to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care. The practice was proactive in offering online services as well as a full range of health promotion and screening that reflected the needs for this age group.

People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The practice is rated as good for the care of people 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. It had carried out annual health checks for people with a learning disability and 95% of these patients had received a follow-up. It offered longer appointments for people with a learning disability.

The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of vulnerable people. It had told vulnerable patients about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations. Staff knew how to recognise signs of abuse in vulnerable adults and children. 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.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The practice is rated as good for the care of people experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia). 100% of people experiencing poor mental health had received an annual physical health check. The practice regularly worked with multi-disciplinary teams in the case management of people experiencing poor mental health, including those with dementia. It carried out advance care planning for patients with dementia.

The practice had told patients experiencing poor mental health about how to access various support groups and voluntary organisations. It had a system in place to follow up patients who had attended accident and emergency (A&E) where they may have been experiencing poor mental health. Staff had received training on how to care for people with mental health needs and dementia.

Good



Summary of findings

What people who use the service say

The national GP patient survey results published on 2 July 2015 showed the practice was performing in line with local and national averages. There were 116 responses and a response rate of 25.7%.

- 60.9% find it easy to get through to this surgery by phone compared with a CCG average of 76.6% and a national average of 73.3%.
- 92% find the receptionists at this surgery helpful compared with a CCG average of 89.3% and a national average of 86.9%.
- 67% with a preferred GP usually get to see or speak to that GP compared with a CCG average of 58.6% and a national average of 60%.
- 88% were able to get an appointment to see or speak to someone the last time they tried compared with a CCG average of 86% and a national average of 85.2%.

- 92.9% say the last appointment they got was convenient compared with a CCG average of 93.2% and a national average of 91.8%.
- 71.2% describe their experience of making an appointment as good compared with a CCG average of 75.8% and a national average of 73.3%.
- 55.1% usually wait 15 minutes or less after their appointment time to be seen compared with a CCG average of 71.9% and a national average of 64.8%.
- 51.9% feel they don't normally have to wait too long to be seen compared with a CCG average of 63.9% and a national average of 57.7%.

As part of our inspection we also asked for CQC comment cards to be completed by patients prior to our inspection. We received four comment cards which were all positive about the standard of care received.

Albert House Clinic

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a **CQC Lead Inspector**. The team included a GP specialist adviser and a practice manager specialist adviser.

Background to Albert House Clinic

Albert House Clinic provides General Medical Services to approximately 4,000 patients.

There are two GP partners, one male and one female which ensure that patients can be seen by a male or female GP as they choose. The practice also has locum GP's to assist in covering the surgeries, using the same GP's for continuity of care. There is a practice nurse and a healthcare assistant. They are supported by a team of management, reception and administrative staff. There are also staff from the Health Authority available at the practice, district nurses, health visitors, a midwife and a counsellor. The practice is accredited as a training practice and supports medical students.

Appointments are from 8:30 – 12 noon and 1:30 – 5:30 pm, Monday to Friday. There are also extended surgery hours on a Saturday from 8:00 – 10:30am.

The practice is registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to provide the regulated activities of diagnostic and screening procedures; family planning; surgical procedures, maternity and midwifery services and treatment of disease, disorder and injury.

Out of Hours services are accessed via the 111 service.

The practice also offers a range of enhanced services including learning disabilities, minor surgery, childhood immunisation and vaccination and timely diagnosis and support for people with dementia.

Why we carried out this inspection

We inspected this service as part of our new comprehensive inspection programme.

How we carried out this inspection

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

We also looked at how well services are provided for specific groups of people and what good care looks like for them. The population groups are:

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

Detailed findings

Before our inspection we carried out an analysis of data from our Intelligent Monitoring system. We also reviewed information we held and asked other organisations and key stakeholders to share what they knew about the service. We reviewed the practice's policies, procedures and other information the practice provided before the inspection. The information reviewed did not highlight any significant areas of risk across the five key question areas.

We carried out an announced inspection on 12 August 2015.

We reviewed all areas of the surgery, including the administrative areas. We sought views from patients both face-to-face and via comment cards. We spoke with the practice manager, GPs, nursing staff, administrative and reception staff.

We observed how staff handled patients attending for appointments and how information received from patients ringing the practice was handled. We reviewed how the GPs made clinical decisions. We reviewed a variety of documents used by the practice to run the service.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safe track record and learning

There was an open and transparent approach and a system in place for reporting and recording significant events. People affected by significant events received a timely and sincere apology and were told about actions taken to improve care. Staff told us they would inform the practice manager of any incidents and there was also a recording form available on the practice's computer system. All complaints received by the practice were entered onto the system and automatically treated as a significant event. The practice carried out an analysis of the significant events.

