

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Kenton Clinic (1-585109177)

Inspection date: 12 July 2019

Date of data download: 03 July 2019

Overall rating: Good

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

Safe **Rating:** **Requires Improvement**

We rated the practice as requires improvement for safe because:

- Safeguarding training was not at the appropriate level for all staff.
- Not all actions from the infection control and prevention audit had been implemented.
- Clinical specimens were not always stored appropriately.
- Not all staff were trained to recognise the red flag symptoms of sepsis.
- We found evidence that the healthcare assistant was administering Vitamin B12 injections without the authority of Patient Specific Directions (PSDs) from the prescriber.
- There were no records to demonstrate that medical oxygen and the defibrillator were checked regularly to ensure they were fit for use.
- There was no evidence to demonstrate that learning from significant events was shared with the whole practice team.

Safety systems and processes

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

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding processes and procedures.	Yes
Safeguarding systems, processes and practices were developed, implemented and communicated to staff.	Yes
There were policies covering adult and child safeguarding which were accessible to all staff.	Yes
Policies and procedures were monitored, reviewed and updated.	Yes

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role.	Partial
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
Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for their role.	Yes
There were regular discussions between the practice and other health and social care professionals to support and protect adults and children at risk of significant harm.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Safeguarding training was not in line with intercollegiate guidance (updated in January 2019); Safeguarding Children and Young People: Roles and Competencies for Healthcare Staff. The guidance states that all clinical staff are required to be trained to safeguarding children level 3 and non-clinical staff who have contact with patients are required to be trained to safeguarding children level 2. However, we found that the nurse had safeguarding children training level 2 and the healthcare assistant and non-clinical staff level 1.	

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.	Yes
There were systems to ensure the registration of clinical staff (including nurses and pharmacists) was checked and regularly monitored.	Yes

Safety systems and records	Y/N/Partial
There was a record of portable appliance testing or visual inspection by a competent person. Date of last inspection/test: 15/02/19	Yes
There was a record of equipment calibration. Date of last calibration: 15/02/19	Yes
There were risk assessments for any storage of hazardous substances for example, liquid nitrogen, storage of chemicals.	Yes
There was a fire procedure.	Yes
There was a record of fire extinguisher checks. Date of last check: 23/11/18	Yes
There was a log of fire drills. Date of last drill: 02/07/19	Yes

There was a record of fire alarm checks. Date of last check: 23/11/18	Yes
There was a record of fire training for staff.	Yes
There were fire marshals.	Yes
A fire risk assessment had been completed. Date of completion: 17/10/18	Yes
Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed.	Yes

Health and safety	Y/N/Partial
Premises/security risk assessment had been carried out. Date of last assessment: 17/10/18	Yes
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken. Date of last assessment: 17/10/18	Yes

Infection prevention and control

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were generally met. However, we identified some shortfalls in relation to monitoring standards, storage of clinical specimens and inoculation injury procedures.

	Y/N/Partial
There was an infection risk assessment and policy.	Yes
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: 23/05/19	Yes
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Partial
There was a system to notify Public Health England of suspected notifiable diseases.	Yes
The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.	Partial
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>We found that not all issues identified in the latest infection prevention and control audit had been acted on. For example, a cleaning schedule for clinical equipment and colour coded cleaning equipment had not been implemented.</p> <p>We found evidence that clinical specimens were regularly stored alongside vaccines in the vaccine fridge when they were not collected the same day they were taken.</p> <p>We found that not all clinical staff were aware of the action to take in the event of an inoculation injury.</p>	

Risks to patients

There were systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety. However, we found shortfalls in relation to the management of sepsis.

	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
Comprehensive risk assessments were carried out for patients.	Yes
Risk management plans for patients were developed in line with national guidance.	Yes
The practice was equipped to deal with medical emergencies (including suspected sepsis) and staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.	Yes
Clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections including sepsis.	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.	No
There was a process in the practice for urgent clinical review of such patients.	Yes
When there were changes to services or staff the practice assessed and monitored the impact on safety.	Yes
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>Although clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections. We found that other staff had not received training on recognising the red flag symptoms of sepsis.</p>	

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
Referral letters contained specific information to allow appropriate and timely referrals.	Yes
Referrals to specialist services were documented 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

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
---	-----

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

The practice had systems for the appropriate and safe use of medicines, including medicines optimisation. However, we found shortfalls in relation to these.

