

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Greensward Surgery (1-6777428088)

Inspection date: 20 April 2022

Date of data download: 04 April 2022

Overall rating: Good

Safe

Rating: Good

Safety systems and processes

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

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
Safeguarding systems, processes and practices were developed, implemented and communicated to staff.	Yes
Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role.	Yes
There was active and appropriate engagement in local safeguarding processes.	Yes
The Out of Hours service was informed of relevant safeguarding information.	Yes
There were systems to identify vulnerable patients on record.	Yes
Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required.	Yes
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.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">We saw evidence that that safeguarding concerns were discussed at the weekly clinical meetings.	

Recruitment systems	Y/N/Partial
Recruitment checks were carried out in accordance with regulations (including for agency staff and locums).	Yes

Staff vaccination was maintained in line with current Public Health England (PHE) guidance if relevant to role.	No
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We reviewed non clinical and clinical staff files and found they had been recruited in line with guidance. There was a system in place to review the registration of clinical staff. There was not an effective system to record evidence of staff immunisations as required in the Immunisation Against Infectious Diseases, the 'Green Book'. 	

Safety systems and records	Y/N/Partial
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken. Date of last assessment:	Yes 19/10/2021
There was a fire procedure. Date of fire risk assessment:	Yes 07/05/2021
Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed.	
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice had two fire officers to carry out weekly fire alarm tests and support staff and patients during an emergency. The fire risk assessment specified actions required and who was responsible for which actions, the practice told us these had all been completed. 	

Infection prevention and control

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were met.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff had received effective training on infection prevention and control.	Yes
Infection prevention and control audits were carried out. Date of last infection prevention and control audit: December 2021	Yes
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Yes
The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff had received infection prevention control training and were aware who the infection control lead was. Actions identified in infection control audits had been addressed. We saw evidence of appropriate handwashing facilities and adequate provision of personal protective equipment (PPE). 	

Risks to patients

There were adequate 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.	Yes
There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.	Yes
The practice was equipped to respond to medical emergencies (including suspected sepsis) and staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.	Yes
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.	Yes
There were enough staff to provide appointments and prevent staff from working excessive hours	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the practice did not use temporary or agency staff the registrar who was temporarily based at the practice had an effective induction. 	

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had 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.	Yes
There was a system for processing information relating to new patients including the summarising of new patient notes.	Yes
There were systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.	Yes
Referrals to specialist services were documented, contained the required information and there was a system to monitor delays in referrals.	Yes
There was a documented approach to the management of test results, and this was managed in a timely manner.	Yes
There was appropriate clinical oversight of test results, including when reviewed by non-clinical staff.	Yes

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) (01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)	0.79	0.85	0.76	No statistical variation
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). (01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	9.6%	10.1%	9.2%	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 (01/07/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	6.31	6.13	5.28	Tending towards variation (negative)
Total items prescribed of Pregabalin or Gabapentin per 1,000 patients (01/07/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	136.2‰	119.5‰	129.2‰	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity of Hypnotics prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	0.47	0.69	0.62	No statistical variation
Number of unique patients prescribed multiple psychotropics per 1,000 patients (01/07/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	6.5‰	6.1‰	6.8‰	No statistical variation

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.	Yes
Blank prescriptions were kept securely, and their use monitored in line with national guidance.	Yes
Staff had the appropriate authorisations to administer medicines (including Patient Group Directions or Patient Specific Directions).	Yes

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.	Yes
There was a process for the safe handling of requests for repeat medicines and evidence of structured medicines reviews for patients on repeat medicines.	Yes
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.	Yes
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.	Yes
The practice monitored the prescribing of controlled drugs. (For example, investigation of unusual prescribing, quantities, dose, formulations and strength).	Yes
There were arrangements for raising concerns around controlled drugs with the NHS England Area Team Controlled Drugs Accountable Officer.	Yes
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.	Yes
For remote or online prescribing there were effective protocols for verifying patient identity.	Yes
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.	Yes
There was medical oxygen and a defibrillator on site and systems to ensure these were regularly checked and fit for use.	Yes
Vaccines were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with PHE guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective.	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff employed by the PCN (Primary Care Network) were responsible for undertaking medicine reviews and dealing with prescription queries. • Weekly telephone clinics and wellbeing clinics were set up to deal with patient medication queries and follow up on discharge letters. • 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 (01/07/2021 to 31/12/2021), was higher than local and national averages. The practice was aware of this and told us that all patients prescribed this medicine had been reviewed and the prescribing was appropriate. • We carried out remote clinical searches and found that required monitoring was being carried out effectively for most patients however some strengthening to their systems was required. - We saw that all patients who were prescribed a direct anti-coagulant drug had a calculated creatine clearance required to determine dosage. The practice had a system in place to review 	

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
<p>this information before prescribing. However, this information had not been correctly coded on individual patient records. During the inspection this was rectified and a system was put in place to ensure this continued. There was no risk to patient safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eight patients with Chronic Kidney Disease stages 4 or 5 were identified as not having the correct monitoring. We reviewed five of these patients and found that one patient required a blood test. This was arranged during the inspection. There was no risk to patient safety. - We identified 1286 patients diagnosed with hypothyroidism. Of these we saw that five patients had not received the correct monitoring. The practice followed this up during the inspection and told us that the correct checks had already been completed or arranged. 	