We reviewed safety records, incident reports and minutes of meetings where these were discussed. Lessons were shared to make sure action was taken to improve safety in the practice. For example, information was received into the practice giving the name of a patient and that they were deceased when in fact it was a different patient with the same name. Following an investigation it was found that 3 forms of identification had not been used, either by the practice or the hospital. A memo was sent to all staff to ensure correct information was gathered using 3 forms of identification.

Safety was monitored using information from a range of sources, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. This enabled staff to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture of safety. The practice used the National Reporting and Learning System (NRLS) e Form to report patient safety incidents.

Overview of safety systems and processes

The practice could demonstrate its safe track record through having risk management systems in place for safeguarding, health and safety including infection control, medication management and staffing.

There were arrangements in place to safeguard adults and children from abuse that reflected relevant legislation and local requirements. Policies were accessible on the computer system to all staff. The policies clearly outlined who to contact for further guidance if staff had concerns

about a patient's welfare. There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding and they had level 3 training. Staff demonstrated they understood their responsibilities and all had received training relevant to their role.

A notice was displayed in the waiting room, advising patients that a chaperone could be provided if they wanted one. The nurses would act as chaperones, if required and had received relevant training. All staff who acted as chaperones had received a disclosure and barring check (DBS). These 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.

There were procedures in place for monitoring and managing risks to patient and staff safety. The practice had up to date fire risk assessments and carried out fire drills. All electrical equipment was checked to ensure the equipment was safe to use and clinical equipment was checked to ensure it was working properly. The practice also had a variety of other risk assessments in place to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control.

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were followed. The practice nurse was the clinical lead who liaised with the local infection prevention teams to keep up to date with best practice. All staff were aware of who the lead was. There was an infection control policy protocol in place. The practice undertook regular infection control audits and any changes required were identified and recorded on an action plan which was reviewed quarterly. The practice had also been audited by the infection control team from the local hospital. The practice had carried out Legionella risk assessments.

The arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency drugs and vaccinations, in the practice kept patients safe (including obtaining, prescribing, recording, handling, storing and security). Prescriptions were securely stored and all were signed by a GP before the prescription was issued.

Recruitment checks were carried out and the three files we sampled showed that appropriate recruitment checks had been undertaken prior to employment. For example, proof of identification, references, qualifications, registration with the appropriate professional body and the appropriate checks through the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Are services safe?

Arrangements to deal with emergencies and major incidents

There was an instant messaging system on the computers in all the consultation and treatment rooms which alerted staff to any emergency. All staff received annual basic life support training and there were emergency medicines available in the treatment room. The practice had a defibrillator available on the premises and oxygen with adult and children's masks. There was also a first aid kit

and accident book available. Emergency medicines were easily accessible to staff in a secure area of the practice and all staff knew of their location. All the medicines we checked were in date and fit for use.

The practice had a comprehensive business continuity plan in place for major incidents such as power failure or building damage. The plan included emergency contact numbers for staff.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment

The practice carried out assessments and treatment in line relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards, including National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines. The practice had systems in place to ensure all clinical staff were kept up to date. The practice had access to guidelines from NICE and used this information to develop how care and treatment was delivered to meet needs. The practice monitored that these guidelines were followed through risk assessments, audits and random sample checks of patient records.

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

The practice participated in the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF). (This is a system intended to improve the quality of general practice and reward good practice). The practice used the information collected for the QOF and performance against national screening programmes to monitor outcomes for patients. Current results were 541.4 out of 545 points available. This practice was not an outlier for any QOF (or other national) clinical targets.

Data showed:

- Performance for diabetes related indicators was similar to the national average.
- The percentage of patients with hypertension having regular blood pressure tests was similar to the national average
- Performance for mental health related indicators was similar to the national average.
- The dementia diagnosis rate was comparable to the national average.

Clinical audits were carried out and all relevant staff were involved to improve care and treatment and people's outcomes. The practice provided details of audits that had been undertaken and these included completed audits where the improvements made were checked and monitored. This included an audit of the patients who had type 2 diabetes and were overweight. Patients were given a particular treatment weekly and regular monitoring of patient's weight showed that almost all those patients lost

weight. Fourteen patients had a weight reduction, the average being 5.9%. There were no side effects of that medicine taken weekly by patients on this study and it was continued.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care and treatment.

