

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

The Margaret Thompson Medical Centre (1-550792490)

Inspection date: 17 and 24 August 2022.

Date of data download: 26 July 2022

Overall rating: Requires improvement

At this inspection on 17 and 24 August 2022 we rated the practice requires improvement overall. The key questions caring and responsive were rated as good. Safe, effective and well-led were rated as requires improvement. This is because:

- The incident reporting system was ineffective.
- Not all staff had undertaken the relevant training for their role and had an appraisal.
- There was a lack of effective governance systems to maintain oversight of the risks in the practice.

Safe

Rating: Requires improvement

The practice is rated as requires improvement for providing safe services. This is because:

- There was limited use of systems to record and report safety concerns, incidents and near misses. Some staff were not clear how to do this.
- The provider did not have oversight of all referrals to secondary care.
- Historical safety alerts were not always reviewed to ensure actions were followed.

Safety systems and processes

The practice had clear systems, practices and processes to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse, however further training was required for staff.

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
Safeguarding systems, processes and practices were developed, implemented and communicated to staff.	Y
Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role.	Partial
There was active and appropriate engagement in local safeguarding processes.	Y
The Out of Hours service was informed of relevant safeguarding information.	Y
There were systems to identify vulnerable patients on record.	Y
Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required.	Partial
There were regular discussions between the practice and other health and social care professionals such as health visitors, school nurses, community midwives and social workers to support and protect adults and children at risk of significant harm.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Not all staff had completed the update training required for safeguarding at the time of the inspection. This had been identified and training dates had been booked. In the absence of a DBS check the provider had not undertaken a risk assessment prior to employment for non-clinical staff.	

Recruitment systems	Y/N/Partial
Recruitment checks were carried out in accordance with regulations (including for agency staff and locums).	Partial
Staff vaccination was maintained in line with current UK Health and Security Agency (UKHSA) guidance if relevant to role.	Partial
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: We found photographic identification was not held in staff recruitment files, but documented checks had been completed prior to employment. We found three out of the four staff records we reviewed did not contain vaccination status.	

Safety systems and records	Y/N/Partial
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken. Date of last assessment: 2016	Partial
There was a fire procedure.	Partial
Date of fire risk assessment: 12 April 2022 Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed.	Partial
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: An external contractor had been booked to undertake a health and safety risk assessment of the building and premises in September 2022. A programme of refurbishment had been agreed but this has not been completed at the time of the inspection. For example, to replace the flooring and chairs in the practice. The fire procedure was under review and nominated fire marshals training had been booked. The provider was working towards completing actions identified from the fire risk assessment.	

Infection prevention and control

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were met. However, further action was required to train staff.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff had received effective training on infection prevention and control.	Partial
Infection prevention and control audits were carried out. Date of last infection prevention and control audit: 16 August 2022	Y
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Partial
The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Four out of seventeen staff had not completed the required update training for infection prevention control. Staff training was scheduled to take place at the next practice meeting. The provider was working towards completing the outstanding actions from the latest infection prevention and control audit.	

Risks to patients

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

	Y/N/Partial
There was an effective approach to managing staff absences and busy periods.	Y
There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.	Y
The practice was equipped to respond to medical emergencies (including suspected sepsis) and staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.	Partial

Receptionists were aware of actions to take if they encountered a deteriorating or acutely unwell patient and had been given guidance on identifying such patients.	Y
There were enough staff to provide appointments and prevent staff from working excessive hours	Y
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>Thirteen out of seventeen staff had not completed the required update training to respond to medical emergencies at the time of the inspection. Training for this had been booked for September and October 2022.</p>	

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff did not always have the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment.

	Y/N/Partial
Individual care records, including clinical data, were written and managed securely and in line with current guidance and relevant legislation.	Y
There was a system for processing information relating to new patients including the summarising of new patient notes.	Partial
There were systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.	Y
Referrals to specialist services were documented, contained the required information and there was a system to monitor delays in referrals.	Partial
There was a documented approach to the management of test results and this was managed in a timely manner.	Y
There was appropriate clinical oversight of test results, including when reviewed by non-clinical staff.	Y
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>There was a backlog for summarising new patient notes which the provider was working through at the time of the inspection following staff absence.</p> <p>We found a referral outstanding from November 2021 which had not been actioned. We raised this with the provider during our inspection who took immediate action. Referrals were monitored by the referring clinician and there was no central oversight and follow up of patients to ensure they had been seen.</p>	

