Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Westwood Medical Health Centre (1-545359535)

Inspection date: 20 November 2018

Date of data download: 05 December 2018

Overall rating: Good

Please note: Any Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) data relates to 2017/18.

Well-led

Rating: Good

Leadership capacity and capability

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 in place which were regularly reviewed.	Υ	
Staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities.	Y	
There were appropriate governance arrangements with third parties.	Y	
The practice had established effective systems and processes to ensure good governance in accordance with the fundamental standards of care. Specifically, the practice had implemented an effective process to monitor and respond to Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) alerts consistently. This included carrying out the appropriate actions to ensure patients were not affected by the alerts.		
The practice had reviewed and implemented a revised procedure for transporting oxygen safely in an emergency.		
The practice had implemented a process to consistently record the content of discussions, proposed actions at all meetings.	decisions and	

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 practices 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 Band	Z-score threshold
1	Significant variation (positive)	Z ≤-3
2	Variation (positive)	-3 < Z ≤ -2
3	No statistical variation	-2 < Z < 2
4	Variation (negative)	2≤Z<3
5	Significant variation (negative)	Z ≥3
6	No data	Null

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.

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

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.