- The practice had an induction programme for newly appointed non-clinical members of staff that covered such topics as safeguarding, fire safety, health and safety and confidentiality.
- The learning needs of staff were identified through a system of appraisals, meetings and reviews of practice development needs. Staff had access to appropriate training to meet these learning needs and to cover the scope of their work. This included ongoing support during sessions, one-to-one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and facilitation and support for the revalidation of doctors. All staff had had an appraisal within the last 12 months.
- Staff received training that included: safeguarding, fire procedures, basic life support and information governance awareness. Staff had access to and made use of e-learning training modules and in-house training.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

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 their intranet system. This included care and risk assessments, care plans, medical records and test results. Information such as NHS patient information leaflets was also available. All relevant information was shared with other services in a timely way, for example when people were referred to other services.

Staff worked together and with other health and social care services to understand and meet the range and complexity of people's needs and to assess and plan ongoing care and treatment. This included when people moved between services, including when they were referred, or after they are discharged from hospital. We saw evidence that multi-disciplinary team meetings took place on a monthly basis and that care plans were routinely reviewed and updated.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Consent to care and treatment

Patients' consent to care and treatment was always sought 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. When providing care and treatment for children and young people, assessments of capacity to consent were also carried out in line with relevant guidance. Where a patient's mental capacity to consent to care or treatment was unclear the GP or nurse assessed the patient's capacity and, where appropriate, recorded the outcome of the assessment. The process for seeking consent was monitored through records audits to ensure it met the practice's responsibilities within legislation and followed relevant national guidance.

Health promotion and prevention

Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice. These included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, carers, those at risk of developing a long-term condition and those requiring

advice on their diet, smoking and alcohol cessation. Patients were then signposted to the relevant service. Patients who may be in need of extra support were identified by the practice.

The practice had a comprehensive screening programme. The practice's uptake for the cervical screening programme was 81.1%. There was a policy to offer telephone reminders for patients who did not attend for their cervical screening test. The practice also encouraged its patients to attend national screening programmes for bowel and breast cancer screening.

Childhood immunisation rates for the vaccinations given were comparable to CCG and national averages. Flu vaccination rates for the over 65s were also comparable to CCG and national averages.

Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks. These included health checks for new patients and NHS health checks for people aged 40–74. Appropriate follow-ups on the outcomes of health assessments and checks were made, where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

We observed throughout the inspection that members of staff were courteous and very helpful to patients both attending at the reception desk and on the telephone. Curtains were provided in consulting rooms so that patients' privacy and dignity was maintained during examinations, investigations and treatments. Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations and conversations that took place in these rooms could not be overheard.

The four patient CQC comment cards we received were positive about the service experienced. Patients said they felt the practice offered a good service and staff were caring and treated them with dignity and respect. We also spoke with two members of the PPG on the day of our inspection. They also told us they were satisfied with the care provided by the practice and said their dignity and privacy was respected.

Reception staff knew that when patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs. Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access support groups and organisations. The practice's computer system notified GPs if a patient was also a carer. There was a carer's register and those identified as carers were being supported, for example, by offering health checks.

Data, showing how people felt they were treated by the practice, from the National GP Patient Survey showed from 127 responses that performance was above or in line with local and national averages. This included:

- 80.6% said the last GP they saw was good at treating them with care and concern, compared to the CCG average of 88.9% and national average of 85.1%.
- 93.5% said the last GP they saw was good at listening to them compared to the CCG average of 89.7% and national average of 86.8%.
- 99.4% said they had confidence in the last nurse they saw or spoke to compared to the CCG average of 98.3% and national average of 97.2%.
- 87.9% of patients found reception staff helpful compared to the CCG average of 87.6% **and national average of 86.9%.**

Care planning and involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Patients we spoke with on the day of our inspection told us that health issues were discussed with them and they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

Data 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 and results were in line with local and national averages. For example:

- 89.7% said the last GP they saw was good at explaining tests and treatments compared to the CCG average of 89.2% and national average of 86.3%.
- 93% said the last nurse they saw was good at treating them with care and concern, compared to the CCG average of 92.5% and national average of 90.4%.
- 90.3% said the last GP they saw was good at involving them in decisions about their care compared to the CCG average of 85.2% and national average of 81.5%.

Patients we spoke with told us that health issues were discussed with them and they felt involved in decision making about the care and treatment they received. They also told us they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them. Patient feedback on the comment cards we received was also positive and aligned with these views.