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

The practice had systems for the appropriate and safe use of medicines, including medicines optimisation

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
Number of antibacterial prescription items prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/04/2021 to 31/03/2022) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)	1.37	0.89	0.79	Variation (negative)
The number of prescription items for co-amoxiclav, cephalosporins and quinolones as a percentage of the total number of prescription items for selected antibacterial drugs (BNF 5.1 sub-set). (01/04/2021 to 31/03/2022) (NHSBSA)	9.5%	8.3%	8.8%	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity per item for Nitrofurantoin 50 mg tablets and capsules, Nitrofurantoin 100 mg m/r capsules, Pivmecillinam 200 mg tablets and Trimethoprim 200 mg tablets prescribed for uncomplicated urinary tract infection (01/10/2021 to 31/03/2022) (NHSBSA)	7.44	5.37	5.29	Variation (negative)
Total items prescribed of Pregabalin or Gabapentin per 1,000 patients (01/10/2021 to 31/03/2022) (NHSBSA)	316.0‰	226.5‰	128.2‰	Variation (negative)
Average daily quantity of Hypnotics prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/04/2021 to 31/03/2022) (NHSBSA)	0.84	0.90	0.60	No statistical variation
Number of unique patients prescribed multiple psychotropics per 1,000 patients (01/10/2021 to 31/03/2022) (NHSBSA)	15.7‰	11.1‰	6.8‰	Variation (negative)

Note: ‰ means *per 1,000* and it is **not** a percentage.

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
The practice ensured medicines were stored safely and securely with access restricted to authorised staff.	Y
Blank prescriptions were kept securely, and their use monitored in line with national guidance.	Y
Staff had the appropriate authorisations to administer medicines (including Patient Group Directions or Patient Specific Directions).	Y

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
The practice could demonstrate the prescribing competence of non-medical prescribers, and there was regular review of their prescribing practice supported by clinical supervision or peer review.	N/A
There was a process for the safe handling of requests for repeat medicines and evidence of structured medicines reviews for patients on repeat medicines.	Y
The practice had a process and clear audit trail for the management of information about changes to a patient's medicines including changes made by other services.	Y
There was a process for monitoring patients' health in relation to the use of medicines including high risk medicines (for example, warfarin, methotrexate and lithium) with appropriate monitoring and clinical review prior to prescribing.	Partial
The practice monitored the prescribing of controlled drugs. (For example, investigation of unusual prescribing, quantities, dose, formulations and strength).	Y
There were arrangements for raising concerns around controlled drugs with the NHS England and Improvement Area Team Controlled Drugs Accountable Officer.	Y
If the practice had controlled drugs on the premises there were appropriate systems and written procedures for the safe ordering, receipt, storage, administration, balance checks and disposal of these medicines, which were in line with national guidance.	N/A
The practice had taken steps to ensure appropriate antimicrobial use to optimise patient outcomes and reduce the risk of adverse events and antimicrobial resistance.	Y
For remote or online prescribing there were effective protocols for verifying patient identity.	Y
The practice held appropriate emergency medicines, risk assessments were in place to determine the range of medicines held, and a system was in place to monitor stock levels and expiry dates.	Y
There was medical oxygen and a defibrillator on site and systems to ensure these were regularly checked and fit for use.	Y
Vaccines were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with UKHSA guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective.	Y
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>As part of this inspection a number of set clinical record searches were undertaken by a CQC GP specialist advisor. The records of patients prescribed medicines that require review were checked to ensure the required monitoring was taking place. These searches were visible to the practice.</p> <p>The clinical searches found there was a backlog for ensuring patients had the required monitoring for some medicines. For example, 15% of patients prescribed Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEI) had not had the appropriate monitoring in the last eighteen months. We were told the practice was working through the backlog following the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>From information available to us we saw there had been improvement for antibiotic prescribing for urinary tract infections since December 2021. We were told other prescriptions such as pregabalin, gabapentin and psychotropic were higher due to the patient demographic of the area and this was reviewed with the commissioners and local primary care network.</p>	

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements made

The practice system to learn and make improvements when things went wrong needed improvement.

