Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Bartongate Surgery (1-554231962)

Inspection date: 4 April 2018

Date of data download: 03 April 2018

Safe

Safety systems and processes

Source	
There was a lead member(s) of staff for safeguarding processes and procedures.	Yes
Safety and safeguarding systems, processes and practices were developed, implemented and communicated to staff.	Yes
Policies were in place covering adult and child safeguarding. They were updated and reviewed and accessible to all staff.	Yes
Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role (for example level three for GPs, including locum GPs)	Yes
The practice worked in partnership with other agencies to protect patients from abuse, neglect, harassment, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect. Information about patients at risk was shared with other agencies in a timely way.	Yes
Systems were in place to highlight vulnerable patients on record. There was a risk register of specific patients	Yes
Reports and learning from safeguarding incidents were available to staff.	Yes
Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required	Yes
Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had a DBS check.	Yes

Explanation of any 'No' answers:

The Phlebotomist was trained to level three Child Safeguarding.

All staff had received a DBS Check. A self-declaration was undertaken for all staff annually to demonstrate that their circumstances have not changed.

Recruitment Systems	
The registered person provided assurances that safety was promoted in their recruitment practices.	Yes
Recruitment checks were carried out in accordance with regulations (including for agency staff, locums and volunteers).	Yes
Staff vaccination was maintained in line with current PHE guidance and if relevant to role.	Yes
Systems were in place to ensure the registration of clinical staff (including nurses and pharmacists) was checked and regularly monitored.	Yes
Staff who require medical indemnity insurance had it in place	Yes

Safety Records	
There was a record of portable appliance testing or visual inspection by a competent person	Yes
Date of last inspection/Test:	14/01/2018
There was a record of equipment calibration	Yes
Date of last calibration:	21/04/2017
Risk assessments were in place for any storage of hazardous substances e.g. liquid nitrogen, storage of chemicals	Yes
Fire procedure in place	Yes
Fire extinguisher checks	Yes
Fire drills and logs	No
Fire alarm checks	Yes
Fire training for staff	Yes
Fire marshals	Yes
Fire risk assessment	Yes
Date of completion	23/01/2018
Actions were identified and completed.	Yes
The risks assessment identified that the practice should provide an area for smoking. The practice has determined that staff working at the practice are non-smokers.	
Health and safety	
Premises/security risk assessment?	Yes
Date of last assessment:	09/01/2018
Health and safety risk assessment and actions	Yes
Date of last assessment:	09/01/2018
Additional comments:	
Next whole staff fire training 22/04/2018 Provider sent information that a fire drill had been undertaken on 05/04/2018	

Infection control

Risk assessment and policy in place Date of last infection control audit: The provider acted on any issues identified

03/03/2018 An action plan was in place which the practice was working

through.

Yes

Detail:

An action plan was in place which the practice was working through.

The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe?

Yes

Any additional evidence

Legionella Risks Assessment undertaken on 30/01/2018 by an external contractor.

Risks to patients

The practice had systems in place to monitor and review staffing levels and skill mix.	Yes
There was an effective approach to managing staff absences and busy periods.	Yes
Comprehensive risk assessments were carried out for patients and risk management plans were developed in line with national guidance	Yes
Staff knew how to respond to emergency situations.	Yes
Receptionists were aware of 'red flag' sepsis symptoms that might be reported by patients and how to respond.	No
The practice had equipment available to enable assessment of patients with presumed sepsis.	Yes
There were systems in place to enable the assessment of patients with presumed sepsis in line with NICE guidance.	Yes
The impact on safety was assessed and monitored when the practice carried out changes to the service or the staff.	Yes
Explanation of any 'No' answers: Staff had not received sepsis training. Staff were aware with regard to how to respond in an emergency and there were systems in place to respond when medical emergencies arose. The practice had contacted a training company who were working on developing a training module on sepsis. The practice had plans for GPs at the practice to give all non-clinical staff information on this topic during one of the practice's training event in a few weeks' time.	