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) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)	0.44	0.72	0.88	Significant Variation (positive)
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). (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHSBSA)	14.1%	12.1%	8.7%	Variation (negative)
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 (01/10/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHSBSA)	6.71	6.25	5.61	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity of oral NSAIDs prescribed per Specific Therapeutic Group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR-PU) (01/10/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHSBSA)	0.72	0.96	2.07	Significant Variation (positive)

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).	No
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	Yes

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
changes to a patient's medicines including changes made by other services.	
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
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
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.	Partial
Vaccines were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with PHE guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective.	Yes
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>We found evidence that the healthcare assistant was administering vitamin B12 injections without the authority of Patient Specific Directions (PSDs) from the prescriber. (A PSD is a written instruction to administer a medicine to a named patient or list of named patients where each patient has been individually assessed by the prescriber).</p> <p>There were no records to demonstrate that the medical oxygen and defibrillator were checked regularly to ensure they were fit for use.</p> <p>Although there was negative variation for 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. The overall prescribing rate for antibiotics was approximately 50% of CCG/England average which evidenced good antimicrobial stewardship.</p>	

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong. However, there was no evidence that learning was shared with the whole practice team.

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	Yes

externally.	
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.	Partial
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	9
Number of events that required action:	9
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: We found evidence that significant events were recorded, investigated and learnt from. However, there was no evidence from practice meeting minutes that learning was shared with the whole practice team.	

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

Event	Specific action taken
Aggressive and abusive patient.	To ensure patients who have a history of aggression are flagged on the clinical system so they can be booked in with a senior partner or to make sure another member of staff is present for the consultation.
Blood sample was missed and not sent with the courier.	Procedures reviewed to ensure blood samples were not missed.

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
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: We saw examples of actions taken on recent alerts for example, regarding oral anticoagulants and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and regarding epipen auto-injectors for administering adrenaline.	

Effective

Rating: Good

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.	No
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
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Although, there was no overarching system to ensure clinicians were up to date with current evidence-based guidance we did not find evidence that the clinicians were not up to date or prescribing inappropriately.	

Prescribing	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) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) <small>(NHSBSA)</small>	0.62	0.56	0.77	No statistical variation

Older people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- 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.
- The practice carried out integrated care plan assessments for older patients to reduce the number of admissions to hospital.
- The practice sent out weekly invites for Abdomen Aortic Aneurysm screening and sent to all those

patients who turn 65 years of age.

- The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital. It ensured that their care plans and prescriptions were updated to reflect any extra or changed needs.
- The practice carried out structured annual medication reviews for older patients.
- Staff had appropriate knowledge of treating older people including their psychological, mental and communication 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. Data provided by the practice showed that they had achieved a seasonal flu vaccination uptake of 78% between 1 September 2018 and 28 February 2019 for patients 65 years and above compared to the CCG average of 68%.

People with long-term conditions

Population group rating: **Good**

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 atrial fibrillation were assessed for stroke risk and treated appropriately.
- Patients with COPD were offered rescue packs.
- Patients with asthma were offered an asthma management plan.