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

Significant events	Y/N/Partial
The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a variety of sources.	Yes
Staff knew how to identify and report concerns, safety incidents and near misses.	Yes
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events.	Yes
Staff understood how to raise concerns and report incidents both internally and externally.	Yes
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.	Yes
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	Three
Number of events that required action:	Three
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff told us there was a no blame culture at the practice and they felt confident raising significant events. These were discussed during meetings and learning was always shared. 	

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

Event	Specific action taken
<u>Issue:</u> A reception staff incorrectly booked an appointment for a patient with a similar name. <u>Impact:</u> The consultation was recorded on the incorrect patients notes and the nominated pharmacy was changed by the clinician. The pharmacy called the practice to inform them of a possible error when the patient presented to collect their medication.	<u>Action:</u> The consultation was marked in error on the incorrect patient notes and added to the correct patient. The nominated pharmacy was reverted for the incorrect patient. <u>Learning:</u> This was discussed at the clinical meeting and all reception staff and clinicians were reminded of the protocol to verify ID and an additional step introduced to clarify spelling of the patient's name.

Safety alerts	Y/N/Partial
There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts.	Yes
Staff understood how to deal with alerts.	Yes

Effective

Rating: Good

At the previous inspection, the practice was rated as outstanding for providing effective care. At this inspection we rated effective as good, as we identified some areas where the practice should continue to improve.

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

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.• Health checks, including frailty assessments, were offered to patients over 75 years of age.• Flu, shingles and pneumonia vaccinations were offered to relevant patients in this age group.• 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 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 demonstrated that they had a system to identify people who misused substances.
- 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

- 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.
- GPs followed up patients who had received treatment in hospital or through out of hours services for an acute exacerbation of asthma.
- 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.
- Patients with asthma were offered an asthma management plan.

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,	50	50	100.0%	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)				
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)	41	43	95.3%	Met 95% WHO based target
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)	42	43	97.7%	Met 95% WHO based target
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)	41	43	95.3%	Met 95% WHO based target
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)	55	55	100.0%	Met 95% WHO based target

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 demonstrated a proactive approach to booking and following up on childhood immunisations

Cancer Indicators	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
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). (Snapshot date: 30/09/2021) (Public Health England)	84.8%	N/A	80% Target	Met 80% target
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (PHE)	43.2%	64.3%	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) (PHE)	73.8%	66.8%	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) (PHE)	52.6%	56.3%	55.4%	No statistical variation

Any additional evidence or comments

- Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (PHE), was below the local and national average. The practice was aware of this and had plans in place to focus on improving uptake.

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.

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

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

During this inspection we saw evidence of completed quality audits. These included: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A quality improvement project relating to patients on Disease Modifying Anti Rheumatic Drugs (DMARDs) to improve monitoring.• A two-cycle audit of patients who were prescribed Prednisolone.
--

Effective staffing

The practice was able to demonstrate that staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care, support and treatment.	Yes
The practice had a programme of learning and development.	Yes
Staff had protected time for learning and development.	Yes
There was an induction programme for new staff.	Yes
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.	Yes
The practice could demonstrate how they assured the competence of staff employed in advanced clinical practice, for example, nurses, paramedics, pharmacists and physician associates.	Yes
There was a clear and appropriate approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff told us that training and the ability to access training was encouraged at the practice.	

- Staff were provided with additional training in their areas of expertise.

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.	Yes
Patients received consistent, coordinated, person-centered care when they moved between services.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the day of inspection, we spoke to two members of staff working at the practice who were employed by the Primary Care Network, a pharmacist and a pharmacy technician. • We saw evidence that the practice had a good working relationship with these staff members to deliver coordinated care. 	

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.	Yes
Staff encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their own health.	Yes
Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks.	Yes
Staff discussed changes to care or treatment with patients and their carers as necessary.	Yes
The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health, for example, stop smoking campaigns and tackling obesity.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Monthly multidisciplinary meetings with the palliative care team and the clinicians were in place to discuss all patients who required and may require end of life care.	

Consent to care and treatment

The practice always 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.	Yes
Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.	Yes
Do Not Attempt Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (DNACPR) decisions were made in line with relevant legislation and were appropriate.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">We reviewed five Do Not Attempt Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, (DNACPR) reviews and saw that there was always evidence of a conversation with a lasting power of attorney where patients lacked mental capacity.	