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Individual care records, including clinical data, were written and managed in line with current guidance and relevant legislation.	Yes
The care records we saw demonstrated that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was made available to relevant staff in an accessible way.	Yes
Referral letters contained specific information to allow appropriate and timely referrals.	Yes
Referrals to specialist services were documented.	Yes
The practice had a documented approach to the management of test results and this was managed in a timely manner.	Yes
The practice demonstrated that when patients use multiple services, all the information needed for their ongoing care was shared appropriately and in line with relevant protocols.	Yes

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

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).(01/07/2016 to 30/06/2017)(NHSBSA)	1.12	0.96	0.98	Comparable to other practices
Percentage of antibiotic items prescribed that are Co-Amoxiclav, Cephalosporins or Quinolones.(01/07/2016 to 30/06/2017) (NHSBSA)	6.7%	9.6%	8.9%	Comparable to other practices

Medicine Management	
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
Staff had the appropriate authorisations in place to administer medicines (including PGDS or PSDs).	Yes
Prescriptions (pads and computer prescription paper) were kept securely and monitored.	Yes
There was a process for the management 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 audits for unusual prescribing, quantities, dose, formulations and strength).	Yes
There were arrangements for raising concerns around controlled drugs with the NHS England Area Team CD Accountable Officer.	Yes
If the practice had controlled drugs on the premises there were systems for the safe ordering, checks on receipt, storage, administration, balance checks and disposal of these medicines in line with national guidance.	NA
Up to date local prescribing guidelines were in use. Clinical staff were able to access a local microbiologist for advice.	Yes
For remote or online prescribing there were effective protocols in place for identifying and verifying the patient in line with GMC guidance.	N/A
The practice held appropriate emergency medicines and .risk assessments were in place to determine the range of medicines held.	Yes
The practice had arrangements to monitor the stock levels and expiry dates of emergency medicines/medical gases	Yes
There was medical oxygen on site	Yes
The practice had a defibrillator	Yes
Both were checked regularly and this was recorded.	Yes
Medicines that required refrigeration were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with PHE guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective in use.	No
Explanation of any 'No' answers:	

Actions had been taken when there were signs that one of the vaccine fridges had operated outside of the normal range. For example, the practice had arranged for the fridge to be investigated and serviced by an engineer. They also identified that there were times where the temperature of the room where the fridge was kept increased and therefore, had installed an air-conditioning unit to keep the room cool. They had also installed a second internal thermometer to monitor the temperature of the fridge. The practice was able to demonstrate that appropriate actions had been taken to ensure the safety and efficacy of vaccines held in stock. However, when the maximum temperature of one of the vaccine fridges indicated that it was outside of the normal range, staff had not recorded the temperature of the internal thermometer.

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements made

Significant events	
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events	Yes
Staff understood how to 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.	3
Number of events that required action	3

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

Event	Specific action taken
A medical issue had been missed when examining a baby.	For GPs to spend more time on examinations for children and to undertake further reading on the area that had been missed. The practice arranged a meeting with the patient's parent to discuss this further.

Safety Alerts	
There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts	Yes
Staff understand how to deal with alerts	Yes

Comments on systems in place:

The practice manager received the alerts which were shared with all clinical staff. The clinical pharmacist supported clinical staff to action the alerts if they applied to the practice.

Any additional evidence

Significant events- We noted that the practice had a low number of significant events in the last 12 months and we discussed these with the management team. They gave us examples where issues were resolved immediately and a change in process was implemented, however, these had not been recorded. For example, when a text reminder about the flu clinic was sent to the wrong patient, the practice identified that some patients had changed their phone numbers and not informed the practice about their updated contact details. The practice asked staff to check patient contact details when they call the practice and to update these where needed. They also identified that the text messaging service would send a notification to the practice when text messages could not be delivered. The practice used this as a prompt to contact the relevant patient to check their contact details.

Effective

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

Prescribing				
Indicator	Practice performance	CCG average	England average	England comparison
Average daily quantity of Hypnotics prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU). (01/07/2016 to 30/06/2017) (NHSBSA)	3.26	1.03	0.90	Significant Variation (negative)

Diabetes Indicators				
Indicator	Practice performance	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	64.4%	82.0%	79.5%	Variation (negative)
QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
	5.8% (38)	16.8%	12.4%	
Indicator	Practice	CCG	England	England
	performance	average	average	comparison
The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	84.2%	80.0%	78.1%	Comparable to other practices
QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
	4.4% (29)	12.8%	9.3%	
Indicator	Practice performance	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) is 5 mmol/l or less (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	69.7%	81.1%	80.1%	Comparable to other practices
QOF Exceptions	8.3% (54)	17.8%	13.3%	