Diabetes Indicators	Practice	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 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	72.9%	79.9%	78.8%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	1.7% (6)	8.8%	13.2%	N/A
The percentage of patients with diabetes, on	81.6%	78.0%	77.7%	No statistical variation

the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>				
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	2.0% (7)	7.6%	9.8%	N/A

	Practice	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 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	72.2%	80.1%	80.1%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	4.0% (14)	9.6%	13.5%	N/A

Other long-term conditions	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, NICE 2011 menu ID: NM23 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	90.7%	79.7%	76.0%	Variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.6% (1)	4.8%	7.7%	N/A
The percentage of patients with COPD who have had a review, undertaken by a healthcare professional, including an assessment of breathlessness using the Medical Research Council dyspnoea scale in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	100.0%	92.2%	89.7%	Variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.0% (0)	8.3%	11.5%	N/A

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 150/90mmHg or less (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	89.2%	83.7%	82.6%	Tending towards variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	1.6% (7)	3.2%	4.2%	N/A
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 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	87.0%	83.2%	90.0%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	4.2% (1)	8.2%	6.7%	N/A

Families, children and young people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- Childhood immunisation uptake rates were in line with the World Health Organisation (WHO) targets.
- The practice contacted the parents or guardians of children due to have childhood immunisations.
- The practice had arrangements for following up failed attendance of children's appointments following an appointment in secondary care or for immunisation and would liaise with health visitors when necessary.
- The practice had arrangements to identify and review the treatment of newly pregnant women on long-term medicines. These patients were provided with advice and post-natal support in accordance with best practice guidance.
- Young people could access services for sexual health and contraception.
- Staff had the appropriate skills and training to carry out reviews for this population group.

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, Polio, Pertussis, Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib)((i.e. three doses of DTaP/IPV/Hib) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(NHS England)</small>	55	60	91.7%	Met 90% minimum (no variation)
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(NHS England)</small>	37	39	94.9%	Met 90% minimum (no variation)
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) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(NHS England)</small>	37	39	94.9%	Met 90% minimum (no variation)
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(NHS England)</small>	38	39	97.4%	Met 95% WHO based target (significant variation positive)

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>

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The practice had systems to inform eligible patients to have the meningitis vaccine, for example before attending university for the first time.
- The practice sent letters to all students who were sitting for their A level examination and offered immediate doctor appointment, if they felt stressed or unwell during their examination.
- 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.
- Patients could book or cancel appointments online and order repeat medication without the need to attend the surgery.

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) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (Public Health England)	66.0%	62.4%	71.7%	No statistical variation
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE)	82.6%	69.4%	69.9%	N/A
Persons, 60-69, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months (2.5 year coverage, %)(01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE)	56.9%	48.5%	54.4%	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. (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE)	90.9%	75.4%	70.2%	N/A
Number of new cancer cases treated (Detection rate: % of which resulted from a two week wait (TWW) referral) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE)	66.7%	57.9%	51.9%	No statistical variation

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable

Population group rating: **Good**

Findings

- Same day appointments and longer appointments were offered when required.
- 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.

**People experiencing poor mental health
(including people with dementia)**

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental illness, and personality disorder by providing access to health checks, interventions for physical activity, obesity, diabetes, heart disease, cancer and access to 'stop smoking' services.
- Same day and longer appointments were offered when required.
- There was a system for following up patients who failed to attend for administration of long-term medication.
- When patients were assessed to be at risk of suicide or self-harm the practice had arrangements in place to help them to remain safe.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment to detect possible signs of dementia. When dementia was suspected there was an appropriate referral for diagnosis.
- Patients with poor mental health, including dementia, were referred to appropriate services.

Mental Health Indicators	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 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	100.0%	92.5%	89.5%	Variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	4.8% (1)	8.3%	12.7%	N/A
The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	100.0%	92.8%	90.0%	Variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.0% (0)	6.3%	10.5%	N/A
The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care plan has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	100.0%	88.1%	83.0%	Variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.0% (0)	6.1%	6.6%	N/A

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice demonstrated some quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided.

