

Dr N Hayward and Partners

Inspection report

ShIPLEY Medical Practice
Alexander Road
ShIPLEY
West Yorkshire
BD18 3EG
Tel: 01274531153

Date of inspection visit: 7 June 2018
Date of publication: 06/08/2018

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 rating June 2015 – Good)

The key questions at this inspection are rated as:

Are services safe? – Good

Are services effective? – Good

Are services caring? – Good

Are services responsive? – Good

Are services well-led? – Good

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Dr N Hayward and Partners on 7 June 2018 as part of our inspection programme.

At this inspection we found:

- The practice had a range of 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. However, we saw that occasionally, this approach was not consistently followed.
- The practice routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care it provided. It ensured that care and treatment was delivered according to evidence-based guidelines.
- Staff involved and treated patients with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect.
- Patients found the appointment system easy to use and reported that they were able to access care when they needed it. The practice had made a number of improvements as a result of patient feedback.

- Complaints were managed effectively with an open and transparent approach. We saw that apologies were made and improvements to patient care implemented as a result.
- There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement at all levels of the organisation.
- The provider received positive feedback from the staff who worked there. We saw that there was effective leadership and strategic planning. People felt valued and listened to.
- The provider worked effectively with other partners to provide a range of high quality services to meet the needs of their population.

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

- Review and improve the arrangements for supporting locum doctors.
- Implement a written staff vaccination policy across the practice to be assured that all relevant staff have been offered the appropriate immunisations in line with national guidance.
- Take action to develop a comprehensive and systematic risk assessment across the operation of the practice. This would include building safety and potential risks posed to staff and members of the public; to be assured that health and safety matters are appropriately identified and acted upon.
- Take action to improve the documented learning and review of significant events across the practice.

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

Please refer to the detailed report and the evidence tables for further information.

Population group ratings

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

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by a Care Quality Commission (CQC) lead inspector. The team included a GP specialist adviser.

Background to Dr N Hayward and Partners

Dr N Hayward and Partners, is located at Shipley Medical Practice, Alexander Road, Shipley, West Yorkshire, BD18 3EG. The practice provides services for 8,247 patients under the terms of a Personal Medical Services contract. The provider is a member of Affinity Care, an organisation that has a current membership of eight local GP practices. The practice building is accessible for those with a physical disability or mobility issues. In addition, the practice has on-site parking available for patients, with designated spaces for disabled patients who require them.

The practice population catchment area is classed as within the third most deprived areas in England, with a rating of one being the most deprived and ten the least deprived. The age profile shows that the practice is similar to the local and national average. Life expectancy of the practice population is similar than other GP practices in the NHS Bradford Districts Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and lower than the national average.

The National General Practice Profile states that 75% of the practice population is from a White British background.

Dr N Hayward and Partners is registered with the Care Quality Commission to provide; surgical procedures, diagnostic and screening procedures, family planning, maternity and midwifery services and the treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

The practice offers a range of enhanced local services including those in relation to:

- childhood vaccination and immunisation
- travel vaccinations
- Influenza and Pneumococcal immunisation
- Anti-coagulation clinics
- A range of clinics for chronic disease management including diabetes and asthma
- Joint injections
- Family planning including the fitting of coils and implants

As well as these enhanced services the practice also offers additional services such as those supporting long term conditions management including spirometry for lung conditions, ECG and blood pressure monitoring, advice and support for alcohol misuse, weight loss and social prescribing including help in accessing welfare benefits.

Allied with the practice is a team of community health professionals that includes health visitors, pharmacy support for those on multiple medications, midwives and members of the district nursing team.

The practice is accredited as a research practice and is a training practice supporting GPs and nurses in training.

There are two GP clinical partners and a non-clinical partner who is the Registered Manager.

The clinical team consists of seven GPs (two male, five female), one GP registrar (female) and two practice nurses (female). The provider also employs a prescribing pharmacist and two health care assistants. The administrative and reception team are supported by managers in risk and performance who are part of the Affinity Care Group. Affinity Care provide corporate and governance support for Dr Hayward and Partners and other member practices.

The practice appointments include:

- Pre-bookable appointments
- Extended hours available three mornings a week

- Urgent and on the day appointments
- Telephone consultations
- Home visits

Appointments can be made in person, via telephone or online.

Practice opening times are:

Monday - 8am to 6.30pm

Tuesday – 8am to 6.30pm

Wednesday – 8am to 6.30pm

Thursday – 8am to 8pm

Friday – 8am to 6.30pm

Access to weekend appointments is available through local 'hub' arrangements for patients that need them.

Out of hours care is provided by Local Care Direct, reached by dialling 111.