Other long term conditions				
Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with asthma, on the register, who have had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that includes an assessment of asthma control using the 3 RCP questions. (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	74.0%	76.4%	76.4%	Comparable to other practices
QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
Indicator	11.3% (49) Practice	9.3% CCG average	7.7% England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with COPD who had a review undertaken including an assessment of breathlessness using the Medical Research Council dyspnoea scale in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	93.1%	93.3%	90.4%	Comparable to other practices
QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
	19.1% (34)	13.4%	11.4%	
Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90 mmHg or less (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	83.9%	84.7%	83.4%	Comparable to other practices
whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90 mmHg or	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90 mmHg or less (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	Practice Exception rate (number of	CCG Exception rate 4.7%	England Exception rate 4.0%	other practices
whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90 mmHg or less (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90 mmHg or less (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF) QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions) 1.5% (13) Practice	CCG Exception rate 4.7% CCG	England Exception rate 4.0% England	other practices England
whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 150/90 mmHg or less (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF) QOF Exceptions Indicator In those patients with atrial fibrillation with a record of a CHA2DS2-VASc score of 2 or more, the percentage of patients who are currently treated with anti-coagulation drug therapy.	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions) 1.5% (13) Practice	CCG Exception rate 4.7% CCG average	England Exception rate 4.0% England average	England comparison Comparable to

Child Immunisation				
Indicator	Numerator	Denominator	Practice %	Comparison to WHO target
Percentage of children aged 1 with completed primary course of 5:1 vaccine. (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (NHS England)	123	136	90.4%	Met 90% Minimum (no variation)
The percentage children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (NHS England)	120	137	87.6%	Below 90% Minimum (variation negative)
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) (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (NHS England)	122	137	89.1%	Below 90% Minimum (variation negative)
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (first dose of MMR) (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (NHS England)	122	137	89.1%	Below 90% Minimum (variation negative)

Cancer Indicators				
Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of women eligible for cervical cancer screening who were screened adequately within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64 (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (Public Health England)	60.9%	76.4%	72.1%	Comparable to other practices
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (PHE)	60.9%	75.4%	70.3%	N/A
Persons, 60-69, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months (2.5 year coverage, %)(PHE)	40.6%	61.8%	54.6%	N/A
The percentage of patients with cancer, diagnosed within the preceding 15 months, who have a patient review recorded as occurring within 6 months of the date of diagnosis. (PHE)	88.0%	73.3%	71.2%	N/A

Mental Health Indicators				
Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	93.2%	94.4%	90.3%	Comparable to other practices
QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
	12.9% (13)	17.8% CCG	12.5%	England
Indicator	Practice	average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	94.4%	93.1%	90.7%	Comparable to other practices
QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
	10.9% (11)	16.2%	10.3%	
Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care plan has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	80.0%	86.8%	83.7%	Comparable to other practices
QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
	3.8% (2)	7.3%	6.8%	

Monitoring care and treatment

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average
Overall QOF score (out of maximum 559)	535	550	539
Overall QOF exception reporting	5.4%	6.3%	5.7%

Effective staffing

Question	Y/N
The registered person provided assurances that staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care, support and treatment. This included specific training for nurses on immunisation and on sample taking for the cervical screening programme.	Yes
The learning and development needs of staff were assessed	Yes
The provider had a programme of learning and development.	Yes
There was an induction programme for new staff.	Yes
Staff had access to appraisals, one to one, 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

Any further comments or notable training.

The practice had plans for two of the practice nurses to attend triage training later in 2018 which would assist GPs with triage for urgent appointments.

Coordinating care and treatment

Indicator		Y/N
The contractor has regular (at least 3 more patients on the palliative care register are	nthly) multidisciplinary case review meetings where all discussed (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	Yes

Helping patients to live healthier lives

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with physical and/or mental health conditions whose notes record smoking status in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (QOF)	95.9%	94.8%	95.3%	Comparable to other practices
QOF Exceptions	Practice Exception rate (number of exceptions)	CCG Exception rate	England Exception rate	
	0.6% (11)	1.0%	0.8%	
Indicator	Practice	CCG	England	England

		average	average	comparison
Number of new cancer cases treated (Detection rate: % of which resulted from a two week wait (TWW) referral) (01/04/2016 to 31/03/2017) (PHE)	58.3%	53.4%	51.6%	Comparable to other practices

Caring

Kindness, respect and compassion

CQC comments cards	
Total comments cards received	6
Number of CQC comments received which were positive about the service	3
Number of comments cards received which were mixed about the service	3
Number of CQC comments received which were negative about the service	0

Examples of feedback received:

Source	Feedback
Comments cards.	Three of the comment cards we received were positive about the practice. Patients commented that the doctors were good and that they had received an excellent service from the practice. Three comment cards contained mixed reviews, two of which referred to the waiting times to get an appointment and one referred to the attitude of reception staff.