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average
Overall QOF score (out of maximum 559)	532.7	540.9	537.5
Overall QOF score (as a percentage of maximum)	95.3%	96.8%	96.2%
Overall QOF exception reporting (all domains)	3.5%	5.8%	5.8%

	Y/N/Partial
Clinicians took part in national and local quality improvement initiatives.	Yes
The practice had a comprehensive programme of quality improvement and used information about care and treatment to make improvements.	No
Quality improvement activity was targeted at the areas where there were concerns.	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

- The practice had carried out an audit on patients prescribed Warfarin as a repeat to check that INR levels were monitored prior to issuing the repeat prescription. The initial audit carried out in December 2018 identified 19 patients on Warfarin, 18 of whom had not had INR levels checked in the previous 4 weeks. The practice took action to review the repeat prescribing policy for Warfarin and a re-audit in July 2019 identified 18 patients on Warfarin, 17 of whom had a recent INR check in the previous 4 weeks. The audit clearly demonstrated improved monitoring of patients prescribed Warfarin.
- A second audit we reviewed was carried out to check patients prescribed a high blood pressure medicine on repeat prescription were having their pulse rate monitored in line with NICE guidance. The audit was a single cycle audit which showed that 83% of patients on the medicine were being monitored.

Any additional evidence or comments

Although we found some evidence of quality improvement there was no comprehensive program in place.

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. 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 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
Induction included completion of the Care Certificate for Health Care Assistants employed since April 2015.	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

Coordinating care and treatment

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

Indicator	Y/N/Partial
The contractor has regular (at least 3 monthly) multidisciplinary case review meetings where all patients on the palliative care register are discussed (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (QOF)	Yes
We saw records that showed that all appropriate staff, including those in different teams and organisations, were involved in assessing, planning and delivering care and treatment.	Yes
Care was delivered and reviewed in a coordinated way when different teams, services or organisations were involved.	Yes
Patients received consistent, coordinated, person-centred care when they moved between services.	Yes

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, tackling obesity.	Yes

Smoking Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with any or any combination of the following conditions: CHD, PAD, stroke or TIA, hypertension, diabetes, COPD, CKD, asthma, schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder or other psychoses whose notes record smoking status in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small>	98.8%	96.3%	95.1%	Variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.0% (0)	0.6%	0.8%	N/A

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
The practice monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.	Yes

Caring

Rating: Good

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion. Feedback from patients was positive about the way staff treated people.

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

CQC comments cards	
Total comments cards received.	38
Number of CQC comments received which were positive about the service.	34
Number of comments cards received which were mixed about the service.	3
Number of CQC comments received which were negative about the service.	1

Source	Feedback
Comment card	Excellent service from the doctor and his staff. Always caring, respectful and respected confidentiality. My concerns are always listened to.
Comment card	The staff are caring and listen to my health issue, my needs were responded to with the right care and advice.
Comment card	My family and I have always received the best care at Kenton Clinic. We have been patients of this clinic for more than 10 years. Staff have always been respectful and always felt cared for. Our children have received good care when required.

National GP Survey results

Note: The questions in the 2018 GP Survey indicators have changed. Ipsos MORI have advised that the new survey data must not be directly compared to the past survey data, because the survey methodology changed in 2018.

Practice population size	Surveys sent out	Surveys returned	Survey Response rate%	% of practice population
3390	319	113	35.4%	3.33%

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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	69.0%	87.4%	89.0%	Variation (negative)
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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	72.9%	84.6%	87.4%	Tending towards variation (negative)
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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	84.7%	94.6%	95.6%	Tending towards variation (negative)
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of their GP practice (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	68.5%	79.7%	83.8%	Tending towards variation (negative)

Any additional evidence or comments

Unpublished data from the 2019 national GP survey showed a good performance for caring indicators. Three hundred and nineteen surveys were sent out and 114 returned (36% completion rate).

For example:

- 83% say the healthcare professional they saw or spoke to was good at listening to them during their last general practice appointment compared to the CCG average of 88% and the national average of 89%.
- 82% say the healthcare professional they saw or spoke to was good at treating them with care and concern during their last general practice appointment compared to the CCG average of 86% and the national average of 87%.
- 78% say the healthcare professional they saw or spoke to was good at giving them enough time during their last general practice appointment compared to the CCG average of 85% and the national average of 89%.
- 90% had confidence and trust in the healthcare professional they saw or spoke to during their last general practice appointment compared to the CCG average of 95% and the national average of 95%.

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

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.	Yes
Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Easy read and pictorial materials were available.	