Significant events	Y/N/Partial
The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a variety of sources.	Partial
Staff knew how to identify and report concerns, safety incidents and near misses.	Partial
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events.	Partial
Staff understood how to raise concerns and report incidents both internally and externally.	Partial
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.	Partial
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	Unknown
Number of events that required action:	Unknown
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The practice had a paper based system for recording incidents. The last recorded incident was in May 2021. The provider recognised improvement to the reporting system was needed, but this had not been addressed at the time of the inspection.	

Example(s) of significant events recorded and actions by the practice.

Event	Specific action taken
Medication error	Staff training needs identified.
Security incident	External support requested.

Safety alerts	Y/N/Partial
There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts.	Partial
Staff understood how to deal with alerts.	Partial
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts, but this did not include a periodic review of historical alerts. We found advice and guidance had not been implemented into practice. For example, we found fourteen patients had been prescribed a drug combination following a Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) alert and had not been reviewed or informed of the risks.	

Effective

Rating: Requires improvement

We rated the practice as requires improvement for providing effective services because:

- Not all staff had undertaken the relevant training updates to do their job. The learning needs of staff were not fully understood.
- There were gaps in management and support arrangements for staff as appraisal, supervision and professional development was not routinely offered.

QOF requirements were modified by NHS England and Improvement for 2020/21 to recognise the need to reprioritise aspects of care which were not directly related to COVID-19. This meant that QOF payments were calculated differently. For inspections carried out from 1 October 2021, our reports will not include QOF indicators. In determining judgements in relation to effective care, we have considered other evidence as set out below.

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

Patients' needs were assessed, and care and treatment was delivered in line with current legislation, standards and evidence-based guidance supported by clear pathways and tools.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had systems and processes to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence-based practice.	Y
Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.	Y
Patients presenting with symptoms which could indicate serious illness were followed up in a timely and appropriate way.	Y
We saw no evidence of discrimination when staff made care and treatment decisions.	Y
Patients' treatment was regularly reviewed and updated.	Y
There were appropriate referral pathways to make sure that patients' needs were addressed.	Y
Patients were told when they needed to seek further help and what to do if their condition deteriorated.	Y
The practice had prioritised care for their most clinically vulnerable patients during the pandemic	Y

Effective care for the practice population

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The practice used a clinical tool to identify older patients who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs.• Flu, shingles and pneumonia vaccinations were offered to relevant patients in this age group.

- Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks including NHS checks for patients aged 40 to 74. There was appropriate and timely follow-up on the outcome of health assessments and checks where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.
- All patients with a learning disability were offered an annual health check.
- 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 had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule.
- The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental illness, and personality disorder
- Patients with poor mental health, including dementia, were referred to appropriate services.

Management of people with long term conditions

Findings

As part of our inspection, a series of patient clinical records searches were undertaken by a CQC GP specialist advisor. The records of patients with long term conditions were checked to ensure the required assessment and reviews were taking place. These searches were visible to the practice.

- Patients with long-term conditions were offered 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.
- The practice shared clear and accurate information with relevant professionals when deciding care delivery for patients with long-term conditions.
- The practice could demonstrate how they identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), atrial fibrillation and hypertension.
- Adults with newly diagnosed cardio-vascular disease were offered statins.
- Patients with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring.
- Patients with COPD were offered rescue packs.

Child Immunisation	Numerator	Denominator	Practice %	Comparison to WHO target of 95%
The percentage of children aged 1 who have completed a primary course of immunisation for Diphtheria, Tetanus,	51	53	96.2%	Met 95% WHO based target

Polio, Pertussis, Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib), Hepatitis B (Hep B) ((i.e. three doses of DTaP/IPV/Hib/HepB) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)				
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	61	70	87.1%	Below 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their immunisation for Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib) and Meningitis C (MenC) (i.e. received Hib/MenC booster) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	62	70	88.6%	Below 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	62	70	88.6%	Below 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 5 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (two doses of MMR) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	61	69	88.4%	Below 90% minimum

Note: Please refer to the CQC guidance on Childhood Immunisation data for more information: <https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/gps/how-we-monitor-gp-practices>

Any additional evidence or comments

- The practice had met one of the five childhood immunisations uptake indicators.
- The small number of patients affected the overall percentages seen.
- Staff told us they contacted the parents or guardians of children due to have childhood immunisations. The practice had follow up arrangements for failed attendance and would liaise with health visitors when necessary.