Staff told us that translation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas informing patients this service was available.

Patient and carer support to cope emotionally with care and treatment

Notices in the patient waiting room told patients how to access a number of support groups and organisations.

The practice's computer system alerted GPs if a patient was also a carer. There was a practice register of all people who were carers and they were being supported, for example,

Are services caring?

by offering health checks and referral for social services support. Written information was available for carers to ensure they understood the various avenues of support available to them.

Staff told us that if families had suffered bereavement, their usual GP contacted them or sent 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.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice worked with the local CCG to plan services and to improve outcomes for patients in the area. For example, for the past 12 months the practice had been offering patients over the age of 75 a health check. This identified some new cases of people suffering with dementia who needed further support. Services were planned and delivered to take into account the needs of different patient groups and to help provide ensure flexibility, choice and continuity of care. For example;

- There were longer appointments available for people with a learning disability.
- Home visits were available for older patients / patients who would benefit from these.
- Urgent access appointments were available for children and those with serious medical conditions.
- There were disabled facilities, hearing loop and translation services available.

Access to the service

The practice was open for appointments between 8.30 and 12 noon and 1.30 and 5pm. Monday to Friday. Appointments were a mix of advanced, routine, urgent and telephone consultations. Extended hours surgeries were offered at the following times, every Saturday from 8.00 until 10.30am for booked appointments only.

Results from the national GP patient survey showed that patient's satisfaction with how they could access care and treatment was comparable to local and national averages and people we spoke to on the day were able to get appointments when they needed them. For example:

- 79.3% of patients were satisfied with the practice's opening hours compared to the CCG average of 79.1% and national average of 74.9%.
- 60.9% patients said they could get through easily to the surgery by phone compared to the CCG average of 76.6% and national average of 73.3%.
- 71.2% patients described their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 75.8% and national average of 73.3%.
- 55.1% patients said they usually waited 15 minutes or less after their appointment time compared to the CCG average of 71.9% and national average of 64.8%.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice had a system in place for handling complaints and concerns. Its complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations for GPs in England. There was a designated responsible person who handled all complaints in the practice.

We saw that information was available to help patients understand the complaints system; there were posters displayed and a summary leaflet available. Patients we spoke with were aware of the process to follow if they wished to make a complaint.

We looked at seven complaints received in the last 12 months and found that they were dealt with in a timely and appropriate way and had been responded to with a full explanation and apology.

Are services well-led?

Good 

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

Our findings

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients. The practice had a mission statement which was displayed in the waiting areas and staff knew and understood the values. The practice had a robust strategy and supporting business plans which reflected the vision and values and these were regularly monitored.

Governance arrangements

The practice had an overarching governance framework which supported the delivery of the strategy and good quality care. This outlined the structures and procedures in place and ensured that:

- There was a clear staffing structure and that staff were aware of their own roles and responsibilities
- There were practice specific policies were implemented and were available to all staff
- There was a comprehensive understanding of the performance of the practice
- There was a programme of continuous clinical and internal audit which is used to monitor quality and to make improvements
- There were robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and implementing mitigating actions

Leadership, openness and transparency

The partners in the practice had the experience, capacity and capability to run the practice and ensure high quality care. They prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate

care. The partners were visible in the practice and staff told us that they were approachable and always took the time to listen to all members of staff. The partners encouraged a culture of openness and honesty.

Staff told us that regular team meetings were held. Staff told us that there was an open culture within the practice and they had the opportunity to raise any issues at team meetings and were confident in doing so and felt supported if they did. Staff said they felt respected, valued and supported, particularly by the partners in the practice. All staff were involved in discussions about how to run and develop the practice, and the partners encouraged all members of staff to identify opportunities to improve the service.

Seeking and acting on feedback from patients, the public and staff

The practice encouraged and valued feedback from patients, proactively gaining patients' feedback and engaging patients in the delivery of the service. It had gathered feedback from patients through the patient participation group (PPG) and through surveys and complaints received. There was an active PPG which met on a regular basis, carried out patient surveys and submitted proposals for improvements to the practice management team. For example, it had been agreed for the practice to create a poster specifying the job roles of the GP, nurse practitioner, practice Nurse and health care assistant. This was in response to the patient's survey.

The practice had also gathered feedback from staff through staff meetings, appraisals and discussion. Staff told us they would not hesitate to give feedback and discuss any concerns or issues with colleagues and management. Staff told us they felt involved and engaged to improve how the practice was run.