Source	Feedback
Interviews with patients.	Patients reported that the doctors always involved them in their care and treatment and their health conditions were carefully explained to them and the doctors made sure they understood the treatment options available.

National GP 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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	82.2%	91.7%	93.5%	Tending towards variation (negative)

	Y/N/Partial
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 other languages and in easy read format.	Yes
Information about support groups was available on the practice website.	No
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The practice had a website under construction. It	

was not functional at the time of the inspection.

Carers	Narrative
Percentage and number of carers identified.	47 carers identified. (1.4% of the patient list).
How the practice supported carers (including young carers).	The practice offered flu vaccinations and routinely signposted patients with carer responsibilities to local support groups.
How the practice supported recently bereaved patients.	The doctors individually supported bereaved patients and the practice also signposted bereaved patients to local counselling services.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected patients' privacy and dignity.

	Y/N/Partial
Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments.	Yes
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
There were arrangements to ensure confidentiality at the reception desk.	Yes

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.	Yes
The importance of flexibility, informed choice and continuity of care was reflected in the services provided.	Yes
The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services being delivered.	Yes
The practice made reasonable adjustments when patients found it hard to access services.	Yes
There were arrangements in place for people who need translation services.	Yes
The practice complied with the Accessible Information Standard.	Yes

Practice Opening Times	
Day	Time
Opening times:	
Monday	8am – 1pm & 2pm – 7pm
Tuesday	8am – 1pm & 2pm – 7pm
Wednesday	8am – 1pm & 2pm – 6.30pm
Thursday	8am – 1pm & 2pm – 7pm
Friday	8am – 1pm & 2pm – 7pm
Appointments available:	
Monday	9am – 11am & 5pm – 7pm
Tuesday	9am – 11am & 5pm – 7pm
Wednesday	9am – 11am & 5pm – 6.30pm
Thursday	9am – 11am & 5pm – 7pm
Friday	9am – 11am & 5pm – 7pm

National GP Survey results

Practice population size	Surveys sent out	Surveys returned	Survey Response rate%	% of practice population
3390	319	113	35.4%	3.33%

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that at their last general practice appointment, their needs were met (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	86.6%	93.3%	94.8%	Tending towards variation (negative)

Any additional evidence or comments

Unpublished data from the 2019 national GP survey showed a good performance for responsive indicators. See below for details.

Older people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- All 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 provided effective care coordination to enable older patients to access appropriate services.
- In recognition of the religious and cultural observances of some patients, the GP would respond quickly, often outside of normal working hours, to provide the necessary death certification to enable prompt burial in line with families' wishes when bereavement occurred.
- There was a medicines delivery service for housebound patients.

People with long-term conditions

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- Patients with multiple conditions had their needs reviewed in one appointment.
- The practice provided effective care coordination to enable patients with long-term conditions to access appropriate services.
- The practice liaised regularly with the local district nursing team to discuss and manage the needs of patients with complex medical issues.
- Care and treatment for people with long-term conditions approaching the end of life was coordinated with other services.

Families, children and young people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- Additional nurse appointments were available until 7pm on a Wednesday and Friday for school age children so that they did not need to miss school.
- We found there were systems to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency (A&E) attendances. Records we looked at confirmed this.
- All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child were offered a same day appointment when necessary.
- Parents with concerns regarding children under the age of 10 could attend a drop-in clinic held at the same time as the twice weekly baby clinic.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The needs of this population group had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care.
- To accommodate this population group, GP appointments were available until 7pm on a Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday. Nurse appointments were available from 8am to 7pm on a Wednesday and Friday.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people and those with a learning disability.
- People in vulnerable circumstances were easily able to register with the practice, including those with no fixed abode such as homeless people.
- The practice provided effective care coordination to enable patients living in vulnerable circumstances to access appropriate services.
- The practice adjusted the delivery of its services to meet the needs of patients with a learning disability.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- Priority appointments were allocated when necessary to those experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and those patients living with dementia.
- The practice was aware of support groups within the area and signposted their patients to these accordingly.