Cancer Indicators	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of persons eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for persons aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for persons aged 50 to 64). (Snapshot date: 31/12/2021) (UK Health and Security Agency)	61.4%	N/A	80% Target	Below 70% uptake

Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA)	61.0%	54.0%	61.3%	N/A
Persons, 60-74, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months (2.5 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA)	50.4%	53.2%	66.8%	N/A
Number of new cancer cases treated (Detection rate: % of which resulted from a two week wait (TWW) referral) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA)	58.1%	51.6%	55.4%	No statistical variation

Any additional evidence or comments

- The practice had arrangements in place for cervical cancer screening and followed up patients who did not attend their appointment.
- The practice was below the 80% target for cervical cancer screening and had taken steps to improve uptake which included sending patient invite letters and a telephone call where appropriate.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice had a programme of quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided.

	Y/N/Partial
Clinicians took part in national and local quality improvement initiatives.	Y
The practice had a programme of targeted quality improvement and used information about care and treatment to make improvements.	Y
The practice regularly reviewed unplanned admissions and readmissions and took appropriate action.	Y

Examples of improvements demonstrated because of clinical audits or other improvement activity in past two years

The provider had completed an audit on issuing antibiotics for urinary tract infections in March 2022. A diagnostic algorithm was put in place following the audit to promote consistency with prescribing.

Effective staffing

The practice staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles. However, they did not always undertake all the relevant training for their role and the practice did not have an appraisal system for staff.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care, support and treatment.	Y
The practice had a programme of learning and development.	Partial
Staff had protected time for learning and development.	Y
There was an induction programme for new staff.	Y
Staff had access to regular appraisals, one to ones, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and revalidation. They were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation.	N
The practice could demonstrate how they assured the competence of staff employed in advanced clinical practice, for example, nurses, paramedics, pharmacists and physician associates.	N/A
There was a clear and appropriate approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.	Partial
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: At a previous inspection in 5 July 2016 we followed up on concerns identified with regard to a lack of regular staff training and appraisals and found improvements had been made. At this inspection we found the improvements had not been sustained and appraisals had not been completed since 2016. Staff had not undertaken all of the required training for their roles as detailed in the safe domain of this report.	

Coordinating care and treatment

Staff worked together and with other organisations to deliver effective care and treatment.

Indicator	Y/N/Partial
Care was delivered and reviewed in a coordinated way when different teams, services or organisations were involved.	Y
Patients received consistent, coordinated, person-centred care when they moved between services.	Y

Helping patients to live healthier lives

Staff were consistent and proactive in helping patients to live healthier lives.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice identified patients who may need 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.	Y
Staff encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their own health.	Y
Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks.	Y
Staff discussed changes to care or treatment with patients and their carers as necessary.	Y
The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health, for example, stop smoking campaigns and tackling obesity.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:	

Consent to care and treatment

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

	Y/N/Partial
Clinicians understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making. We saw that consent was documented.	Y
Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.	Y
Do Not Attempt Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (DNACPR) decisions were made in line with relevant legislation and were appropriate.	Partial
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: At the time of the inspection there was only one DNACPR record we were able to review and this had been completed in secondary care.	

Caring

Rating: Good

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff understood and respected the personal, cultural, social and religious needs of patients.	Y
Staff displayed understanding and a non-judgemental attitude towards patients.	Y
Patients were given appropriate and timely information to cope emotionally with their care, treatment or condition.	Y

National GP Patient Survey results

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they had a general practice appointment, the healthcare professional was good or very good at listening to them (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	89.8%	90.8%	89.4%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they had a general practice appointment, the healthcare professional was good or very good at treating them with care and concern (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	86.9%	90.0%	88.4%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that during their last GP appointment they had confidence and trust in the healthcare professional they saw or spoke to (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	93.5%	95.4%	95.6%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of their GP practice (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	91.2%	83.8%	83.0%	No statistical variation

Question	Y/N
The practice carries out its own patient survey/patient feedback exercises.	Y

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about care and treatment.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff communicated with patients in a way that helped them to understand their care, treatment and condition, and any advice given.	Y
Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services.	Partial
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The practice did not use advocacy services at the time of the inspection as this had not been required. Patients were referred onto other services for example, social prescribers in the local primary care network, citizens advice and local charity organisations. .	