The previously awarded ratings are displayed as required in the practice and on the practice's website.

Are services safe?

We rated the practice as good for providing safe services.

Safety systems and processes

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

- The practice had appropriate systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse. All staff received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns. Learning from safeguarding incidents were available to staff. Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for their role and had received a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable.)
- Staff took steps, including working with other agencies, to protect patients from abuse, neglect, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The practice carried out appropriate staff checks at the time of recruitment and on an ongoing basis.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control.
- The practice had arrangements to ensure that facilities and equipment were safe and in good working order.
- Arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.

Risks to patients

There were some 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 induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role. However, we saw that the arrangements for supporting locum doctors were effective, but relatively informal as the provider did not have a locum pack.
- The practice did routinely record the vaccination status of their staff. However, we saw that one clinician did not have their vaccination status recorded and there was not a written vaccination policy. During the inspection, the provider told us they would review this approach.

- The practice was equipped to deal with medical emergencies and staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies on the premises and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention. Clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections including sepsis.
- When there were changes to services or staff the practice assessed and monitored the impact on safety.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

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

- The care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to staff.
- The practice had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- Clinicians made timely referrals in line with protocols.

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

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

- The systems for managing and storing medicines, including vaccines, medical gases, emergency medicines and equipment, minimised risks.
- Staff prescribed and administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with current national guidance. The practice had reviewed its antibiotic prescribing and taken action to support good antimicrobial stewardship in line with local and national guidance.
- 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

- There were a range of risk assessments in relation to safety issues. For example, fire and information security. However, we saw that not all operational risks were routinely risk assessed and the provider told us they would review this.
- The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a range of sources.

Are services safe?

Lessons learned and improvements made

- Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.
- There were systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. We saw examples where the practice learned and shared lessons, identified themes and took action to improve safety in the practice. However, we saw that whilst most significant events

were discussed at an appropriate meeting, the provider did not consistently document the impact of learning on systems and processes. The provider assured us that this would be reviewed.

- 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?

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

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

- Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Staff advised patients what to do if their condition got worse and where to seek further help and support.

Older people:

- Older patients who were frail or may be vulnerable received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs. The practice used an appropriate tool to identify patients aged 65 and over who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified as being frail had a clinical review including a review of medication.
- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital. 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.

People with long-term conditions:

- Patients with long-term conditions had a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For patients with the most complex needs, the GP worked with other health and care professionals to deliver a coordinated package of care.
- Staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long term conditions had received specific training.
- GPs followed up patients who had received treatment in hospital or through out of hours services for an acute exacerbation of asthma.
- Adults with newly diagnosed cardiovascular disease were offered statins for secondary prevention. People

with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring and patients with atrial fibrillation were assessed for stroke risk and treated as appropriate.

- The practice was able to demonstrate how it identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), atrial fibrillation and hypertension.
- The practice's performance on quality indicators for long term conditions was above or in-line with local and national averages. For example, the number of patients whose diabetes was well controlled was 86% compared to a local and national average of 80%.

Families, children and young people:

- Childhood immunisation uptake rates were in line with the target percentage of 90% or above.
- 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 70%, which was below the 80% coverage target for the national screening programme. However, this was in-line with the national average of 72%.
- The practice's uptake for breast and bowel cancer screening was below the national average. Average rates for breast cancer screening were 62%, against a local average of 67% and a national average of 70%. Average rates for bowel cancer screening were 50% against a local average of 53% and a national average of 55%. We saw evidence that the practice encouraged people to attend for screening.
- 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 to 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.

Are services effective?

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability and carers.
- The practice had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule.

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

- The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental illness, and personality disorder by providing access to health checks, interventions for physical activity, obesity, diabetes, heart disease, cancer and access to 'stop smoking' services. There was a system for following up patients who failed to attend for administration of long term medication.
- When patients were assessed to be at risk of suicide or self-harm the practice had arrangements in place to help them to remain safe.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment to detect possible signs of dementia. When dementia was suspected there was an appropriate referral for diagnosis.
- The practice offered annual health checks to patients with a learning disability.
- The practice's performance on quality indicators for mental health was above local and national averages.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice had a comprehensive programme of quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.

- The practice used information about care and treatment to make improvements.
- The practice was actively involved in quality improvement activity. Where appropriate, clinicians took part in local and national improvement initiatives.

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. However, we saw that there was not a formal information pack for locum staff. There was an induction programme for new staff. This included one to one meetings, appraisals, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and revalidation.
- There was a clear approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.