Timely access to the service

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

National GP Survey results

	Y/N/Partial
Patients with urgent needs had their care prioritised.	Yes
The practice had a system to assess whether a home visit was clinically necessary and the urgency of the need for medical attention.	Yes
Appointments, care and treatment were only cancelled or delayed when absolutely necessary.	Yes

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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	75.5%	N/A	70.3%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of making an appointment (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	66.3%	64.8%	68.6%	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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)	51.7%	63.1%	65.9%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were satisfied with the type of appointment (or appointments) they	55.8%	69.0%	74.4%	Tending towards variation (negative)

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
were offered (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018)				

Any additional evidence or comments
<p>Unpublished data from the 2019 national GP survey showed a good performance for responsive indicators. Three hundred and nineteen surveys were sent out and 114 returned (36% completion rate). For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 84% find it easy to get through to this GP practice by phone compared to the CCG average of 67% and the national average of 68%. 80% are satisfied with the general practice appointment times available compared to the CCG average of 64% and the national average of 65%. 72% usually get to see or speak to their preferred GP when they would like to compared to the CCG average of 43% and the national average of 48%. 69% were offered a choice of appointment when they last tried to make a general practice appointment compared to the CCG average of 66% and the national average of 62%. 77% were satisfied with the type of appointment they were offered compared to the CCG average of 70% and the national average of 74%. 72% describe their experience of making an appointment as good compared to the CCG average of 65% and the national average of 67%.

Source	Feedback
For example, NHS Choices	NHS choices feedback showed a high satisfaction with the practice and access. The practice received five stars based on 66 ratings.

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.	3
Number of complaints we examined.	3
Number of complaints we examined that were satisfactorily handled in a timely way.	3
Number of complaints referred to the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman.	0

	Y/N/Partial
Information about how to complain was readily available.	Yes
There was evidence that complaints were used to drive continuous improvement.	Yes

Example(s) of learning from complaints.

Complaint	Specific action taken
Patient complained that there were no facilities for the disposal of nappies.	Disposable nappy bags introduced.
Patient suffering from work stress complained that they were not treated well by the GP.	More patience and empathy to be exercised when dealing with patients with work stress.

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

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision and credible strategy to provide high quality sustainable care.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had a clear vision and set of values that prioritised quality and sustainability.	Yes
There was a realistic strategy to achieve their priorities.	Yes
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: The practice had a mission statement to communicate, diagnose, treat and support its patients while maintaining excellence as its core value. The practice vision was to maintain its position as one of the best practices in the clinical commissioning group. The strategy to deliver the vision was training and education of the work force.	

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's speaking up policies were in line with the NHS Improvement Raising Concerns (Whistleblowing) Policy.	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
Staff interviews	Staff reported positively about working for the practice. They said that they were sufficiently supported with training to carry out their roles effectively. Staff said that the leaders were approachable and took notice of any issues they might have.

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

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance. However, we found some shortfalls in the delivery of safe care.

	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 systematic programme of clinical and internal audit.	No
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	No
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
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:	
There were shortfalls in the arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks. The shortfalls related to the management of medicines, emergency equipment, infection prevention and control and staff training.	
There was limited evidence of clinical audit and no systematic programme.	

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 adjust and improve performance.	Yes
Performance information was used to hold staff and management to account.	Yes
Our inspection indicated that information was accurate, valid, reliable and timely.	Yes
Staff whose responsibilities included making statutory notifications understood what this entails.	Yes

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
We spoke to three members of the Patient Participation Group. They told us that the practice actively involved them in decisions about the way the practice was run. They were involved in preparing a newsletter which was distributed to patients on a quarterly basis. The members said that they were involved in setting up events at the practice for small children and their parents and a 'walky talky group' where patients were invited for regular walks to improve fitness. This group was open to all patients.

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.	Yes
Learning was shared effectively and used to make improvements.	Yes

Examples of continuous learning and improvement

The practice has been a teaching practice since 2009 and has participated in the training programme for 3rd, 4th and final year students at Kings College Medical School.

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.