National GP Patient Survey results

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that during their last GP appointment they were involved as much as they wanted to be in decisions about their care and treatment (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	90.6%	93.2%	92.9%	No statistical variation

	Y/N/Partial
Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.	Y
Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access support groups and organisations.	Y
Information leaflets were available in other languages and in easy read format.	Y
Information about support groups was available on the practice website.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:	

Carers	Narrative
Percentage and number of carers identified.	There were 40 carers registered at the practice which equated to around 0.7% of the patient population. 0.7%
How the practice supported carers (including young carers).	The practice referred carers to appropriate support groups and had support from the primary care network.
How the practice supported recently bereaved patients.	The practice referred patients to appropriate support groups and had support from the primary care network.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected patients' privacy and dignity.

	Y/N/Partial
A private room was available if patients were distressed or wanted to discuss sensitive issues.	Y
There were arrangements to ensure confidentiality at the reception desk.	Y

Responsive

Rating: Good

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice understood the needs of its local population and had developed services in response to those needs.	Y
The importance of flexibility, informed choice and continuity of care was reflected in the services provided.	Y
The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services being delivered.	Y
The practice made reasonable adjustments when patients found it hard to access services.	Y
There were arrangements in place for people who need translation services.	Y
The practice complied with the Accessible Information Standard.	Y

Practice Opening Times	
Day	Time
Opening times:	
Monday	08:00 – 18:30
Tuesday	08:00 – 18:30
Wednesday	08:00 – 18:30
Thursday	08:00 – 18:30
Friday	08:00 – 18:30

Further information about how the practice is responding to the needs of their population
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Patients had a named GP who supported them in whatever setting they lived.• The practice was responsive to the needs of older patients and offered home visits and urgent appointments for those with enhanced needs and complex medical issues.• The practice liaised regularly with the community services to discuss and manage the needs of patients with complex medical issues.• All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child were offered a same day appointment when necessary.• The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, Travellers and those with a learning disability.

Access to the service

People were able to access care and treatment in a timely way.

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected access to GP practices and presented many challenges. In order to keep both patients and staff safe early in the pandemic practices were asked by NHS England and Improvement to assess patients remotely (for example by telephone or video consultation) when contacting the practice and to only see patients in the practice when deemed to be clinically appropriate to do so. Following the changes in national guidance during the summer of 2021 there has been a more flexible approach to patients interacting with their practice. During the pandemic there was a significant increase in telephone and online consultations compared to patients being predominantly seen in a face to face setting.

	Y/N/Partial
Patients had timely access to appointments/treatment and action was taken to minimize the length of time people waited for care, treatment or advice	Y
The practice offered a range of appointment types to suit different needs (e.g. face to face, telephone, online)	Y
Patients were able to make appointments in a way which met their needs	Y
There were systems in place to support patients who face communication barriers to access treatment	Y
Patients with most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised	Y
There was information available for patients to support them to understand how to access services (including on websites and telephone messages)	Y

National GP Patient Survey results

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to how easy it was to get through to someone at their GP practice on the phone (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	71.8%	N/A	67.6%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of making an appointment (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	73.9%	70.7%	70.6%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were very satisfied or fairly satisfied with their GP practice appointment times (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	72.1%	68.3%	67.0%	No statistical variation

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were satisfied with the appointment (or appointments) they were offered (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	79.8%	84.0%	81.7%	No statistical variation

Source	Feedback
NHS Choices	Appointment system is great.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

Complaints were listened and responded to and used to improve the quality of care.

Complaints	
Number of complaints received in the last year.	4
Number of complaints we examined.	0
Number of complaints we examined that were satisfactorily handled in a timely way.	Not assessed
Number of complaints referred to the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman.	0

	Y/N/Partial
Information about how to complain was readily available.	Y
There was evidence that complaints were used to drive continuous improvement.	Partial
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The practice had received three formal complaints and one informal complaint. All three formal complaints were under investigation at the time of our inspection. We saw the practice complaints had been referred to NHS England and were following the NHS England complaints process. The complaints had been acknowledged and the investigations were in progress.	

Example(s) of learning from complaints.

Complaint	Specific action taken
Missed diagnosis	Investigation in progress
Medication error	Investigation in progress

Well-led

Rating: Requires improvement

We rated the practice as requires improvement for providing well-led services because:

- Leaders were not always aware of the risks, issues and challenges in the practice.
- There has been no recent review of the governance arrangements, the strategy, or plans.
- There was a lack of effective governance systems for managing risk, issues and performance.

