

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Sunderland GP Alliance - Disruptive Patient Service (1-3296920354)

Inspection date: 3 April 2019

Date of data download: 06 April 2019

Overall rating: Good

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

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
Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for their role.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none">At the last inspection we found that chaperoning staff were occasionally used on an informal basis from another provider within the same building, and that the practice had not carried out formal checks before using these staff. At this inspection we found this had been rectified by only using staff from the provider, who had appropriate recruitment and training checks and procedures according to the provider's policies. The practice therefore carried out appropriate staff checks at the time of recruitment and on an ongoing basis.	

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

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.	Y
There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.	Y
Comprehensive risk assessments were carried out for patients.	Y
Risk management plans for patients were developed in line with national guidance.	Y
Panic alarms were fitted and administrative staff understood how to respond to the alarm and the location of emergency equipment.	Y

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

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

	Y/N/Partial
There was a system for processing information relating to new patients including the summarising of new patient notes.	Y
There were systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.	Y
Referral letters contained specific information to allow appropriate and timely referrals.	Y
Referrals to specialist services were documented.	Y
There was a system to monitor delays in referrals.	Y
There was a documented approach to the management of test results and this was managed in a timely manner.	Y
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.	Y
• The practice had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment. Regular multi-disciplinary meetings were held including with ambulance and secondary care providers, and pharmacy service.	

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.	Y
Staff knew how to identify and report concerns, safety incidents and near misses.	Y
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events.	Y

Staff understood how to raise concerns and report incidents both internally and externally.	Y
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.	Y
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	4
Number of events that required action:	4
Following the last inspection, improvement to systems and reporting had been made, these now mirrored those used by the provider Sunderland GP Alliance at it's 'The Galleries' site, where the service is administrated from. We saw that significant events were documented in a timely fashion and where learning had been recorded, with necessary information disseminated.	

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

Event	Specific action taken
A patient requiring treatment not attending the service	A multi-agency meeting was held to try to contact the patient including welfare checks by police. A learning workshop and task group was formed to discuss how information could be more effectively be shared.
A patient managed to register with another mainstream GP practice, having been struck off for risk and registered with the disruptive patient service.	Following an incident where a patient was able to register with another provider. There were changes made to systems and coding, so that new patients registering have an alert code placed on their records within 24 hours rather than the previous 3-5 days. This means patients who pose a risk in mainstream practice are not able to register or obtain prescriptions elsewhere.

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.
- 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.

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.