Coordinating care and treatment

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

- We saw records that showed that all appropriate staff, including those in different teams and organisations, were involved in assessing, planning and delivering care and treatment.
- The practice shared clear and accurate information with relevant professionals when discussing care delivery for people with long term conditions and when coordinating healthcare for care home residents. They shared information with, and liaised, with community services, social services and carers for housebound patients and with health visitors and community services for children who have relocated into the local area.
- Patients received coordinated and person-centred care. This included when they moved between services, when they were referred, or after they were discharged from hospital. The practice worked with patients to develop personal care plans that were shared with relevant agencies.

Are services effective?

- 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?

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 treated people.
- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs.
- The practice gave patients timely support and information.
- The practice's GP patient survey results were above local and national averages for questions relating to kindness, respect and compassion.

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, with communication aids such as a hearing loop and interpreting services.
- Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services. They helped them ask questions about their care and treatment.
- The practice proactively identified carers and supported them.
- The practice's GP patient survey results were in line with local and national averages for questions relating to involvement in decisions about care and treatment.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected patients' privacy and dignity.

- When patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues, or appeared distressed reception staff told us they offered 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?

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 from the clinical team and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs.

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 multi-disciplinary 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 or those that missed secondary care hospital appointments. Records we looked at confirmed this.

- All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child were offered a same day appointment when necessary.
- A full contraceptive service was offered including the fitting of implants and coils.

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 telephone appointments. Local 'hub' arrangements with participating local practices allowed patients to access appointments at the weekend if required.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable:

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those receiving palliative care, people with a learning disability and those experiencing substance and alcohol misuse problems.
- 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. For example, by scheduling appointments at specific times to reduce anxiety. Patients in crisis were appropriately prioritised.
- The practice had close links with secondary care psychiatry and counselling services in recognition of a higher than average prevalence of mental illness amongst the practice population.

Timely access to care and treatment

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

However, several patients told us that it could be several weeks before they could access a routine appointment. Same day appointments were always available for urgent care needs.

- Patients had timely access to initial assessment, test results, diagnosis and treatment.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients reported that the appointment system had recently improved in response to patient feedback and was now easier to use, with a greater number of same day appointments now available.
- The practice's GP patient survey results were above local averages and in-line with national averages for questions relating to access to care and treatment.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

- Information about how to make a complaint or raise concerns was available. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.
- The complaint policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance. The practice learned lessons from individual concerns and complaints and also from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care.

Please refer to the evidence tables for further information.

Are services well-led?

We rated the practice as good for providing a well-led service.

Leadership capacity and capability

Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.

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

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision and credible strategy to deliver high quality, sustainable care.

- There was a clear vision and set of values. The practice had a realistic strategy and supporting business plans to achieve priorities.
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.
- The strategy was in line with health and social care priorities across the region. The practice planned its services to meet the needs of the practice population.
- The practice monitored progress against delivery of the strategy. This was also effectively bench-marked across other providers in the Affinity Care Group and performed well against their peers.

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. They spoke highly of the management culture and told us that staff were given an extra day of annual leave to enjoy during the month of their birthday.
- 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. We saw that there was an innovative partner development programme in place for salaried doctors wishing to progress to a GP partnership in the future. All staff had received an annual appraisal in the last year. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary.
- There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of all staff.
- The practice actively promoted equality and diversity. Staff had received equality and diversity training. Staff felt they were treated equally.
- There were positive relationships between staff and teams.

Governance arrangements

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

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

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were a range of activities for managing risks, issues and performance.

- These included processes to identify, understand, monitor and address current and future risks including

Are services well-led?

risks to patient safety. However, we saw that the practice did not have a written policy relating to staff vaccination and a clinician did not have their vaccination status recorded. The provider immediately undertook a review of this and assured us a written policy would be implemented.

- We saw that a number of risk assessments were undertaken, including fire and information security. However, we saw that not all operational risks were routinely risk assessed and the provider told us they would review this.
- The practice had processes to manage current and future performance. Practice leaders had oversight of safety alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was clear evidence of action to change practice to improve quality.
- The practice had plans in place and had trained staff for major incidents.
- The practice considered and understood the impact on the quality of care of service changes or developments.

Appropriate and accurate information

The practice acted on appropriate and accurate information.

- Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.
- Quality and sustainability were discussed in relevant meetings where all staff had sufficient access to information.
- The practice used performance information which was reported and monitored and management and staff were held to account.
- The information used to monitor performance and the delivery of quality care was accurate and useful. There were plans to address any identified weaknesses.
- The practice used information technology systems to monitor and improve the quality of care.

- The practice submitted data or notifications to external organisations as required.
- There were effective 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 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. However, we saw that whilst most significant events were discussed at an appropriate meeting, the provider did not consistently document the impact of learning on systems and processes. The provider assured us that this would be reviewed.
- 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.