Leadership capacity and capability

Leaders demonstrated that they had the capacity and skills to deliver high quality sustainable care.

	Y/N/Partial
Leaders demonstrated that they understood the challenges to quality and sustainability.	Y
They had identified the actions necessary to address these challenges.	Partial
Staff reported that leaders were visible and approachable.	Y
There was a leadership development programme, including a succession plan.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The provider had faced challenges with staffing due to absence and vacancies which had impacted on the workload for staff. A new staffing structure was in place which included improving information technology (IT) support as part of the practice succession plan.. At a previous inspection we found shortfalls in training for staff and lack of staff appraisal. We found similar themes at this inspection.	

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision, but it was not supported by a credible strategy to provide high quality sustainable care.

	Y/N/Partial
The vision, values and strategy were developed in collaboration with staff, patients and external partners.	N
Staff knew and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.	Partial
Progress against delivery of the strategy was monitored.	N
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Staff told us they had not been involved in the development of the vision and strategy for the practice, but knew the practice had a clear vision. The practice had plans for improvement but this was not documented and monitored at the time of the inspection.	

Culture

The practice had a culture which drove quality care.

	Y/N/Partial
There were arrangements to deal with any behaviour inconsistent with the vision and values.	Y
Staff reported that they felt able to raise concerns without fear of retribution.	Y
There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of staff.	Y
There were systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.	Y
When people were affected by things that went wrong, they were given an apology and informed of any resulting action.	Y
The practice encouraged candour, openness and honesty.	Y
The practice had access to a Freedom to Speak Up Guardian.	N
Staff had undertaken equality and diversity training.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Staff told us they were not aware who the freedom to speak up guardian was or how to contact them, but were confident raising concerns to the management team.	

Examples of feedback from staff or other evidence about working at the practice

Source	Feedback
Staff feedback	Staff told us they enjoyed working at the practice, but staff absence had impacted on workload. Not all staff felt their views were listened to and acted upon.

Governance arrangements

The overall governance arrangements were ineffective.

	Y/N/Partial
There were governance structures and systems which were regularly reviewed.	N
Staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities.	Y
There were appropriate governance arrangements with third parties.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The governance systems and processes were not in place to assess, monitor and improve the quality and safety of the service provided. The provider could not be assured they were sighted on the overall performance of the practice and identification of risk. For example, the incident reporting process was not effective, patient referrals to other services were not monitored and there were gaps of the required information kept in staff training files.	

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

	Y/N/Partial
There were comprehensive assurance systems which were regularly reviewed and improved.	Partial
There were processes to manage performance.	Partial
There was a quality improvement programme in place.	Y
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	Partial
A major incident plan was in place.	Y
Staff were trained in preparation for major incidents.	Y
When considering service developments or changes, the impact on quality and sustainability was assessed.	Y
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>The provider told us the assurance systems required review as this was not completed regularly including policies.</p> <p>There were processes to manage performance but this was held by individuals and not in one central place.</p> <p>We found a risk assessment had not been completed in the absence of a disclosure barring check (DBS) check for non-clinical staff.</p>	

The practice had systems in place to continue to deliver services, respond to risk and meet patients' needs during the pandemic

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had adapted how it offered appointments to meet the needs of patients during the pandemic.	Y
The needs of vulnerable people (including those who might be digitally excluded) had been considered in relation to access.	Y
There were systems in place to identify and manage patients who needed a face-to-face appointment.	Y
The practice actively monitored the quality of access and made improvements in response to findings.	Y
There were recovery plans in place to manage backlogs of activity and delays to treatment.	Y
Changes had been made to infection control arrangements to protect staff and patients using the service.	Y
Staff were supported to work remotely where applicable.	Y

Appropriate and accurate information

There was a demonstrated commitment to using data and information proactively to drive and support decision making.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff used data to monitor and improve performance.	Y
Performance information was used to hold staff and management to account.	Y
Staff whose responsibilities included making statutory notifications understood what this entailed.	Y

Governance and oversight of remote services

	Y/N/Partial
The practice used digital services securely and effectively and conformed to relevant digital and information security standards.	Y
The provider was registered as a data controller with the Information Commissioner's Office.	Y
Patient records were held in line with guidance and requirements.	Y
Patients were informed and consent obtained if interactions were recorded.	Y
The practice ensured patients were informed how their records were stored and managed.	Y
Patients were made aware of the information sharing protocol before online services were delivered.	Y
The practice had arrangements to make staff and patients aware of privacy settings on video and voice call services.	Y
Online consultations took place in appropriate environments to ensure confidentiality.	Y
The practice advised patients on how to protect their online information.	Y

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The practice involved the public, staff and external partners to sustain high quality and sustainable care.