National GP Survey results

Practice population size	Surveys sent out	% of practice population	Surveys returned	Survey Response rate%
8,743	302	Approximately 1%	96	31.79%

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that they would definitely or probably recommend their GP surgery to someone who has just moved to the local area (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GP Patient Survey)	71.4%	83.7%	78.9%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they saw or spoke to a GP, the GP was good or very good at listening to them (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	87.2%	91.9%	88.8%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who answered positively to question 22 "Did you have confidence and trust in the GP you saw or spoke to?" (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	93.9%	97.6%	95.5%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they saw or spoke to a GP, the GP was good or very good at treating them with care and concern (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	86.0%	89.6%	85.5%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they saw or spoke to a nurse, the nurse was good or very good at listening to them (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	91.5%	93.3%	91.4%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they saw or spoke to a nurse, the nurse was good or very good at treating them with care and concern (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	90.4%	93.3%	90.7%	Comparable to other practices

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Examples of feedback received:

Source	Feedback
Interviews with patients	Patients we spoke with on the day of the inspection commented that they were able to receive an appointment in urgent cases, although routine appointment could take between two to three weeks. They felt they were involved in their care and treated with respect and dignity by staff at the practice.

National GP 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 saw or spoke to a GP, the GP was good or very good at explaining tests and treatments (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	78.9%	90.0%	86.4%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they saw or spoke to a GP, the GP was good or very good at involving them in decisions about their care (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	75.6%	86.2%	82.0%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they saw or spoke to a nurse, the nurse was good or very good at explaining tests and treatments (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	89.5%	92.4%	89.9%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they saw or spoke to a nurse, the nurse was good or very good at involving them in decisions about their care (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017) (GPPS)	89.6%	88.2%	85.4%	Comparable to other practices

Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. Yes

Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access support groups and organisations. Yes

Information leaflets were available in easy read format. yes

Information about support groups was available on the practice website. Yes

Carers	Narrative
Percentage and number of carers identified	The practice had identified 59 patients as carers. This represented approximately 0.7% of the practice patient population.
How the practice supports carers	Dedicated carers clinics once every six months.
How the practice supports recently bereaved patients	The practice telephoned the family of the patient and offered them an appointment at a convenient time.

Privacy and dignity

Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments. Yes

	Narrative
1	Waiting room and reception area separate. Plans to improve the reception area. Funding has been agreed for the work to be undertaken.

Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations. Yes

A private room was available if patients were distressed or wanted to discuss sensitive issues. Yes

Responsive

Tuesdays

Responding to and meeting people's needs

Day	Time
Monday	08:30-13:15
Monday	13:45-18:00
Tuesday	08:30-13:15
Tuesday	13:45-18:00
Wednesday	08:30-13:15
Wednesday	13:45-18:00
Thursday	08:30-13:15
Thursday	13:45-18:00
Friday	08:30-13:15
Friday	13:45-18:00
Appointments available	

Saturdays	09:00-13:00
Home visits	
The practice had a system to assess w	hether a home visit was clinically necessary

18:30- 20:00

Yes

If yes, describe how this was done

and the urgency of the need for medical attention

The practice operated a GP triage system where the duty doctor would assess the need of the patient and arrange a home visit when required.

Timely access to the service

National GP Survey results

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were 'Very satisfied' or 'Fairly satisfied' with their GP practices opening hours. (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017)	83.0%	82.9%	80.0%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who gave a positive answer to "Generally, how easy is it to get through to someone at your GP surgery on the phone?" (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017)	77.9%	80.7%	70.9%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that the last time they wanted to see or speak to a GP or nurse from their GP surgery they were able to get an appointment (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017)	66.7%	84.6%	75.5%	Comparable to other practices
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of making an appointment (01/01/2017 to 31/03/2017)	63.5%	79.4%	72.7%	Comparable to other practices

Examples of feedback received from patients:

Source	Feedback
Comment cards	Patients commented that there were delays in getting a routine appointment. However, urgent appointment was available when they needed it.