Responsive

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 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	Yes
The practice offered a range of appointment types to suit different needs (e.g. face to face, telephone, online)	Yes
Patients were able to make appointments in a way which met their needs	Yes
There were systems in place to support patients who face communication barriers to access treatment	Yes
Patients with most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised	Yes
There was information available for patients to support them to understand how to access services (including on websites and telephone messages)	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The practice offered both face to face and telephone appointments according to the patient's preference.• The administration staff were trained to allocate appointments to the appropriate health care professional.• The nurses also triaged appointments on the day.• The practice had a pharmacy technician employed by the Primary Care Network, who dealt with any prescription related queries.	

Well-led

Rating: Good

Leadership capacity and capability

There was compassionate, inclusive and effective leadership at all levels.

	Y/N/Partial
Leaders demonstrated that they understood the challenges to quality and sustainability.	Yes
They had identified the actions necessary to address these challenges.	Yes
Staff reported that leaders were visible and approachable.	Yes
There was a leadership development programme, including a succession plan.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The partnership was stable and we were told there was no plans to change this.	

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision and 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.	Yes
Staff knew and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.	Yes
Progress against delivery of the strategy was monitored.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Staff told us that they worked towards the vision of providing effective care and treatment to patients and were supported by strong governance.	

Culture

The practice had a culture which drove high quality sustainable care.

	Y/N/Partial
There were arrangements to deal with any behaviour inconsistent with the vision and values.	Yes
Staff reported that they felt able to raise concerns without fear of retribution.	Yes
There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of staff.	Yes
There were systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.	Yes
When people were affected by things that went wrong, they were given an apology and informed of any resulting action.	Yes
The practice encouraged candour, openness and honesty.	Yes
The practice had access to a Freedom to Speak Up Guardian.	Yes
Staff had undertaken equality and diversity training.	Yes

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

Source	Feedback
We spoke to staff employed by the practice as well as staff employed by the PCN who worked at the practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff we spoke with told us they enjoyed working at the practice. Staff told us they had been encouraged to have training and development. Staff said the management and clinicians were always supportive and accessible. Staff told us they felt confident to raise concerns and felt they would be listened to.

Governance arrangements

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

	Y/N/Partial
There were governance structures and systems which were regularly reviewed.	Yes
Staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities.	Yes
There were appropriate governance arrangements with third parties.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were designated leads for areas such as safeguarding, infection prevention and control and long term conditions. 	

Managing risks, issues and performance

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

	Y/N/Partial
There were comprehensive assurance systems which were regularly reviewed and improved.	Yes
There were processes to manage performance.	Yes
There was a quality improvement programme in place.	Yes
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	Yes
A major incident plan was in place.	Yes
Staff were trained in preparation for major incidents.	Yes
When considering service developments or changes, the impact on quality and sustainability was assessed.	Yes

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

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.	Yes
Performance information was used to hold staff and management to account.	Yes
Staff whose responsibilities included making statutory notifications understood what this entailed.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We saw evidence of completed audits and any action plans had measurable outcomes tasked to a delegated individual.• We were told improvements in performance were discussed at staff meetings.	

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.	Yes
The provider was registered as a data controller with the Information Commissioner's Office.	Yes
Patient records were held in line with guidance and requirements.	Yes
Patients were informed and consent obtained if interactions were recorded.	Yes
The practice ensured patients were informed how their records were stored and managed.	Yes
Patients were made aware of the information sharing protocol before online services were delivered.	Yes
The practice had arrangements to make staff and patients aware of privacy settings on video and voice call services.	Yes
Online consultations took place in appropriate environments to ensure confidentiality.	Yes
The practice advised patients on how to protect their online information.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff we spoke to were aware of relevant information governance, data protection and confidentiality procedures.	

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.	Yes
The practice had an active Patient Participation Group.	Yes
Staff views were reflected in the planning and delivery of services.	Yes
The practice worked with stakeholders to build a shared view of challenges and of the needs of the population.	Yes

Feedback from Patient Participation Group.

Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Patient Participation Group (PPG) had not met as frequently during the previous two years as it had done before.• We saw minutes of the meetings that had taken place which were circulated to all who were invited to attend.• The minutes included positive feedback by members of the PPG regarding the practice, including praise for the roll out of the vaccine clinics and the hard work and commitment of the staff team.• The minutes also evidenced that the PPG were able to ask questions and challenge the practice on broader issues relating to local and national issues.

Continuous improvement and innovation

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

	Y/N/Partial
There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement.	Yes
Learning was shared effectively and used to make improvements.	Yes

Examples of continuous learning and improvement

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• On the day of inspection, we spoke to the Advanced Nurse Practitioner and Registrar who both commented specifically on the high quality of training provided.• Most staff had key areas of responsibility and were provided with additional training to support their role.• Staff were given protected learning time and told us they were encouraged to learn and improve.• The practice could access additional staff from their PCN to support new ways of working.
--

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.
- **PHE:** Public Health England.
- **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.