	Y/N/Partial
Patient views were acted on to improve services and culture.	Y
The practice had an active Patient Participation Group.	Partial
Staff views were reflected in the planning and delivery of services.	Partial
The practice worked with stakeholders to build a shared view of challenges and of the needs of the population.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The patient participation group (PPG) meetings had paused during the COVID-19 pandemic. Plans to restart the meetings were in progress. Staff told us they were not involved with the planning of the services, but helped to deliver services.	

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

	Y/N/Partial
There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement.	Partial
Learning was shared effectively and used to make improvements.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The provider had been challenged with staffing shortages which had increased staff workload. The focus had been on managing and sustaining services whilst staff recruitment had taken place. Plans for improvement were in the process of being documented.	

Notes: CQC GP Insight

GP Insight assesses a practice's data against all the other practices in England. We assess relative performance for the majority of indicators using a "z-score" (this tells us the number of standard deviations from the mean the data point is), giving us a statistical measurement of a practice's performance in relation to the England average. We highlight practices which significantly vary from the England average (in either a positive or negative direction). We consider that z-scores which are higher than +2 or lower than -2 are at significant levels, warranting further enquiry. Using this technique, we can be 95% confident that the practice's performance is genuinely different from the average. It is important to note that a number of factors can affect the Z score for a practice, for example a small denominator or the distribution of the data. This means that there will be cases where a practice's data looks quite different to the average, but still shows as no statistical variation, as we do not have enough confidence that the difference is genuine. There may also be cases where a practice's data looks similar across two indicators, but they are in different variation bands.

The percentage of practices which show variation depends on the distribution of the data for each indicator but is typically around 10-15% of practices. The practices which are not showing significant statistical variation are labelled as no statistical variation to other practices.

N.B. Not all indicators in the evidence table are part of the GP insight set and those that aren't will not have a variation band.

The following language is used for showing variation:

Variation Bands	Z-score threshold
Significant variation (positive)	≤ -3
Variation (positive)	> -3 and ≤ -2
Tending towards variation (positive)	> -2 and ≤ -1.5
No statistical variation	< 1.5 and > -1.5
Tending towards variation (negative)	≥ 1.5 and < 2
Variation (negative)	≥ 2 and < 3
Significant variation (negative)	≥ 3

Note: for the following indicators the variation bands are different:

- Child Immunisation indicators. These are scored against the World Health Organisation target of 95% rather than the England average. Note that practices that have "Met 90% minimum" have not met the WHO target of 95%.
- The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to how easy it was to get through to someone at their GP practice on the phone uses a rules-based approach for scoring, due to the distribution of the data. This indicator does not have a CCG average.
- The percentage of women eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64). This indicator does not have a CCG average and is scored against the national target of 80%.

It is important to note that z-scores are not a judgement in themselves, but will prompt further enquiry, as part of our ongoing monitoring of GP practices.

Guidance and Frequently Asked Questions on GP Insight can be found on the following link: <https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/gps/how-we-monitor-gp-practices>

Note: The CQC GP Evidence Table uses the most recent validated and publicly available data. In some cases at the time of inspection this data may be relatively old. If during the inspection the practice has provided any more recent data, this can be considered by the inspector. However, it should be noted that any data provided by the practice will be unvalidated and is not directly comparable to the published data. This has been taken into account during the inspection process.

Glossary of terms used in the data.

- COPD:** Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
- UKHSA:** UK Health and Security Agency.
- QOF:** Quality and Outcomes Framework.
- STAR-PU:** Specific Therapeutic Group Age-sex weightings Related Prescribing Units. These weighting allow more accurate and meaningful comparisons within a specific therapeutic group by taking into account the types of people who will be receiving that treatment.
- ‰** = per thousand.