Listening and learning from complaints received

The complaints policy and procedures were in line with recognised guidance and contractual obligations. Yes

Information was available to help patients understand the complaints system. Yes

Complaints	
Number of complaints received in the last year.	six
Number of complaints we examined	one
Number of complaints we examined that were satisfactorily handled in a timely way	yes
Number of complaints referred to the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman	none

Additional comments:

When a patient complained about a member of staff and approached this member of staff outside of the surgery with regards to the complaint, the practice advised staff to be very aware of how they are speaking to patients.

Well-led

Leadership capacity and capability

Vision and strategy

Practice Vision and values

To provide a good service and care for patients. To work with other agencies and meet the needs of the local population.

Culture

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

Source	Feedback
Nursing Staff	They enjoyed working at the practice and felt the leadership team was approachable.

Examples of changes made by the practice as a result of feedback from staff

Source	Example
	Introduced the role of Assistant Practice Manager to take some responsibilities
	from the Practice manager.

Examples of the practice responding to incidents and concerns and how they communicate with patients and those involved (consider duty of candour)

Source	Example
	A patient complained about a medical issue had been missed when examined by one of the GPs. The practice wrote to the patient and apologised, and offered to meet with a GP and the practice manager.

Examples of concerns raised by staff and addressed by the practice

Source	Example	
	er Staff raised concerns about a member of staff using social media. Social Media policy introduced. Staff were also required to attend a training event on this topic.	
The practice's speaking up policies are in line with the NHSI National Raising Issues Policy.		Yes

Examples of actions to improve quality in past 2 years

Area	Impact
	The practice recognised that a number of patients can develop diabetes and no show symptoms of this. The practice has decided to screen all patients presenting with mild symptoms of diabetes.

Appropriate and accurate information

Staff whose responsibilities include making statutory notifications understand what this	Yes	
entails	165	l

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

Feedback from Patient Participation Group;

Feedback

The Patient Participation Group (PPG) were positive about the practice. We spoke with two out of the four members of the group who shared personal experiences of how they felt the practice had gone above and beyond in supporting patients with their health needs. The also shared an example of how the practice took on suggestions and made improvements as a result. For example, following the flu clinic at the practice in 2016, the PPG suggested that the practice review how the clinic was organised to avoid the practice being overcrowded. They told us that the following year, the practice had made changes where a two member of staff ran the clinic, where one member of staff administered vaccines and another member of staff completed administrative tasks so that patient flow was more efficient.

Continuous improvement and innovation

Examples of innovation and improvements	Impact on patients
Supporting patients who were Muslims.	The practice identified that there was an increase in patients suffering from fatigue, urine infections and sore throats during the period of Ramadan (Ramadan is the ninth month of the Islamic calendar, and a time when Muslims across the world will fast during the hours of daylight.). Following attendance at a training event, one of the practice nurses ontained information on how patients could keep well during fasting. The practice had therefore planned for a learning event to take place at the practice on the 2 May 2018 (approximately one week before the beginning of Ramadan) where patients of the Muslim faith would be invited to attend to learn hints and tips on how they can manage their long term conditions during that time. They had worked with a representative of the local mosque to share this information among the local Muslim community. Men and women of Muslim faith would be invited separately to accommodate the needs of this community. We were told that patients were sent letters in previous years to advise them to stop certain medicines during Ramadan.
	 The practice was working on hosting a "ladies evening" at a local café to raise awareness of the importance of cervical screening.

Any additional evidence

•	The practice was successful in bidding for funds to improve some areas of the practice such	as the
	reception areas.	

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, a statistical tool which shows the deviation from the England average. It gives us a statistical measurement of a practice's performance in relation to the England average, and measures this in standard deviations. We calculate a z-score for each indicator, thereby highlighting the practices which significantly vary from the England average (in either a positive or negative direction). We consider that z-scores which are +2 or more or -2 or less are at significant levels, warranting further enquiry.

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

The following language is used for banding variation:

Significant variation (positive)

- Variation (positive)
- Comparable to other practices
- Variation (negative)
- Significant variation (negative)

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

• Child Immunisation indicators. These are scored against the World Health Organisation target of 95%.

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: http://www.cqc.org.uk/what-we-do/how-we-use-information/monitoring-gp-practices